

44550

6

90595
Junt
18 Jan 2

U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

Reports
no. 12

REPORT
ON
THE COST OF CRIME



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1931

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - - - Price \$1.10

42925

HV
6775
.A5
1931

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

JUNE 24, 1931.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I beg to transmit herewith a twelfth report of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, treating of the Cost of Crime.

I have the honor to be,
Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM,
Chairman.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE COST OF CRIME

The economic and financial aspects of the problem of crime are of obvious importance. Not only is the economic background of the criminal of significance in any analysis of causative factors in criminality but the financial effects of crime as reflected in the cost of crime and criminal justice are matters of general interest and definite significance (a) as indicating the importance to the community, from a monetary standpoint, of the adequate control of crime, and (b) as bearing upon questions of efficiency and economy in the administration and enforcement of the criminal law. In other reports we have considered certain aspects of the economic background of criminals as a causative factor in criminality, but we have not elsewhere considered, except generally, the economic and financial effects of crime.

When we commenced our labors some two years ago, we found that no comprehensive scientific study of the cost of crime and criminal justice in the United States had ever been made. Conceiving such a study to be an essential part of the thorough inquiry into the general problem of law enforcement which we were commissioned by the President and authorized by the Congress to make, we determined to undertake it.

The investigations have been made under the direction of Goldthwaite H. Dorr, Esq., and Sidney P. Simpson, Esq., of the New York Bar. Mr. Dorr has had long experience in Federal prosecution and practice, and has served as head of the criminal division of the United States attorney's office in the southern district of New York and as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Simpson has practiced in Washington, D. C., and in New York, and has contributed to legal periodicals on public and administrative law subjects. Both are members of the law firm of Hines, Rearick, Dorr, Travis & Marshall, of New York, and their labors in making the investigation for us were made possible by that firm.

The investigations which form the basis for the detailed parts of the report which follows have been in progress

since 1929, and, while not entirely complete, we believe they have been as comprehensive as the time available, the limited funds we were able to devote to the study, and the pioneer nature of this inquiry would permit. In making the investigations, the directors have been assisted by hundreds of public-spirited citizens, most of whom served without compensation. We desire to join with Messrs. Dorr and Simpson in expressing appreciation of this invaluable cooperation. We believe that the following report contains a clear and accurate analysis of the elements of economic loss to the country which result from crime, and that the figures assembled as a result of the cooperative effort of those who contributed to the preparation of the reports may be regarded as reliable estimates.

The facts found and conclusions reached by Messrs. Dorr and Simpson, together with certain recommendations made by them, are fully set forth in the concluding part of their report on the Cost of Crime and Criminal Justice in the United States (pp. 438-453, *infra*). Certain of them, however, deserve emphasis here.

1. THE ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF CRIME

The tremendous economic burden imposed by crime upon the community is clearly demonstrated by the investigations which have been made. Regarding the cost of administration of criminal justice, for example, the report of the investigators estimates that the administration of the criminal law costs the Federal Government something over \$52,000,000 annually, of which over \$34,000,000 is chargeable to the enforcement of prohibition; that rural protection by State police forces in the 11 States having such forces costs over \$2,500,000 annually; that State penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies involve an expenditure of over \$51,000,000 each year; and that a sum very substantially in excess of \$247,000,000 per year is spent in connection with criminal law enforcement in the cities of this country over 25,000 in population. In addition, large private expenditures for protection against crime are made. For example, some \$3,900,000 is paid annually to companies engaged in the business of providing armored-car service for transporting money and valuables.

The aggregate amount of losses to private individuals due to criminal acts is quite impossible of exact determination; but certain illustrative figures are presented in the report which we regard as of significance as indicating the economic importance of such losses. For example, the insured losses due to burglary, robbery, larceny, and embezzlement—which, of course, form only a part of the total losses due to these causes—average in excess of \$47,000,000 annually. Probably much more important are losses due to commercialized fraud and to organized extortion and racketeering. The only figures available as to commercialized fraud are the estimates by the Post Office Department of the amount of losses due to the use of mails to defraud, which appear, from those estimates, to have averaged over \$68,000,000 a year for the last 10 years. We believe that this represents only a small proportion of the total loss due to criminal frauds, and we think it quite probable that the loss due to organized extortion and racketeering is of still greater magnitude. In connection with this general question of private losses due to crime, moreover, we consider it to be of significance that the annual amount paid out by members of the public in this country for insurance against criminal acts averages in excess of \$106,000,000.

Looking at the matter of economic loss from another point of view, the investigators have considered the question of the indirect economic injury to the community as a whole due to the loss of potential productive labor of criminals and persons imprisoned for crime, and to the diversion from directly productive activities of the vast army of law enforcement officers and other persons concerned with protective activities which the existence of the criminal makes necessary. While, as they indicate, the total amount of this indirect loss is incapable of exact determination or estimate, it seems probable, as they state, that the indirect loss of productive labor of prisoners and law enforcement officers alone is of the order of magnitude of some \$300,000,000 a year.

The findings of the consultants thus strikingly confirm the accuracy of the general belief that crime imposes a tremendous economic burden on the community. The total amount of the economic loss to this country traceable to the

criminal and his activities is, for reasons which are fully set forth in the report which follows, impossible of precise determination; but the data which are available show, and show conclusively, that the economic damage which results from crime is most serious. It should not require the dramatic effect of some lump-sum total figure to emphasize the importance and necessity, from a purely economic standpoint, of dealing adequately with the problem of preventing crime and controlling the criminal.

2. CONCLUSIONS AS TO COST AND EFFICIENCY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

While the following report thus clearly brings out the economic importance of the problem of crime, the significance of the report does not, in our judgment, lie solely or principally in this fact. We believe that the detailed data presented and conclusions reached as to the cost of administering the criminal law may be made to serve as important aids in increasing the economy and efficiency of our criminal justice machinery.

One of the most important conclusions reached, and one with which we thoroughly agree, is that the cost of administering the criminal law, while large, is of less economic importance than the losses inflicted by the criminal, so that it is much more important from an economic standpoint to increase the efficiency of the administration of criminal justice than to decrease its cost. True economy in administering the criminal law may well require in many instances the material increase of expenditures for enforcing the law in order to secure increased efficiency and in order to deal adequately with new types of crime and "improved" methods of criminals.

However, expenditures for the administration of criminal justice, although relatively of less economic importance than the losses caused by the criminal, are very large; so that careful consideration of all possible means of reducing the cost of public justice, in so far as this can be done without decreasing its efficiency, is called for. Our consultants suggest two possible ways in which this may be done. First, there is obvious necessity for eliminating

wasteful expenditures. One difficulty in the way of progress along this line now lies in the lack of any objective standards for the measurement of the comparative efficiency of the law-enforcement machinery in different communities. The consultants believe that the carrying through to completion of their comparative study of the cost of criminal justice in the larger cities of the country, which it has been impossible to complete due to the enforced cessation of our work, may be expected to throw light on this matter. Second, they suggest the advisability of a thorough overhauling of our criminal laws, looking toward the elimination from the penal codes of the States and of the Federal Government of legislation which is obsolete or of doubtful social utility. We agree. The desirability of confining the criminal law to those fields of social control where its effective operation is of real importance is, we think, entirely clear, and the possibility of effecting economies by so confining it appears to be substantial.

The report which follows points out (a) the desirability of increasing the efficiency of police administration to a level commensurate with the very large expenditures involved; (b) the possibility that economy in the penal and corrective treatment of criminals may be promoted by an increased emphasis on probation and parole in preference to institutional treatment in suitable cases; and (c) the possibility that not enough money is being spent on prosecution in view of its importance in the efficient enforcement of law. These conclusions of our consultants are directly in line with our own conclusions, reached on other grounds, set forth in our Reports on Police, on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole, and on Prosecution.

3. CERTAIN DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to these general conclusions and recommendations relating to increased efficiency and economy in administering the criminal law, we adopt the following specific recommendations:

(a) The investigators have recommended that steps be taken to lessen the economic burden which now falls on those members of the public who are required to serve as jurors and attend as witnesses in criminal cases. Our obser-

vations under the heading "Jury Trial" in our Report on Criminal Procedure advert to this present unsatisfactory situation, and the recommendations, made in our Report on Prosecution, looking toward the drastic curtailment of the functions of the grand jury and toward the encouragement of waivers of trial by jury in criminal cases, should be steps toward improvement. Messrs. Dorr and Simpson suggest in this connection that material improvement in the docket procedure of our courts, which will obviate delays and the unnecessary attendance of jurors and witnesses, is highly desirable. We entirely agree, and recommend this matter to the attention of judicial councils and courts in the several States and of the conference of senior circuit judges. We also concur in our consultants' recommendation that careful consideration be given to the question of more nearly adequate compensation for jurors and reimbursement to witnesses in criminal cases. Under the American system of jurisprudence, effective enforcement of the criminal law is largely dependent on good jurors and willing witnesses. The present system, especially as it operates in the larger cities, is not well contrived to produce either.

(b) The following report contains a recommendation that appropriate steps be taken forthwith to develop accurate and comprehensive statistics as to the cost of administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government and by the several States and their municipal subdivisions. We concur in this recommendation and in the detailed suggestions made in the report as to how it can be carried out. While statistics are not a universal solvent for problems of law enforcement, they frequently are, as we have said in our Report on Criminal Statistics, the beginning of wisdom. This is especially true where matters of cost are concerned.

(c) In this connection, we again call attention to the recommendation in the accompanying report that the comparative study of municipal costs of criminal justice with which the investigators have made much progress, but which they were unable to complete due to the necessary cessation of our work at this time, be carried through to completion along the lines they have indicated. By enlisting the cooperation of educational institutions, government research bureaus and civic organizations throughout the country, we have been

able to assemble data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in 300 of the 365 cities of the United States over 25,000 in population, including all the cities over 200,000 in population and over 90 per cent of those over 50,000 in population. The basic data are thus now available for an analysis of comparative costs of criminal justice administration in urban communities which, we believe, has great possibilities, and our consultants have outlined a definite plan for making such an analysis. We believe it important that this plan be carried out.

(d) We believe that nation-wide thorough and scientific studies of racketeering and organized extortion and of commercialized fraud should be made. Limitations upon available funds and time made it impossible for these studies to be made by us. The investigations made by our consultants have induced an opinion on their part that these two types of crime are of outstanding and increasing importance in this country, and that to deal with them adequately will require accurate and comprehensive knowledge of their ramifications and methods, which is now nowhere available. We agree as to the importance of such studies and recommend that means be found for beginning them forthwith.

These specific recommendations relate largely to the ascertainment of further facts to serve as a basis for intelligent consideration of problems of economy and efficiency in the administration of criminal justice. Adequate financial statistics as to Federal, State, and municipal enforcement of the criminal law, and the development, if possible, of standards of efficient expenditure for criminal-justice purposes, should facilitate greatly intelligent planning and action looking toward the improvement of our criminal justice machinery. In part, however, these specific recommendations, like the general conclusions of our consultants which we have approved, have broader implications. The importance of dealing effectively with organized crime, whether commercialized fraud or extortion, can not be over-emphasized. Intelligent action requires knowledge—not, as in too many cases, a mere redoubling of effort in the absence of adequate information and a definite plan. The carrying out of our recommendation for immediate, comprehensive,

and scientific nation-wide inquiry into organized crime should make possible the development of an intelligent plan for its control.

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM,
Chairman.

HENRY W. ANDERSON.
NEWTON D. BAKER.
ADA L. COMSTOCK.
WILLIAM I. GRUBB.
WILLIAM S. KENYON.
MONTE M. LEMANN.
FRANK J. LOESCH.
KENNETH MACKINTOSH.
PAUL J. MCCORMICK.
ROSCOE POUND.

JUNE 24, 1931.

REPORT ON
THE COST OF CRIME AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
IN THE UNITED STATES

PREPARED FOR
THE NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
GOLDTHWAITE H. DORR
AND
SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

FOREWORD

The purposes of this report, prepared under our direction for the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, are: First, to analyze the problem of determining the cost of crime in the United States; second, to present the results of specific and detailed studies of various aspects of the economic loss to the community and to particular individuals or classes of individuals resulting from crime; and third, to set forth certain conclusions and recommendations which have been developed as a result of these studies.

For reasons which are set forth in detail hereafter,¹ no single lump-sum figure will be presented in this report as representing the aggregate annual economic cost of crime to the United States. We are of the opinion that no such aggregate figure can be worked out with even approximate accuracy, and are unwilling to indulge in vague estimates which could, at best, be no more than guesses. Accordingly, the attempt has been rather to indicate the elements of cost and loss which are related directly or indirectly to crime than to develop a single figure representing total cost. Detailed monetary figures have been made use of primarily for illustrative purposes, except in the case of some specific classes of costs—particularly certain aspects of the cost of administration of criminal justice—where accurate and useful statistical data could be obtained.

The studies which have supplied the material for this report have been in progress since September, 1929, and have been as comprehensive as the time and funds available have permitted. They have included an examination of the published material, statistical and otherwise, available in the English language relating to the subject; the assembling of unpublished material on the cost of State police and State penal institutions; a nation-wide field study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in American cities, car-

¹ See pp. 67-70, 436-437, *infra*.

ried out in 300 communities through the cooperation of educational institutions, government research organizations and chambers of commerce; a study, carried out with the assistance of the Department of Justice, of the cost of administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government; the collection of data as to private expenditures for protection against crime; and a detailed analysis of the character and magnitude of losses to private individuals and to the community as a result of criminal activities.

While these studies have been made as inclusive as possible, consistent with thoroughness and accuracy, it has been impossible to cover every phase of the subject in the limited time and with the limited funds available, and consequently there are certain important topics which are not dealt with in detail. Thus, our studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice have been limited to the Federal Government, State police forces and penal institutions, and the cities of the United States over 25,000 in population, omitting county costs (except where included as part of the cost of administering criminal justice in urban communities) and municipal costs in cities and villages under 25,000 in population. Moreover, limitations of time have made it impossible to carry through to completion the analysis of the data secured as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in urban communities.² The basic data for that analysis are, however, made available in the report and the lines which the further study of that data should take are indicated.

A serious omission occurs in that part of the report which deals with losses to individuals due to criminal acts. Probably the most important losses of this character result from the tremendous growth in recent years of organized extortion and so-called "racketeering," and from commercialized frauds of various sorts. We had originally hoped to carry out detailed field studies of these matters, at least in a few selected urban centers, but, due to the limited allotment of funds for the work, were reluctantly forced to abandon this plan. As present report points out,³ the economic loss due to criminal activities of these types is most serious. The fact

² See p. 340, *infra*.

³ See pp. 400-413, *infra*.

that it has not been practicable to develop data as to the precise amount of losses of this character must not be allowed to obscure the great economic importance of dealing adequately with these forms of crime.

While the scope of this report is thus limited in certain respects, the nature and importance of those elements of cost and loss related to crime which it has not been possible to deal with in detail have in all cases been indicated. Moreover, it has been our endeavor to investigate thoroughly the topics which are dealt with in detail in the report, so that the report may, we think, be regarded as definitive as to the topics thus dealt with. It is to be hoped that those topics which it has not been possible to investigate and report upon in detail may form the subject of future studies by qualified agencies.⁴

The report is in 10 parts.

Part 1—Introductory Analysis of the Cost of Crime—analyzes the problem of determining the cost of crime, discusses the various kinds of costs and losses resulting from or related to crime, and indicates how the subsequent more detailed sections of the report are related to the general subject and to each other.

Part 2—The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice by the Federal Government—prepared with the assistance of Dr. Laurence F. Schmeckebier, of the staff of the Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., and in cooperation with the Department of Justice, presents data as to the Federal costs of police, prosecution, courts, and penal and corrective agencies, with particular reference to the relative cost of enforcing certain of the more important Federal criminal laws.

Part 3—Published Statistical Material on State and Municipal Costs of the Administration of Criminal Justice—prepared with the assistance of Mr. John H. Libby, consulting economist, Washington, D. C., discusses the extent and character of the available statistical material on State and municipal expenditures for the prevention and punishment of crime, and points out the serious defects of that material.

⁴ See pp. 449-453, *infra*.

Part 4—The Cost of State Police Forces—presents data as to expenditures for State police forces and discusses the extent and character of those expenditures.

Part 5—The Cost of State Penal and Correctional Institutions and Parole Agencies—presents and discusses data as to the cost of penal and corrective treatment of adult offenders and juvenile delinquents in the institutions of the several States and as to the cost of State-administered parole.

Part 6—The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities—prepared with the assistance of Dr. Raymond H. Franzen, consulting statistician, New York, N. Y., and Mr. William B. Hubbell, of the New York bar, presents the results of a cooperative field study in 300 of the 365 cities of the United States over 25,000 in population, including all of the cities over 200,000 in population and more than 90 per cent of the cities over 50,000 in population, and sets forth a plan for the complete analysis of these data. This part is the largest in bulk and in many respects the largest in importance of any of the parts of this report. It presents data never heretofore available, which have been collected through the carefully coordinated cooperative efforts of hundreds of investigators throughout the country. The study on which this part of the report is based represents a pioneer effort in three respects: First, in securing accurate data on the cost of criminal justice on a nation-wide scale; second, in enlisting and coordinating a wide diversity of agencies throughout the country in carrying out a cooperative research project; and, third, in outlining a plan for the application of modern statistical methods to this type of data.

Part 7—Private Expenditures for Protection against Crime—prepared with the assistance of Mr. Sydney Waldecker, of the New York bar, discusses the various types of private expenditures for protection against crime and for the detection and penal and corrective treatment of criminals, and presents illustrative statistical data.

Part 8—Private Losses due to Criminal Acts—discusses the character and extent of the losses suffered and costs incurred by individuals as the result of criminal activities, and presents illustrative figures.

Part 9—Economic Losses to the Community due to the Existence of Crime—discusses the losses suffered by the community as a whole as the result of crime and the existence of a criminal class.

Part 10—Summary and Recommendations—summarizes the data presented in the preceding parts of the report and sets forth certain conclusions and recommendations developed by us on the basis of these data.

A bibliographical appendix lists and discusses the published material on the subject of the cost of crime and criminal justice.

This report is the result of the labor of literally hundreds of public-spirited individuals, most of whom served the commission without compensation. We desire particularly to express our sense of obligation to the educational institutions, government research bureaus, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations which supervised studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice in 300 cities throughout the country, and to the individuals who made those studies. Without their able and devoted assistance, the most important single part of this report could never have been prepared. In developing the project for this nation-wide study, and in translating the project so developed into actuality, we have had the benefit of the advice and assistance of an advisory group of experts in municipal government, administration and finance. To the members of that group—Dean Edith Abbott, of the University of Chicago; Prof. William Anderson, of the University of Minnesota; Dr. Russell Forbes, director of the Municipal Administration Service; Dr. Luther Gulick, director of the National Institute of Public Administration; Prof. A. N. Holcombe, of Harvard University; Mr. Robert Lynd, secretary of the Social Science Research Council; Prof. Samuel C. May, of the University of California; Dr. Lewis A. Maverick, of the University of California at Los Angeles; Prof. W. E. Mosher, of Syracuse University; Prof. Howard W. Odum, of the University of North Carolina; Dr. Lent D. Upson, director of the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research; and Dr. W. F. Willoughby, director of the Institute for Government Research—and to the special advisors who counseled and assisted as to particular prob-

lems—Mr. W. W. Law, of Price, Waterhouse & Co.; Mr. W. Earl Weller, director, and Mr. Hazen C. Pratt, of the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research; Mr. Bruce Smith, director of the committee on uniform crime records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police; and Mr. Welles A. Gray, some time assistant director of the Municipal Administration Service—we owe a large debt of gratitude. We also desire to express our sense of obligation to the many Federal, State and municipal officials who have assisted us. Special mention should be made of the assistance rendered by Dr. W. M. Steuart, director of the Bureau of the Census; by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Bureau of Investigation, Mr. John W. Gardner, general agent, and Mr. J. J. Waters, statistician, of the Department of Justice; and by the members of the staff of the commission. Finally we wish to express our grateful appreciation of the wise counsel and guidance of Hon. Paul J. McCormick, chairman of the commission's subcommittee on the cost of crime. The report is the coordinated result of the labors of many, and stands, we feel, as a remarkable testimonial to the unselfish zeal for the public service of those who contributed to its preparation.

GOLDTHWAITE H. DORR.
SIDNEY P. SIMPSON.

CONTENTS

PART 1

INTRODUCTORY ANALYSIS OF THE COST OF CRIME

By Goldthwaite H. Dorr and Sidney P. Simpson

	Page
I. Introduction.....	33
II. Analysis of the cost of crime:	
1. What is the "cost of crime"?	33
2. Costs related to crime.....	36
3. Order of further discussion.....	36
III. The cost of administration of criminal justice:	
1. Introductory.....	37
2. Cost of police.....	37
3. Cost of prosecution.....	41
4. Cost of the criminal courts.....	42
5. Cost of penal and corrective treatment.....	44
6. Summary and reference to detailed studies.....	46
IV. Private expenditures for protection against crime:	
1. Introductory.....	49
2. Cost of protective agencies.....	49
3. Cost of protective devices.....	50
4. Note on the cost of protection of public property.....	50
5. Cost of detective agencies.....	51
6. Cost of penal and corrective treatment.....	51
7. Summary and reference to detailed studies.....	52
V. Private losses due to criminal acts:	
1. Introductory.....	53
2. Losses due to crimes against the person.....	54
3. Losses due to direct crimes against property.....	54
4. Losses due to other crimes affecting wealth.....	54
5. Private losses incidental to the administration of criminal justice.....	56
6. Cost of insurance against criminal acts.....	57
7. Summary and reference to detailed studies.....	58
VI. Losses to the State due to criminal acts:	
1. Introductory.....	59
2. Losses to the State as a property owner.....	59
3. Losses due to frauds on the public revenue.....	59
4. Summary and reference to detailed studies.....	60

	Page
VII. Indirect losses to the community due to the existence of crime:	
1. Introductory.....	60
2. Loss of productive labor of criminals.....	60
3. Loss of productive labor of prisoners.....	61
4. Loss of productive labor of law enforcement officers.....	61
5. Other indirect losses.....	62
6. Cost of supporting dependents of prisoners.....	62
7. Summary and reference to detailed studies.....	63
VIII. The total cost of crime:	
1. Classification of costs related to crime.....	64
2. The immediate cost of crime.....	67
3. The ultimate cost of crime to the community.....	68
4. Conclusion.....	69

PART 2

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE BY
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

By Sidney P. Simpson and Laurence F. Schmeckeber

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	71
2. Geographical scope.....	71
3. Period covered.....	72
II. The Federal machinery for administering criminal justice:	
1. Introductory.....	72
2. Federal police agencies.....	72
3. Federal prosecuting agencies.....	77
4. Federal criminal courts.....	78
5. Federal penal and correctional institutions.....	80
6. Federal probation and parole agencies.....	81
III. Determination of the cost of Federal criminal justice:	
1. Introductory.....	83
2. Securing the basic data.....	84
3. Allocation of costs.....	84
4. Functional divisions of costs.....	85
5. Elements of cost omitted.....	87
6. Receipts.....	88
7. Accuracy of figures developed.....	90
IV. Cost of Federal police agencies:	
1. Police agencies in the Department of Justice.....	95
2. Police agencies in other executive departments and establishments.....	96
3. The United States marshals.....	100
4. Summary of police costs.....	106

V. Cost of Federal prosecution:	Page
1. The Department of Justice.....	106
2. The United States attorneys.....	109
3. Note on Federal grand juries.....	113
4. Other prosecuting agencies.....	113
5. Summary of prosecution costs.....	113
VI. Cost of the Federal criminal courts:	
1. The district courts.....	114
2. The United States commissioners.....	123
3. The circuit courts of appeals.....	127
4. The Supreme Court of the United States.....	128
5. Summary of criminal court costs.....	128
VII. Cost of Federal penal institutional treatment:	
1. Permanent penal institutions.....	129
2. Prison camps.....	131
3. Prisoners in State, county and municipal institutions.....	131
4. The National Training School for Boys.....	132
5. General administration.....	132
6. Summary of costs of penal treatment.....	133
VIII. Cost of Federal probation, parole and pardon:	
1. Introductory.....	135
2. Probation.....	135
3. Parole.....	137
4. The pardon attorney.....	137
5. Summary of probation and pardon costs.....	138
IX. The cost to the Federal Government of administering the criminal law:	
1. General summary.....	138
2. Geographical distribution of cost.....	139
3. Cost of enforcing various types of laws.....	144
X. Recommendations as to permanent Federal statistics as to the cost of criminal justice.....	151

PART 3

PUBLISHED STATISTICAL MATERIAL ON STATE AND
MUNICIPAL COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL
JUSTICE

By Sidney P. Simpson and John H. Libby

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	153
2. Character of material dealt with.....	154
3. Geographical scope of study.....	154
4. Period covered by study.....	155
5. Material examined.....	155
6. Comprehensiveness of study.....	155
7. Order of discussion.....	156

	Page
II. Problems which arise in determining State and municipal costs of administering criminal justice:	
1. Introductory.....	157
2. Allocation of cost as between civil and criminal activities.....	157
3. Capital expenditures.....	158
4. Treatment of receipts.....	159
5. Classification of expenditures.....	161
6. Requisites of satisfactory cost statistics.....	162
7. Fiscal periods covered by existing statistics.....	163
III. Statistics on police costs:	
1. Extent of material.....	164
2. Character of material.....	168
3. Value of material.....	170
IV. Statistics on the cost of prosecution:	
1. Introductory.....	172
2. Extent of material.....	173
3. Character of material.....	174
4. Value of material.....	174
V. Statistics on criminal court costs:	
1. Introductory.....	175
2. Extent of material.....	175
3. Character of material.....	176
4. Value of material.....	177
VI. Statistics on the cost of penal institutions:	
1. Introductory.....	178
2. Extent of material on State institutions.....	178
3. Extent of material on county and municipal institutions.....	179
4. Character of material.....	180
5. Value of material.....	182
VII. Statistics on the cost of probation and parole:	
1. Introductory.....	184
2. Extent and character of material on probation costs.....	184
3. Extent and character of material on parole costs.....	185
4. Value of material.....	185
VIII. Conclusion:	
1. Summary of available statistical material.....	186
2. Requirements of satisfactory financial statistics.....	188
3. Recommendations as to financial statistics.....	190

PART 4

THE COST OF STATE POLICE FORCES

By Sidney P. Simpson

	Page
I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	192
2. Period covered.....	192
3. Method of investigation.....	193
II. State police forces:	
1. Introductory.....	194
2. Highway police forces.....	194
3. Semimilitary forces.....	195
4. State police forces proper.....	195
5. Other State police agencies.....	196
6. Scope of this study.....	196
III. State police costs:	
1. Special problems involved.....	197
2. Basic operating costs.....	198
3. Cost of criminal work.....	200
4. Cost of prohibition enforcement.....	202
5. Conclusion.....	203

PART 5

THE COST OF STATE PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND PAROLE AGENCIES

By Sidney P. Simpson

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	205
2. Scope of study.....	205
3. Period covered.....	206
4. Material used.....	207
II. Problems of institutional costs:	
1. Introductory.....	208
2. Classification of operating expenses.....	208
3. Treatment of capital outlays.....	210
4. Treatment of receipts.....	211
5. Treatment of expenditures for prison industries.....	212
6. Accuracy of figures.....	213
III. Cost of State penal and correctional institutions for adults:	
1. Institutional cost figures.....	214
2. Cost per inmate.....	220
3. Per capita cost.....	223
4. Comparative costs of State and Federal institutions.....	225
5. Significance of institutional cost figures.....	226
6. Total State costs.....	227

IV. Cost of State correctional institutions for minors:	Page
1. Introductory.....	232
2. Institutional cost figures.....	233
3. Comparative State totals.....	236
V. Cost of State parole agencies:	
1. Introductory.....	238
2. Comparative State figures.....	238
VI. Conclusion:	
1. Summary of State costs of penal and corrective treatment.....	240
2. Conclusions to be drawn from the figures.....	241

PART 6

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
IN AMERICAN CITIES

By Sidney P. Simpson, Raymond H. Franzen and William B. Hubbell

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	244
2. Relation to other studies.....	245
3. Scope of study.....	248
4. Order of discussion.....	252
II. Method of investigation:	
1. Necessity for cooperative investigation.....	253
2. Possible agencies of local cooperation.....	254
3. Securing cooperation.....	255
4. Coordinating the studies.....	258
5. Editing the reports.....	262
III. Problems of cost determination:	
1. Introductory.....	263
2. Allocation of cost of agencies having both civil and criminal functions.....	265
3. Allocation of State and county costs.....	267
4. Capital investment and carrying charges.....	269
5. Receipts.....	270
6. Summary.....	270
IV. Extent and character of the cost data obtained:	
1. Introductory.....	271
2. Number of studies made.....	271
3. Geographical distribution of studies.....	274
4. Distribution of studies by population groups.....	275
5. Accuracy of data obtained.....	277
6. Comparability of figures.....	280
7. Summary.....	281

V. The cost of administration of criminal justice in American cities over 25,000 population:	Page
1. Introductory.....	281
2. Police costs.....	282
3. Prosecution costs.....	289
4. Cost of public defense of accused persons.....	296
5. Cost of the criminal courts.....	297
6. Cost of penal and corrective treatment.....	306
7. Receipts.....	321
8. Total cost of criminal justice.....	322
VI. Plan for completion of investigation:	
1. Introductory.....	339
2. Objective of investigation.....	341
3. Community data.....	341
4. Data as to amount of crime.....	343
5. Plan for completing investigation.....	346
6. Desirability of completing investigation.....	347
7. Recommendation.....	348

PART 7

PRIVATE EXPENDITURES FOR PROTECTION AGAINST
CRIME

By Sidney P. Simpson and Sydney Waldecker

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	349
2. Classes of private expenditures.....	349
3. Method of investigation.....	350
II. Cost of protective agencies:	
1. Protective agencies, devices and services.....	351
2. Kinds of protective agencies.....	351
3. Private police forces.....	352
4. Private policemen and guards.....	354
5. Watchmen.....	355
6. Other protective agencies.....	356
7. Conclusion.....	357
III. Cost of protective devices and services:	
1. Introductory.....	358
2. Safes.....	358
3. Burglar and fire alarms.....	359
4. Other protective devices.....	360
5. Protective services.....	361
6. Armored cars.....	362
7. Conclusion.....	363
IV. Cost of detective agencies:	
1. Introductory.....	364
2. Private detective agencies.....	364
3. Investigation departments.....	365
4. Conclusion.....	365

V. Private expenditures for correctional treatment:	Page
1. Introductory.....	366
2. Private correctional institutions for delinquent minors and wayward girls.....	367
3. Private probation agencies.....	368
4. Conclusion.....	369

PART 8

PRIVATE LOSSES DUE TO CRIMINAL ACTS

By Sidney P. Simpson

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of study.....	370
2. Scope of study.....	370
3. Method of investigation.....	372
4. Accuracy of statistical material presented.....	373
II. Losses due to crimes against the person:	
1. Introductory.....	374
2. Homicide.....	375
3. Mayhem and wounding.....	377
4. Sex offenses.....	378
5. Conclusion.....	378
III. Losses due to direct crimes against property:	
1. Introductory.....	379
2. Arson.....	379
3. Malicious mischief.....	381
4. Theft.....	383
5. Embezzlement.....	396
6. Conclusion.....	397
IV. Losses due to crimes affecting wealth other than direct crimes against property:	
1. Introductory.....	398
2. Commercialized fraud.....	400
3. Extortion and racketeering.....	406
4. Conclusion.....	412
V. The cost of insurance against crime:	
1. Introductory.....	413
2. Theft insurance.....	414
3. Fidelity insurance.....	414
4. Riot insurance.....	415
5. Conclusion.....	415
VI. Private losses incident to the administration of criminal justice:	
1. Introductory.....	416
2. Loss due to service as jurors in criminal cases.....	417
3. Attendance in court as witnesses.....	418
4. Conclusion.....	418

PART 9

INDIRECT LOSSES TO THE COMMUNITY DUE TO THE EXISTENCE OF CRIME

By Sidney P. Simpson

I. Introduction:	Page
1. Direct and indirect losses.....	420
2. Scope of study.....	421
II. Loss of productive labor of criminals:	
1. Introductory.....	422
2. Number of criminals.....	422
3. Earning power of criminals.....	423
4. Amount of loss unascertainable.....	424
III. Loss of productive labor of prisoners:	
1. Introductory.....	424
2. Number of prisoners.....	424
3. Earning power of prisoners.....	425
4. Order of magnitude of loss.....	426
IV. Loss of productive labor of law enforcement officers:	
1. Introductory.....	427
2. Number of law enforcement officers.....	428
3. Earning power of law enforcement officers.....	432
4. Order of magnitude of loss.....	433
V. Other losses of productive labor:	
1. Class of loss.....	433
2. Criminal lawyers.....	433
3. Professional bondsmen.....	434
4. Jurors and witnesses in criminal cases.....	434
5. Employees of companies providing crime insurance.....	434
6. Persons employed in manufacturing and selling protective devices.....	435
VI. Conclusion:	
1. Summary.....	435
2. The ultimate cost of crime.....	436

PART 10

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By Goldthwaite H. Dorr and Sidney P. Simpson

I. Summary:	
1. Introductory.....	438
2. The public cost of administration of criminal justice.....	438
3. Private expenditures for protection against crime.....	439
4. Losses due to criminal acts.....	440
5. The cost of insurance against crime.....	441
6. Indirect losses to the community due to the existence of crime.....	441
7. The total cost of crime.....	442

II. Certain conclusions:	Page
1. Introductory.....	443
2. Relative expenditures for criminal justice agencies.....	444
3. Relative importance of cost of administering criminal justice and of losses due to crime.....	446
4. Possible reductions of the cost of criminal justice.....	446
5. Summary of conclusions.....	448
III. Recommendations:	
1. Introductory.....	449
2. Improvement of financial statistics.....	449
3. Completion of study of municipal costs.....	451
4. Study of commercialized fraud.....	451
5. Study of racketeering and organized extortion.....	451
6. Study of how to reduce the economic burden on jurors and witnesses in criminal cases.....	452
7. Summary of recommendations.....	452

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Introduction:	
1. Purpose of bibliography.....	457
2. Scope of bibliographical investigation.....	457
3. Arrangement of material.....	458
II. Books, articles and other secondary material on the cost of crime:	
1. Material included.....	458
2. How material was collected.....	459
3. List of material.....	459
4. Value of material.....	464
III. Reports containing statistical data on the cost of administration of criminal justice:	
1. Material included.....	467
2. How material was collected.....	467
3. List of Federal publications.....	468
4. List of State and municipal publications.....	470

APPENDIX B

Persons and Organizations Responsible for Field Investigations of Municipal Costs of Criminal Justice:

Alabama.....	484
Arizona.....	484
Arkansas.....	485
California.....	485
Colorado.....	485
Connecticut.....	486

Delaware.....	487
District of Columbia.....	487
Florida.....	487
Georgia.....	488
Illinois.....	488
Indiana.....	489
Iowa.....	491
Kansas.....	492
Kentucky.....	492
Louisiana.....	493
Maine.....	493
Maryland.....	494
Massachusetts.....	494
Michigan.....	496
Minnesota.....	496
Mississippi.....	497
Missouri.....	497
Montana.....	498
Nebraska.....	498
New Hampshire.....	498
New Jersey.....	499
New Mexico.....	499
New York.....	499
North Carolina.....	501
North Dakota.....	501
Ohio.....	501
Oklahoma.....	503
Oregon.....	503
Pennsylvania.....	503
Rhode Island.....	505
South Carolina.....	505
South Dakota.....	506
Tennessee.....	506
Texas.....	507
Utah.....	507
Virginia.....	507
Washington.....	508
West Virginia.....	508
Wisconsin.....	508

APPENDIX C

Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities (reprint).....	510a
--	------

APPENDIX D

Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, New York (reprint).....	552a
--	------

APPENDIX E		Page
Outline of Project for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice (reprint).....		607
APPENDIX F		
Instruction Circulars Issued to Field Investigators.....		635
APPENDIX G		
Population, Form of Government, and Volume of Crime in American Cities over 25,000 in Population, 1930.....		644
APPENDIX H		
The Cost of Criminal Justice in Rhode Island, 1920-1929.....		655
LIST OF TABLES		
PART 2:		
Table 1. Cost of criminal police agencies in the Department of Justice, 1929-30.....		95
Table 2. Cost of various criminal police activities of Department of Justice, 1929-30.....		96
Table 3. Cost of criminal police agencies in executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice, 1929-30.....		96
Table 4. Cost of various criminal police activities of executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice, 1929-30.....		98
Table 5. Cost of criminal police activities of United States marshals, 1929-30.....		101
Table 6. Cost of various criminal police activities of United States marshals, 1929-30.....		103
Table 7. Cost of criminal police activities of the Federal Government, 1929-30.....		106
Table 8. Cost of various criminal police activities of the Federal Government, 1929-30.....		106
Table 9. Cost of prosecution activities of Department of Justice, 1929-30.....		107
Table 10. Cost of various prosecution activities of Department of Justice, 1929-30.....		108
Table 11. Cost of prosecution activities of United States attorneys, 1929-30.....		109
Table 12. Cost of various prosecution activities of United States attorneys, 1929-30.....		111
Table 13. Cost of prosecution by the Federal Government, 1929-30.....		114
Table 14. Cost of various prosecuting activities of the Federal Government, 1929-30.....		114
Table 15. Cost of the criminal business of the district courts, 1929-30.....		116

PART 2—Continued.		Page
Table 16. Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the district courts, 1929-30.....		120
Table 17. Cost of various activities of United States commissioners, 1929-30.....		124
Table 18. Cost of the criminal business of the circuit courts of appeals, 1929-30.....		127
Table 19. Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the circuit courts of appeals, 1929-30.....		127
Table 20. Cost of various kinds of business of the Supreme Court, 1929-30.....		128
Table 21. Cost of the criminal business of the Federal courts, 1929-30.....		129
Table 22. Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the Federal courts, 1929-30.....		129
Table 23. Cost of Federal penitentiaries and reformatories, 1929-30.....		129
Table 24. Analysis of operating cost of Federal penitentiaries and reformatories for adults, 1929-30.....		130
Table 25. Operating cost per inmate of Federal penitentiaries and reformatories for adults, 1929-30.....		130
Table 26. Cost of Federal penitentiary and reformatory confinement of adults, by offenses, 1929-30.....		131
Table 27. Cost of Federal prison camps, 1929-30.....		131
Table 28. Cost of Federal prison camp confinement for various offenses, 1929-30.....		131
Table 29. Cost of confinement of Federal prisoners in State, county and municipal penal institutions, by offenses, 1929-30.....		132
Table 30. Cost of National Training School for Boys, by offenses, 1929-30.....		132
Table 31. Cost of Bureau of Prisons, 1929-30.....		133
Table 32. General administration cost of Federal penal treatment, by offenses, 1929-30.....		133
Table 33. Cost of Federal penal treatment 1929-30.....		133
Table 34. Cost of Federal penal treatment for various offenses, 1929-30.....		134
Table 35. Cost of Federal probation for various offenses, 1929-30.....		136
Table 36. Estimated expenditures for Federal probation, 1930-31.....		136
Table 37. Estimated expenditures for Federal parole, 1930-31.....		137
Table 38. Cost of office of Federal pardon attorney chargeable to various offenses, 1929-30.....		138
Table 39. Cost of Federal probation and pardon for various offenses, 1929-30.....		138
Table 40. Cost of Federal criminal justice, 1929-30.....		139

	Page
PART 2—Continued.	
Table 41. Geographical distribution of specified Federal costs of criminal justice, 1929-30.....	140
Table 42. Cost of Federal criminal justice chargeable to various offenses, 1929-30.....	145
Table 43. Cost of prohibition enforcement, by districts 1929-30.....	147
Table 44. Cost of Federal prohibition enforcement, 1929-30.....	149
Table 45. Cost of Federal prohibition enforcement by civil and criminal proceedings, 1929-30.....	149
Table 46. Cost of enforcement of the Federal antinarcotic laws, 1929-30.....	149
Table 47. Cost of Federal enforcement of Federal criminal laws, 1929-30.....	150
Table 48. Per capita cost of Federal enforcement of Federal criminal laws, 1929-30.....	150
PART 3:	
Table 1. Geographical distribution of urban communities reporting police costs.....	167
PART 4:	
Table 1. Operating costs of State police forces, 1928.....	199
Table 2. Cost of criminal work of State police forces, 1928.....	200
Table 3. Relation of cost of criminal work of State police to rural population.....	201
Table 4. Relation of size of State police forces and cost of criminal work to rural population.....	202
Table 5. Relative cost of prohibition and other criminal work of State police forces, 1928.....	203
PART 5:	
Table 1. Expenditures of State penal institutions for adults, 1928.....	214
Table 2. Operating expenses of State penal institutions for adults, 1928.....	218
Table 3. Operating cost per inmate of State penal institutions for adults, 1928.....	220
Table 4. Operating cost per inmate by States and types of penal institutions for adults, 1928.....	222
Table 5. Per capita cost of State penal institutions for adults, 1928.....	224
Table 6. Comparative cost of Federal and State penal institutions for adults.....	226
Table 7. State costs of penal treatment of adults, 1928.....	228
Table 8. Operating cost per inmate of State institutions for juvenile delinquents, 1926-27.....	234
Table 9. Comparative costs per inmate of State and Federal institutions for juvenile delinquents 1926-27.....	235
Table 10. Cost of State correctional treatment of juvenile delinquents, 1928.....	236

	Page
PART 5—Continued.	
Table 11. Cost of State parole agencies, 1928.....	238
Table 12. Cost of State penal and corrective treatment, 1928.....	240
PART 6:	
Table 1. Number and proportion of cities studied.....	271
Table 2. Number of cities studied by States.....	272
Table 3. Geographical distribution of cities studied.....	275
Table 4. Distribution of cities studied by population groups.....	275
Table 5. Geographical distribution of cities between 25,000 and 50,000 population studied.....	276
Table 6. Police costs in American cities, 1930.....	283
Table 7. Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930.....	290
Table 8. Cost of public defense of accused persons in American cities, 1930.....	297
Table 9. Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930.....	298
Table 10. Cost of criminal work of appellate courts, 1930.....	305
Table 11. Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930.....	308
Table 12. Cost of probation in American cities, 1930.....	314
Table 13. Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930.....	323
Table 14. Average costs of administration of criminal justice in American cities, by population groups.....	334
Table 15. Direct municipal costs of criminal justice as related to total municipal expenditures for general departments.....	335
PART 7:	
Table 1. Expenditures for watch clocks, 1925-1930.....	356
Table 2. Expenditures for safes, chests, and vaults, 1920-1929.....	359
Table 3. Expenditures for bullet-resisting glass, 1928-1930 (incomplete).....	360
Table 4. Expenditures for protective services, 1920-1929.....	362
PART 8:	
Table 1. Fire losses in the United States, 1920-1928.....	380
Table 2. Riot losses in the United States, 1921-1929.....	382
Table 3. Losses due to bank burglaries and robberies, 1921-1930.....	385
Table 4. Insured losses, due to bank burglaries and robberies, 1923-1929.....	386
Table 5. Losses due to thefts from jewelers, 1921-1929.....	388
Table 6. Losses due to theft of railroad freight, 1920-1929.....	389
Table 7. Automobiles stolen and recovered, 1925-1929.....	390
Table 8. Insured losses due to automobile theft, 1929-30.....	390
Table 9. Insured losses due to residence burglary, theft, and larceny, 1923-1929.....	392
Table 10. Insured losses due to mercantile open stock burglary, 1923-1929.....	392
Table 11. Insured losses due to mercantile safe burglary, 1923-1929.....	392

PART 8—Continued.	Page
Table 12. Insured losses due to office and store robbery, 1923-1929.....	393
Table 13. Insured losses due to messenger robbery, 1923-1929.....	393
Table 14. Insured losses due to paymaster robbery, 1923-1929.....	393
Table 15. Summary of insured losses, 1925-1929.....	394
Table 16. Losses due to mail thefts, 1921-1930.....	395
Table 17. Insured losses due to embezzlement, 1925-1929.....	396
Table 18. Summary of insured losses due to direct crimes against property, 1925-1929.....	398
Table 19. Estimated losses due to use of the mails to defraud, 1924-1930.....	405
Table 20. Premiums on larceny, burglary, and robbery insurance, 1921-1928.....	414
Table 21. Premiums on automobile theft insurance, 1925-1930.....	414
Table 22. Premiums on fidelity insurance, 1925-1929.....	415
Table 23. Premiums on riot insurance, 1921-1929.....	415
Table 24. Premiums on insurance against crime, 1925-1928.....	415
APPENDIX H:	
Table 1. Cost of criminal justice in Rhode Island, 1920-1929 (exclusive of towns).....	655
Table 2. Per capita cost of criminal justice in Rhode Island, 1920-1929 (exclusive of towns).....	656

PART 1

INTRODUCTORY ANALYSIS OF THE COST OF CRIME

By GOLDTHWAITE H. DORR and SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This introductory part of this report has the twofold purpose (a) of analyzing the conception of the "cost of crime" and considering the feasibility of measuring that cost in terms of dollars and cents, and (b) of serving as an introduction to the more detailed studies of particular phases of the cost of crime and criminal justice which form the next 8 parts of the report.

A preliminary analysis is an obviously indispensable prerequisite to any intelligent consideration of the subject of the cost of crime. In this introductory discussion we undertake to make that analysis and to define the problem to be investigated. Moreover, through a somewhat detailed preliminary discussion of various kinds of costs related to crime, the basis is developed for considering whether it is practicable to work out an aggregate figure for the cost of crime to the country expressed in monetary terms. This detailed preliminary discussion of the various classes of costs related to crime also makes it possible to indicate at the outset exactly how the later detailed parts of the report are related to the general subject of the cost of crime and criminal justice.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE COST OF CRIME

1. *What is the "cost of crime"?*—In a very broad sense the "cost of crime" might perhaps be regarded as extending beyond general economic loss and individual financial burden to those imponderable elements of human wastage which are

of vital social importance in connection with crime. This study, however, is concerned with the cost of crime in its economic and financial sense only.

How is the economic cost of crime to be determined? Theoretically, the cost on an annual basis to the country as a whole could be arrived at by determining (a) the actual annual national income; and (b) what the annual national income would be if there were no crime. The result reached by subtracting the first factor from the second might then fairly be said to be the annual economic cost of crime to the country. But any such procedure is obviously impracticable. While the first factor, although it can not be ascertained with exact accuracy, can be intelligently estimated,¹ the second factor is wholly unascertainable. An attempt to compute what the annual national income would be if there were no crime would be somewhat like an attempt to determine what the course of history would have been if Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo, or what the present national wealth would be if slavery had never existed in this country. It is clear, therefore, that if the annual economic cost of crime to the country as a whole is to be determined, it must be done, if at all, by indirect means.²

So far we have been considering the cost of crime to the community as a whole. This is measured, as has been pointed out, by the difference between what the national income would be if there were no crime and the actual national income. But the problem may be looked at from another point of view. Instead of considering the aggregate economic loss to the community as a whole, we may consider the aggregate dollars-and-cents' burden on the individual members of the community imposed by expenditures for protection against crime and by losses due to crime. The amount of this burden does not necessarily measure the economic loss to the community as a whole, nor does the amount of economic loss to the community as a whole necessarily

¹ See National Bureau of Economic Research, *Income in the United States: Its Amount and Distribution, 1909-1919* (New York, 1921); Copeland, *The National Income and Its Distribution, in Recent Economic Changes in the United States*, vol. 2, pp. 757-839 (New York, 1929); King, *The National Income and Its Purchasing Power* (New York, 1930).

² As to the possibility of this, see pp. 68-69, *infra*.

measure the amount of the direct burden imposed on individuals by crime. In this report, as rather arbitrary shorthand phrases, we shall speak of the economic loss to the community as a whole as the *ultimate cost of crime*, and of the aggregate burden on the individual members of the community as the *immediate cost of crime*.

These two aspects of the cost of crime are for the most part mutually exclusive. The elements of the ultimate cost of crime are not, in general, elements of the immediate cost of crime, and the converse is also true. The ultimate cost of crime, for example, includes losses due to the uneconomic use of the potential productive labor of criminals and law enforcement officers, but does not include transfers of money or other property from injured individuals to persons engaged in criminal activities. The immediate cost of crime, on the other hand, does not include general economic losses to the community due to the uneconomic use of potential productive labor, but does include amounts of money paid out in taxes to support the machinery of law enforcement, and transfers of money and property from law-abiding individuals to criminals as a result of criminal acts. Some losses are both immediate and ultimate, as in the case of the actual destruction of property; but in most instances the two classes of costs are entirely separate, and must be so regarded or confusion will result.

We have already pointed out that the ultimate cost of crime to the community is not susceptible of direct ascertainment.³ The problem of ascertaining the immediate cost of crime is somewhat different, but even here it is obvious that an aggregate figure can be obtained, if at all, only by analyzing all the various classes of costs related to crime; determining which of them form part of the immediate cost of crime; and then ascertaining whether those classes of costs can be accurately measured. Such an analysis is also a prerequisite to ascertaining whether it is possible to determine the ultimate cost of crime by indirect methods. After that analysis has been made, it will be possible to consider whether any total figures for either immediate or ultimate costs can successfully be developed.

³ See p. 34, *supra*.

2. *Costs related to crime.*—The direct costs or losses resulting from or related to crime may be classified in the first instance into (a) the cost of preventing and punishing crime and (b) losses due to criminal acts. Part of each of these classes of financial burdens is borne directly by private individuals and part indirectly by such individuals as members of the public, although in very different proportions. The major part of the cost of preventing and punishing crime is borne indirectly through taxes, while losses due to criminal acts primarily affect individuals directly; but, while private expenditures for protection against and punishment of crime and public losses due to criminal acts are of less importance, they are by no means negligible. All these classes of costs form a part of the immediate cost of crime, but, except for losses due to the actual destruction of or injury to property or to crimes against the person, afford no measure of the ultimate economic cost of crime to the community as a whole.

In addition to these classes of costs, consideration must be given to those elements of ultimate cost to the community which are not directly connected with specific public or private expenditures or specific losses to the state or to individuals.

Each of these classes of cost related to crime must be examined to determine to what extent costs of that class are susceptible of accurate ascertainment. After such consideration, it will be possible to consider the possibility of developing definite total figures for immediate and ultimate costs.

3. *Order of further discussion.*—The next 5 chapters of this part of this report will analyze the constituent elements of and discuss the possibility of ascertaining accurately (a) the cost of administration of criminal justice; (b) private expenditures for protection against crime; (c) private losses due to criminal acts; (d) losses to the State due to criminal acts; and (e) indirect losses to the community as a whole due to the existence of crime. The final chapter of this part will discuss the question of whether any satisfactory estimate of the total cost of crime is possible and, if not, to what extent information on costs related to crime may nevertheless be obtainable and significant. In the course of examining and analyzing the various kinds of costs related to crime, at-

tention will from time to time be directed to the detailed discussions of particular topics contained in the later parts of this report.

CHAPTER III

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *Introductory.*—The cost to the public of preventing, detecting and punishing crime may be divided into four principal elements: (a) the cost of police; (b) the cost of prosecution; (c) the cost of the criminal courts; and (d) the cost of penal and corrective treatment of convicted criminals. The police are primarily concerned with exercising the functions of prevention and detection; the other agencies referred to are primarily concerned with punishment, although, of course, punishment may operate as a deterrent to other potential criminals and so as a factor in crime prevention.

Theoretically, part of the general administrative overhead of the executive department of each particular law enforcement unit should be included in the cost of criminal justice, since part of the function of the executive is to supervise law enforcement; but in practice the amount which should be so included is small and very difficult of ascertainment, and so may well be omitted from consideration. Moreover, that part of the work of the Federal and State executive departments which is concerned with the granting of pardons and the exercise of executive clemency is analytically a part of the cost of administration of criminal justice. Finally, there may be special costs in particular jurisdictions which should be included, such as, for example, the cost of the public defense of accused persons in jurisdictions where this is provided for by law. Generally speaking, however, the four classes of costs referred to above—police, prosecution, criminal courts, and penal and corrective treatment—make up the public cost of administration of criminal justice.

2. *Cost of police.*—The function of police is carried out in the United States by a variety of agencies—Federal, State, county and municipal. We are not here concerned with the technical details of how the amounts of police costs are to be ascertained. This is a matter which will be dealt

with later in this report.⁴ It will be desirable, however, briefly to consider at this point the general character of existing police agencies and the extent to which they perform functions in connection with criminal law enforcement.

The most important Federal police agencies are the Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Prohibition of the Department of Justice, which are concerned almost solely with the detection and bringing to trial of offenders against the Federal criminal laws. Some criminal law enforcement work is done by the United States marshals, who are under the supervision of the Department of Justice. There are, moreover, a number of bureaus and agencies in other executive departments and in at least one of the independent executive agencies of the Federal Government which have criminal law enforcement functions. These will be considered in detail in a later part of this report.⁵ We may here mention, merely by way of illustration, the Secret Service and the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department, the Immigration Service of the Department of Labor and the Bureau of Inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In most cases the functions of these bureaus or agencies are in part administrative, and so are only in part related to the prevention and detection of crime. Finally, the Federal Government, through its designated agencies, polices the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the insular possession of the United States, including the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico.

State police activities may take two distinct forms. The first includes State functions analogous to the law-enforcement activities of the Federal executive departments, and is not of major importance in most States. The second includes the work of State police forces, which exercise the ordinary functions of peace officers, particularly in the rural areas. Such State police forces exist in a number of States.⁶ In most instances the State police have some administrative functions in connection with traffic control.

⁴ See pp. 164-172, *infra*.

⁵ See pp. 72-77, *infra*.

⁶ Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas and West Virginia have State police forces having general State-wide police authority. In addition, State highway police forces exist in Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Washington and other States. For further details, see pp. 192-204, *infra*.

County police functions are ordinarily exercised by the sheriff and are usually confined to the rural areas of the county in question, although in some cases the sheriff exercises active police jurisdiction within the incorporated cities of his county. In many cases a large part of the activity of the sheriff's office is civil—i. e., serving process in civil actions, levying attachments and executions, etc. In some parts of the country regular county police forces are maintained.

As far as the urban sections of the United States are concerned, police is primarily a municipal function. Every municipality worthy of the name has its police force, varying in size from the 18,718 men of the New York city police department⁷ to the 1 or 2 men forming the police force of many a small village. Most of the police work of the country is carried on by these municipal forces. These forces not only prevent and detect crime but also exercise certain administrative functions, such as traffic control, the administration of licensing ordinances, etc.,⁸ so that in any attempt to determine the amount of the cost of police chargeable to the administration of the criminal law an allocation of cost as between criminal and administrative functions is obviously necessary.⁹

From an analytical standpoint the cost of detaining prisoners while awaiting trial and of holding material witnesses in custody is a part of the cost of police rather than a part of the cost of penal treatment, although in most cases the same jail or other detention building serves to confine prisoners awaiting trial, witnesses held in default of bond, and convicted persons serving short sentences. In some cases, civil prisoners, such as those jailed for failure to pay alimony or for other contempts of court, are also confined there. In determining the cost of police chargeable to the adminis-

⁷As of Apr. 1, 1931.

⁸ For a detailed analysis of the activities of a typical police department, see Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, N. Y., reprinted as Appendix D to this report (pp. 574-581, *infra*). In the smaller communities the peace officers (usually called constables), in most cases, have numerous civil and administrative duties.

⁹ For a discussion of methods of allocation, see Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities, reprinted as Appendix C to this report (pp. 525, 533-535, *infra*). The question of allocation is also dealt with in detail later in this report. See pp. 168-172, 265-267, *infra*.

tration of criminal justice, due allowance must be made for these factors.¹⁰

The military and naval forces of the Federal Government and of the several States may sometimes exercise police functions. So far as their own internal police is concerned, this relates primarily to military and naval discipline; and, in any case, an analysis of the cost of military criminal justice would fall outside the scope of the present study. But, in addition to their own internal police, the armed forces do on occasion supplement the work of the ordinary Federal, State and municipal police agencies. Are they on that account to be considered police agencies themselves, *pro tanto*, so that part of the cost of maintaining the military and naval establishments is to be considered an element of the cost of administration of criminal justice? The answer would appear to be in the negative, for two reasons: First, the primary function of the Army and Navy, including the National Guard and Naval Reserve, is the national defense. While they are in fact available to be used to put down internal disorder, the military and naval establishments would have to be maintained at their present strength for purposes of national security if there were no crime or threat of crime. Second, even if it be assumed that part of the cost of maintaining the Army and Navy should be allocated to the cost of administration of criminal justice, that part would be so nearly indeterminate, and in any event so small,¹¹ as to make the allocation both impossible and unimportant. An exception must be made, however, in the case of the Coast Guard, which is largely engaged in attempting to enforce prohibition and is maintained partly for that purpose.¹²

¹⁰ For further discussion of jail costs, see p. 46, *infra*. The cost of transportation of prisoners is sometimes regarded as an element of police cost, although, analytically, it is a part of the cost of penal treatment as far as convicted prisoners are concerned. See p. 227, *infra*.

¹¹ The amount of time spent on riot duty by the Regular Army, the Navy and the Naval Reserve is negligible, and that spent by the National Guard is not large. The actual expenditures for transportation, subsistence, etc., necessary to put and keep the armed forces in the field for riot duty is a part of the cost of administration of criminal justice, but is comparatively small in amount, and no serious error will result from failure to consider it.

¹² The precise extent to which the cost of the Coast Guard is part of the cost of administration of criminal justice is discussed in pt. 2 of this report. See pp. 74, 96, *infra*.

In the case of most of the police agencies referred to above, part of their activities, as has been indicated, can not be regarded as directly related to the enforcement of the criminal law, but must be regarded as administrative. It would not be proper to add the total costs of Federal police agencies, State police, county sheriffs and police, city police, and village constables, and conclude that the total represented an element of the cost of administration of criminal justice. Part of that total would do so, but only part, although probably the major part. In any study of the cost of administration of criminal justice, therefore, the problem of allocation of police costs will arise. It is only after that problem has been solved that it becomes possible to arrive at criminal police costs which in their entirety form part of the public cost of administration of criminal justice. This problem of allocation, as has been stated, will be dealt with in detail later in this report;¹³ for present purposes it is sufficient to point out that the problem exists.

3. *Cost of prosecution.*—The function of prosecution, like that of police, is exercised by Federal, State, county and municipal agencies.

Federal prosecutions are carried on by the various United States attorneys in their respective districts and by their assistants. The United States attorneys' offices also handle civil cases to which the United States is a party, so that their work is by no means solely that of prosecution. The work of the United States attorneys includes the handling of appeals to the circuit courts of appeals, but not appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, which are handled by the Department of Justice under the supervision of the Solicitor General. The Department of Justice supervises Federal prosecutions and in some cases (especially those involving violations of the antitrust laws) actually conducts them. The major part of the business of that department, however, is civil. Prosecutions in the District of Columbia, the Territories and the insular possessions are also handled by Federal officials.

In some States the attorney general exercises a limited general supervision over prosecution throughout the State, and he or his deputies may conduct individual prosecutions

¹³ See p. 39, *supra*.

in special cases. In most States, moreover, the attorney general's office handles appeals in criminal cases. Much of the business of the State attorney generals' offices, and probably most of it in the majority of States, is, however, civil in its nature.

As a general rule, prosecution is primarily a county function. In most jurisdictions the prosecuting attorney for serious offenses is a county officer, who, in some instances, may handle the county's civil business, and, especially in rural sections, may even engage in private law practice. In the majority of instances, however, the work of the prosecutor's office is entirely criminal, so that the cost thereof is in its entirety a part of the cost of administration of criminal justice. The grand jury, although sometimes used for investigations not directly connected with prosecution, is primarily a part of the prosecuting machinery.¹⁴ Like the prosecutor, it is normally a county agency.

In some instances, particularly in the larger cities, prosecution may be in part a city function. Thus, where there is a city court,¹⁵ there is very likely to be a city prosecutor. That official may be the city attorney, and so concerned also with civil matters, or he may be solely a prosecuting officer. He will be found to deal in most instances solely with prosecutions for minor offenses and with the initial stages of prosecutions for serious crimes, but not with the actual trial of persons accused of serious crimes.

In the case of prosecution, the problem of allocation of cost as between civil and criminal functions, while it does not always exist, will frequently arise. Here, as in the case of police, it is desired merely to point out that fact; detailed methods of dealing with the problem will be discussed later in this report.¹⁶

4. *Cost of the criminal courts.*—In the case of the courts, as in the case of police and prosecution, we find Federal, State, county and municipal agencies concerned in the administration of criminal justice.

The Federal tribunals most concerned with the administration of the criminal law are the 84 United States district

¹⁴As to the relation of the grand jury to the machinery of prosecution, see pp. 78, 113, *infra*.

¹⁵See p. 44, *infra*.

¹⁶See pp. 172, 174, *infra*.

courts in the continental United States, which handle an extensive criminal business, as well as a large civil business.¹⁷ Closely associated with the criminal work of the district courts is the work of the United States commissioners, who conduct preliminary hearings, hear removal proceedings, and perform similar functions. In general, their duties are those of committing magistrates and are wholly criminal. The jurisdiction of the 10 circuit courts of appeals is wholly appellate. While this includes the hearing of criminal appeals, such appeals are a relatively minor part of the business of those courts.¹⁸ Some criminal cases reach the Supreme Court of the United States, but they form a very small part of the total business of that court.¹⁹ In addition, the courts of the District of Columbia, of the Territories and of the insular possessions exercise criminal as well as civil jurisdiction.

The State courts are the principal tribunals having jurisdiction over serious criminal offenses other than Federal crimes. In some instances, as will be pointed out below, such jurisdiction is exercised by county or municipal courts; but, in most cases, it is the State courts that try and sentence persons accused of serious violations of the criminal law. While, in a few instances, separate criminal courts have been set up, the general practice in the State courts is for the same tribunal to hear both civil and criminal cases, in some instances holding separate terms for each class of cases, in some instances not.

In some States, county courts perform the functions indicated above as normally belonging to the State courts,²⁰ or

¹⁷The total number of criminal cases filed in the district courts of the United States (excluding the district courts for Alaska, Hawaii and Porto Rico, and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, which are not included among the 84 district courts referred to above) during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1929, and ending June 30, 1930, was 85,400, and the number of civil cases, exclusive of bankruptcy cases, was 42,701. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 106-107, 117-120, 129, 137, 184. See also pp. 114-119, *infra*.

¹⁸The total number of criminal cases docketed in the circuit courts of appeals during the fiscal year 1929-30, was 399, and the total number of civil cases, 2,150. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 105. See also p. 127, *infra*.

¹⁹Out of a total of 838 cases docketed during October Term, 1929, only 50 were criminal cases. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 9-11. See also p. 128, *infra*.

²⁰This, for example, is the case in some parts of the State of New York.

those indicated below as, in some cases, vested in municipal courts.

In the larger cities, city courts frequently have criminal jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is usually, although not always, confined to the trial of minor offenses, and to preliminary hearings in the case of serious offenses. In most smaller cities, and in some of the larger ones, justices of the peace or analogous officers have jurisdiction over petty criminal offenses, as well as minor civil jurisdiction.

A special problem arises in connection with the cost of juvenile courts. According to modern ideas, such courts are not criminal courts at all in the technical legal sense, and the whole present tendency is against so regarding them.²¹ Nevertheless, the juvenile court plays a part, and an increasingly important part, in the battle against crime, and, regardless of procedure or technical nomenclature, must be regarded as part of the governmental machinery for preventing, detecting and punishing crime—i. e., as part of the machinery for the administration of criminal justice. In so far, however, as juvenile courts have other types of jurisdiction—as, for example, jurisdiction over domestic relations cases—part of their cost must be excluded from the cost of criminal justice.

It will be seen from the foregoing discussion that the problem of allocation of cost as between civil and criminal functions is especially important and difficult in the case of the courts, and that it must constantly be kept to the forefront in any consideration of the cost of courts as related to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

5. *Cost of penal and corrective treatment.*—The post-conviction treatment of criminals, other than those who are discharged upon the mere payment of a fine,²² may take the form of confinement in a penal or correctional institution, probation or parole. Under modern theories of penology, each of these three forms of post-conviction treatment has both a penal and a corrective aspect, so that all are

²¹ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Child Offender in the Federal System of Justice, pp. 25-31.

²² The execution of criminals convicted of murder (or, in some cases, rape) and the flogging of criminals for certain offenses (as in Delaware and Maryland), although dramatic, are relatively uncommon forms of post-conviction treatment, and do not call for special discussion in a study of costs.

here classed together as forms of penal and corrective treatment. Parole differs from probation in that it is a form of post-conviction treatment preceded by a period of confinement in a penal institution, while probation is not so preceded.²³

Penal and corrective treatment is carried out by the Federal Government, by all the States, by most counties and by many cities. Some of these governmental units maintain penal institutions, operate probation agencies, and also administer a parole system, and some do one or more of these things. In considering the cost of penal and corrective treatment, it is necessary to consider how and through what agency each of these kinds of treatment is administered in each instance.

The Federal Government maintains penal institutions, operates a probation system and administers a system of parole. Not all Federal prisoners can be housed in Federal institutions, and, in consequence, a large number, particularly those incarcerated for relatively short terms, are confined in State or county institutions. In such cases the Federal Government pays the State or county for caring for the prisoners. The number of civil prisoners in Federal institutions is negligible, so that the entire cost of Federal penal and corrective treatment may properly be regarded as part of the cost of administration of criminal justice.

All the States, except Delaware, maintain penal institutions for adults. In some States most persons convicted of crime within the State are confined in such institutions; whereas in others the State institutions are primarily for serious offenders, while many minor offenders and sometimes some serious offenders are confined in county penitentiaries or workhouses or in city jails. All the persons confined in State penal institutions for adults are criminals, no civil prisoners being admitted, so that the entire cost of State penitentiaries is to be regarded as part of the cost of administration of criminal justice. All the States have cor-

²³ See Report of Special Committee on the Parole Problem Appointed by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, p. 8 (New York, 1930).

rectional institutions for juvenile delinquents.²⁴ The administration of parole²⁵ is generally a State function, but probation is a matter frequently left to county or municipal administration.²⁶

County functioning as regards penal and corrective treatment frequently includes the maintenance of a county jail, penitentiary or workhouse,²⁷ used for the confinement of misdemeanants and other minor offenders,²⁸ and may also include the operation of detention homes for juvenile delinquents. Civil prisoners are sometimes confined in county institutions, and, if so, an allocation must be made before the cost of such institutions is included as part of the cost of administration of criminal justice. A similar allocation is necessary in the case of detention homes which care for dependent children as well as for delinquents. Probation is frequently a county function. While probation is primarily a criminal-law-enforcement activity, some probation departments handle domestic relations cases, and it would therefore be inaccurate to include the entire cost of probation as part of the cost of administering the criminal law without an investigation of the functions of each probation department.

Municipal penal and corrective treatment is, in general, limited to the operation of municipal probation agencies, where such exist (generally under the supervision of, or as a branch of, the municipal court), and to the maintenance of penal institutions for minor offenders and correctional institutions for juvenile delinquents.

6. *Summary and reference to detailed studies.*—The cost of administration of criminal justice thus includes (a) that part of the cost of police properly allocable to the activities of Federal, State, county and municipal police agencies in preventing and detecting crime, as distinguished from their

²⁴ Some such institutions have dependent as well as delinquent minors as inmates. Where this is the situation, an appropriate allocation of cost must be made.

²⁵ All the States, except Mississippi and Virginia, have some sort of parole laws. As to the situation in Mississippi and Virginia, see p. 83, *infra*, note 42.

²⁶ Probation is administered entirely by the State in Rhode Island and Vermont and partially by the State in Alabama, Iowa, Utah and Wisconsin.

²⁷ The county jail is frequently used to confine persons awaiting trial and material witnesses held in default of bail. The cost of such confinement, as has been pointed out above (p. 39, *supra*), is really a police cost.

²⁸ In some cases serious offenders are confined in county institutions. This is notably true in Delaware, where there is no State penitentiary.

administrative activities; (b) the cost of Federal, State, county and municipal prosecution, which must be arrived at, in many cases, by an allocation of the cost of offices doing other work besides prosecuting crime; (c) that part of the cost of the Federal, State, county and municipal courts properly allocable to the handling of criminal cases; and (d) the cost of Federal, State, county and city penal institutions, probation and parole, making due allowance for the civil prisoners and dependent children in some institutions and for the noncriminal work of certain probation departments. It also includes the cost of the public defense of persons accused of crime in those jurisdictions where this is provided for by law. The result reached by adding all these costs together is a minimum, since there should theoretically be included also some part of the general administrative overhead of the executive departments—Federal, State and municipal—charged with the duty of supervising the enforcement of the criminal law, and possibly a small part of the cost of some of the Nation's armed forces. It can safely be said, therefore, that a figure arrived at by such a process of addition might fairly be taken to be a conservative total for the public cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States.

It will be apparent, however, that the complete ascertainment of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States and its possessions would be an undertaking of tremendous magnitude. It would involve studies for the Federal Government, including the District of Columbia, the Territories and the insular possessions; for each of the 48 States; and for each county, city and village in the country. There are 3,073 counties in the continental United States,²⁹ and 6,252 incorporated cities and villages having a population of 1,000 or over.³⁰ All of these would have to be covered in a complete study, as would the 10,346 incorporated places having a population of less than 1,000.³¹ Any such study would obviously require an enormous expenditure of time and money. Moreover, in so far as such a study was

²⁹ See Population Bulletin, First Series: United States Summary, 1930, pp. 8-33 (U. S. Census, 1931).

³⁰ See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 14.

³¹ *Ibid.*

directed merely toward developing a single total figure for the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States, it would be of no very great significance. It would, of course, be interesting to know what that total figure is, but the possession of this knowledge would be of no important practical use. The potential usefulness of a nation-wide study lies rather in the comparative data which it would furnish. Fortunately, valuable comparative data are obtainable without the necessity of making studies for each of the 19,719 separate State and municipal units within the continental United States.

Our plan for studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice, adopted in the light of these considerations, involved (a) a study of all the published statistical material on the subject, whether Federal, State, county or municipal, and an examination of such unpublished material as might prove to be available in the Bureau of the Census; (b) a comprehensive study of Federal costs of administering justice within the continental United States; (c) studies for the cities of the continental United States over 25,000 in population, including all costs of the administration of criminal justice in those cities, whether borne by city, county or State; (d) a study of the cost of State police forces; and (e) a study of the cost of State penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies. The data to be secured under this plan were believed to be the most complete and useful which could be obtained in the time and with the funds available.

The following detailed discussions of particular aspects of the cost of administration of criminal justice, prepared on the basis of the data obtained as a result of these studies, are included as parts of this report:

Part 2. The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice by the Federal Government.

Part 3. Published Statistical Material on State and Municipal Costs of the Administration of Criminal Justice.

Part 4. The Cost of State Police Forces.

Part 5. The Cost of State Penal and Correctional Institutions and Parole Agencies.

Part 6. The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities.

These detailed studies, considered in connection with this chapter of the report, will, we believe, give a reasonable complete picture of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States. There are, it is true, certain omissions; but these omissions are confined to the matters of (a) certain State costs, other than the cost of State police forces and penal and correctional agencies, which are relatively minor in amount; (b) costs in the rural districts of the country, where the organization for enforcement is least elaborate because least necessary, and where, therefore, costs are relatively small; and (c) costs in the Territories and insular possessions, all of which are outside the continental limits of the United States. These omitted costs are, we believe, of relatively minor importance, and we therefore feel that this report presents a reasonably comprehensive discussion of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States.

CHAPTER IV

PRIVATE EXPENDITURES FOR PROTECTION AGAINST CRIME

1. *Introductory.*—Most of the cost of preventing, detecting and punishing crime is paid by the public through taxes. There are, however, substantial private outlays for the prevention and detection of criminal activities, and some penal and corrective activities are carried on at private expense. Such private activities are of the same general character as public activities in the enforcement of the criminal law as far as the function performed is concerned; the basic difference is in the source of the funds which defray the expenses of those activities.

Private expenditures of this character fall into three classes: (a) expenditures for protective agencies and devices for the purpose of preventing crime; (b) expenditures for the detection of crime; and (c) expenditures for penal and corrective treatment.

2. *Cost of protective agencies.*—The general function of private protective agencies is the same as one of the functions of the police—i. e., the suppression and prevention of crime.⁵²

⁵² In the case of the police, this is primarily the function of the uniformed patrol force.

Protective agencies, as distinguished from protective devices, involve the utilization of human beings to perform this function. A wide variety of such agencies are at present utilized in this country, varying all the way from the individual night-watchman or caretaker to complete organizations of privately paid police, such as the industrial police of Pennsylvania and the police forces of the various railroad companies.

It will at once be recognized that the costs of certain of these protective agencies—such as watchmen, for example—are not entirely chargeable to protection against crime. Protection against fire, against civil trespass, and the like, may be even more important functions; and it may be extremely difficult to work out any satisfactory allocation of cost. The difficulty is less acute in the case of organized bodies of privately-paid police, but even here such an allocation may well be required.

3. *Cost of protective devices.*—In addition to the cost of the protective agencies just referred to, there are substantial private expenditures for inanimate devices which protect against crime by making the commission of specific criminal acts more difficult. Examples of such protective devices are safes, burglar alarms, etc. These devices are useful only to prevent a relatively narrow, although very important, class of crimes against property, such as burglary, larceny, and robbery.

Here again the question of allocation of cost may well arise, especially as regards safes and similar devices. The desire for fire protection, for protection against carelessness, etc., may be of greater force in leading to the installation of a safe than the desire for protection against burglars; and an appropriate division of cost will be very difficult to make.

4. *Note on the cost of protection of public property.*—Expenditures for the protection of public property are, for the most part, included in the cost of administration of criminal justice, under the head of police. Expenditures for protective devices for public property, however, do not form part of the cost of administration of criminal justice, and are logically related to private expenditures of the same character. In comparison with private expenditures,

such public expenditures are relatively small, and are referred to here merely for the sake of analytical completeness.

5. *Cost of detective agencies.*—To a certain extent, privately paid agencies exercise functions in connection with the detection of criminals which parallel those of public police agencies. In addition to the numerous private detective agencies which exist in this country, most of which devote at least some of their time to the detection of criminals, many business organizations³³ maintain departments which function as detective bureaus to a considerable extent. In some cases private detective organizations have rendered good service in capturing criminals and breaking up criminal gangs.³⁴

Accurate analysis of the cost of private agencies of crime detection is important if such costs are to be related to the cost of crime generally. In the case of the ordinary private detective agency, particularly, a large part of the work done is in connection with domestic relations cases rather than in connection with crime. It should be noted, moreover, that, in the case of much privately-paid detective work which does involve crime, emphasis is likely to be placed rather upon the recovery of money or property than upon the bringing of criminals to justice. While expenditures incurred to recover stolen property, where the criminal is left at large, are in a sense a cost of crime, it can hardly be said that they are of the same character as other private expenditures in the aid of the administration of criminal justice.

6. *Cost of penal and corrective treatment.*—Although penal and corrective treatment is primarily a governmental function, some social and correctional activities are carried out by private agencies. This is particularly true in the case of delinquent minors, where the official probation system may be supplemented by private organizations. Moreover, in numerous cases, privately supported institutions may be

³³ The large insurance companies, particularly fidelity and surety companies, are an example.

³⁴ A conspicuous example is the breaking up of the "Molly Maguire" organization in Pennsylvania by an operative of the Pinkerton detective agency some 50 years ago. See Rowan, *The Pinkertons: A Detective Dynasty*, pp. 238-272 (Boston, 1931). Compare Adamec, *Dynamite*, pp. 12-21 (New York, 1931).

used for the confinement of delinquent minors and wayward girls.

It is extremely difficult in many instances to separate activities which are, strictly speaking, penal and corrective, from the general social service work of agencies which carry on both classes of activities. In most cases, activities of the former sort will be regarded, and properly regarded, by the particular agency as having primarily to do with social service and not with criminal law enforcement or administration; but, from the standpoint of the present discussion, the expense of such activities—which would otherwise have to be carried on at public expense, and so would become part of the cost of administration of criminal justice—should be considered as costs related to crime.

7. *Summary and reference to detailed studies.*—Private expenditures for protection against crime include (a) that part of the expenditure of private individuals and organizations for protective agencies, such as watchmen, guards, private police, etc., which has for its purpose the prevention and suppression of crime; (b) that part of the expenditure of private individuals and organizations for inanimate protective devices, such as safes, burglar alarms, armored cars, etc., which has for its purpose the prevention of criminal acts; (c) that part of the expenditure of private individuals and organizations for private detective agencies which has for its purpose the bringing of criminals to justice; and (d) private expenditures for the penal and corrective treatment of criminals and delinquents. Closely related to private expenditures for protective devices are public expenditures for such devices to protect public property, which form an analogous class of costs related to crime.

There are very considerable difficulties in the way of securing accurate data as to private expenditures for protection against crime. In the first place, the sources of the data are most diverse. In the second place, many private agencies engaged in protective and detective activities may well be unwilling to supply information for publication because it would involve the disclosure of business secrets. Third, the problems of allocation which arise are, in many important cases, insoluble. In view of these difficulties, which were perceived at the outset of the investigation, we determined to

confine our studies of private costs of protection to (a) the detailed analysis of the various elements of such costs, with a view to discussing them qualitatively; and (b) the securing of as much illustrative statistical and other data as possible, to supplement that discussion. This plan has been carried into execution and extensive investigations made along these lines; and part 7 of this report, prepared on the basis of these investigations, contains a detailed discussion of expenditures for protective agencies and devices, for detective agencies, and for penal and corrective treatment, the discussion being illustrated where possible by specific figures as to various types of expenditures of this character. While that part of the report does not give any total figure for private expenditures for protection against crime, we believe that it brings out the character, magnitude, and economic importance of such expenditures.

CHAPTER V

PRIVATE LOSSES DUE TO CRIMINAL ACTS

1. *Introductory.*—Thus far in this discussion we have been considering the cost of repressing criminal acts, either by preventing them entirely or by providing for their punishment when committed. No consideration has as yet been given to the actual losses caused by criminal acts themselves. We will next consider the question of such losses as suffered by private individuals.⁸⁵

Private losses due to criminal acts may be divided into four classes: (a) losses due to crimes against the person; (b) losses due to direct crimes against property; (c) losses due to other crimes affecting wealth; (d) losses incidental to the administration of criminal justice; and (e) the cost of insurance against criminal acts. The last of these is not, strictly speaking, a class of losses due to criminal acts, but represents rather the cost of indemnity against such acts;⁸⁶ but it is included here for convenience in discussion.

⁸⁵ The term "private individual" is here used in contrast to governmental units and to the community as a whole, and includes corporations and other private associations of individuals.

⁸⁶ See pp. 57-58, *infra*.

2. *Losses due to crimes against the person.*—The fact of loss to the individual who is the victim of a criminal act directed toward his or her person—such as murder, rape, mayhem, etc.—is clear. The problem of placing an *economic valuation* on that loss is, however, a very different matter. While such valuations are constantly being made by juries in actions for wrongful death, civil actions for rape, actions for assault and battery, etc., they vary enormously and erratically, and, even if available for every case of criminal injury to the person, which, of course, they are not, could hardly be relied upon as accurate measures. In point of fact, the loss due to death or to a bodily injury can not be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Some rough estimates of economic loss may perhaps be possible,³⁷ but it will at best be little more than a guess. While the very real economic loss due to crimes against the person must be recognized, it is not feasible, as a practical matter, to state that loss in definite figures which will be commensurable with other monetary figures as to losses due to criminal acts.

3. *Losses due to direct crimes against property.*—When we come to crimes against property, the case is different. Losses due to direct crimes against property—i. e., crimes which involve the destruction of physical property, such as arson, or the direct appropriation by the criminal of money or property belonging to another, such as burglary, larceny, robbery and embezzlement—are obviously susceptible of being evaluated in monetary terms. The damage to the building burned, the amount of money embezzled, the value of the property stolen—all these may be accurately stated in terms of dollars and cents. The only difficulty is that of ascertaining how many criminal acts of this character are committed, and what the value of the property destroyed or converted is in each case. This difficulty, though purely a practical one, is serious; the extent to which it may be overcome as a practical matter will be discussed later in this report.³⁸

4. *Losses due to other crimes affecting wealth.*—In addition to crimes directly affecting specific property or funds, there is a large and very important class of criminal acts

³⁷ See pp. 374-379, *infra*.

³⁸ See pp. 379-398, *infra*.

which impair interests of substance—i. e., deprive persons of wealth—but are not directed toward any specific property or money.³⁹ The two outstanding examples of crimes of this class are fraud and extortion. In both these cases, as in the case of direct crimes against property, the wealth of the criminal is increased, but the essence of the crime is not that specific money or property is taken but rather that the general estate of the victim is decreased.⁴⁰

Here, as in the case of direct crimes against property, there is a loss which is clearly measurable in economic terms. There is no such difficulty with regard to the monetary evaluation of loss as that which arises in the case of crimes against the person.⁴¹ However, the problem of ascertaining the amount of such loss is much more difficult than it is in the case of direct crimes against property. In the case of such direct crimes, the amount of money or the value of the property taken or destroyed measures the loss to the victim and the gain to the criminal.⁴² In the case of other crimes affecting wealth, this is not necessarily true. Thus, in the case of losses due to fraud, the loss to the victim is not the amount of money he has parted with, but that amount less the value of what he received in return.⁴³ In the case of extortion in the form of blackmail, the loss is the amount of money parted with by the person blackmailed, but this is not true in the case of some other forms of extortion, especially when the pocketbook of the ultimate victim is reached indirectly.

This may be best illustrated by considering that highly organized form of extortion, the "racket." In one typical form of racket, the initial victims are the persons engaged in a particular business—say, for example, the laundry business. The racketeers "organize" the business—i. e., compel all those engaged in it to pay tribute under threat of having their shops blown up, their property destroyed, and their

³⁹ This distinction between crimes directly affecting specific property and other crimes affecting wealth is adopted for reasons of convenience in the present discussion rather than because it is analytically a fundamental one.

⁴⁰ For a further discussion of this distinction, see pp. 398-399, *infra*.

⁴¹ See p. 54, *supra*.

⁴² This is clearly true when money is taken. It may not be true of stolen property, which the thief may have to dispose of at a sacrifice.

⁴³ In many cases of criminal fraud, the property the victim receives is worth little or nothing; but this is by no means always the case.

lives and bodily safety endangered. Naturally, the "organized" laundrymen seek to pass this burden on to their customers by raising prices, and in many instances the ability of the racketeer to bring about monopoly conditions in the "organized" line of business may enable them to do so. In some cases, indeed, the initial victims of the racket may be able to pass on *more* than the amount of the tribute required of them to the ultimate consumers, so that they, as well as the organizers of the racket, actually profit. The result in either case is that the ultimate consumer pays more for his laundry.⁴⁴ Obviously, his loss due to the criminal activity of the racketeer is not his entire laundry bill, but the additional amount he has had to pay on account of the racket. This amount may be extremely difficult to ascertain accurately.

Indeed, the determination of losses due to crimes involving fraud or extortion is a peculiarly difficult problem. Not only is the problem of evaluating the amount of a given loss great, but the problem of finding out in what instances losses have occurred is even greater. No one can say how many "rackets" are being operated to-day in New York or in Chicago or in St. Louis, much less compute the loss to the ultimate consumer resulting therefrom. No more can anyone say how many fraudulent bankruptcies, insurance frauds or other fraudulent schemes are perpetrated in the United States annually, much less estimate the amount of loss to the victims of those schemes. But this should not blind us to the tremendous economic importance of these forms of criminal activity. We can recognize the immensity of the loss due to these forms of crime even if we can not measure it.

5. *Private losses incidental to the administration of criminal justice.*—The administration of the criminal law requires the service of private citizens as jurors in criminal cases and their attendance as witnesses. Jury service and testimony in court are, under our system of jurisprudence, among the basic duties of citizenship which, like the duty of military service, must be discharged even at substantial financial sacrifice. While some compensation is ordinarily

⁴⁴ For a more comprehensive discussion, see pp. 406-413, *infra*.

paid jurors, it is, in many cases, quite inadequate to reimburse the financial loss sustained.

The tremendous difficulty of securing any accurate information as to the aggregate economic burden imposed upon persons required to serve as jurors and attend as witnesses in criminal cases is obvious. The mere ascertainment of the number of persons so serving and the length of time served by each would be a very large task, while the determination of what the actual financial loss was in each case would require a knowledge of the particular economic situation of each juror and witness. While this class of private losses must be recognized, it would be futile to expect to develop any accurate dollars-and-cents figures as to the amount of such losses.

6. *Cost of insurance against criminal acts.*—As has already been stated,⁴⁵ the cost of insurance against criminal acts falls in a quite different category from the other forms of loss due to crime which have been discussed above. The cost of insurance is not, strictly speaking, a loss at all. The person who pays a premium on a burglary insurance policy, while he is out of pocket the amount of the premium, does get something in return—viz., the agreement of the insurance company to indemnify him in the event his house is burglarized. However, since, if there were no danger of burglary, there would be no reason for the payment of the premium, the person paying it may very properly regard the amount thereof as a loss to him resulting from crime. While it is not a loss due to a particular criminal act, it is a cost caused by the possibility of criminal acts. It seems proper, therefore, to consider the cost of insurance against crime as a private loss due to crime, so far as each individual insured is concerned. Of course, in any attempt to ascertain the total loss to private individuals due to criminal acts or the possibility of such acts (thus including insurance premiums), it would not be proper to add direct losses and insurance premiums, without deducting insured losses paid.

Unlike the other private costs and losses due to crime previously discussed, the cost of insurance against crime is, in general, readily and accurately ascertainable. The only

⁴⁵ See p. 53, *supra*.

serious difficulty arises in determining how much of the cost of fire insurance is to be ascribed to insurance against arson. This problem, together with other more detailed aspects of the matter of insurance costs, will be dealt with later in this report.⁴⁶

7. *Summary and reference to detailed studies.*—Losses to private individuals due to criminal acts include (a) losses due to crimes against the person, such as murder and mayhem, which are not measurable in monetary terms; (b) losses due to direct crimes against property, such as robbery and larceny, which are so measurable; (c) losses due to other crimes affecting wealth, such as commercialized fraud and racketeering, which are theoretically measurable in monetary terms, but very difficult of ascertainment in practice; and (d) private losses incidental to the administration of criminal justice, which are as a practical matter quite impossible of measurement. Closely allied to losses due to criminal acts is the cost of insurance against such acts.

The plan followed by us in studying the general topic of private losses due to criminal acts was framed in the light of detailed consideration of the difficulties involved. It seemed futile to attempt any quantitative study of losses due to crimes against the person or of financial losses suffered by jurors and witnesses in criminal cases; and the subjects of losses due to racketeering and commercialized fraud were so large and fraught with so much difficulty that comprehensive field investigation, which would have been essential if definite data were to be secured, was regarded by the commission as impracticable in view of the limited time and funds available. The detailed studies which have been made have included (a) an examination of the published material relating to private losses due to crime; (b) a study of the available unpublished source data on losses due to direct crimes against property, including arson, burglary, embezzlement and larceny; (c) a similar study as to certain forms of commercial fraud; and (d) a study of the cost of various forms of insurance against crime. Part 8 of this report, prepared on the basis of the data obtained as a result of these detailed investigations combined with the results of

⁴⁶ See pp. 413-416, *infra*.

a careful general study of the entire topic of private losses due to crime, presents a comprehensive and detailed discussion of such losses from a descriptive standpoint and such detailed figures as to losses of certain specified kinds as it has been possible to assemble. It is believed that this part of the report, while it does not present total figures as to private losses due to criminal acts, does indicate the nature and character of such losses and their economic importance.

CHAPTER VI

LOSSES TO THE STATE DUE TO CRIMINAL ACTS

1. *Introductory.*—Private individuals and corporations are not the only victims of criminal acts. The State,⁴⁷ considered as an economic unit, may also suffer loss as a result of crime. Thus, it is subject to losses due to crimes directly affecting its property or indirectly affecting its wealth in the same way as individuals or private corporations. Moreover, the State may suffer losses not in its capacity as an owner of property but in its capacity as collector of the public revenues.

2. *Losses to the State as a property owner.*—So far as the State as an owner of property is concerned, the problem of losses due to crime is substantially similar to the analogous problem in the case of private property owners.⁴⁸ The principles already discussed are thus applicable to governmental units as well as to private individuals.

3. *Losses due to frauds on the public revenue.*—In collecting the public revenue the State is functioning not in its character of property owner but in its character of sovereign. Defrauding the revenue is everywhere made a crime by statute, so that losses of revenue due to successful frauds on the revenue are clearly losses due to criminal acts. The amount of such losses, however, is impossible of practical ascertainment. There is no actual loss of revenue, in most cases, unless the fraud remains undetected; and in such case it is

⁴⁷As used in this chapter, the term "State" refers collectively to the governmental units of the country, including the Federal Government and the several States and their respective municipal subdivisions.

⁴⁸There is a practical difference with regard to insurance costs, since, as a general rule, the State does not insure against criminal acts. But this is a purely pragmatic distinction.

impossible to determine what the loss has been. In some instances, losses may result from an attempt to defraud the revenue which is ultimately detected, and in such case the amount of loss may be ascertainable; but it can not be assumed that the amount of such detected losses will bear any ascertainable relation to the actual aggregate loss. In consequence, very little success may be expected in any study of losses of this character.

4. *Summary and reference to detailed studies.*—Losses to the State due to crime include (a) losses to the State as a property owner, which are no different in character from similar losses to private individuals, and (b) losses due to frauds on the revenue. The first class of losses is not of sufficient importance to require detailed discussion, while the amount of losses of the second class is impossible of accurate ascertainment or estimate. For these reasons, no special study of losses to the State due to criminal acts has been made, and no further discussion of the subject is included in this report.⁴⁹

CHAPTER VII

INDIRECT LOSSES TO THE COMMUNITY DUE TO THE EXISTENCE OF CRIME

1. *Introductory.*—In addition to the immediate losses to individuals and to the State, which result from criminal acts, there are certain indirect losses to the community which are definitely traceable to crime.

2. *Loss of productive labor of criminals.*—There can be no doubt that the loss to the community of the productive labor of persons engaged in criminal activities is a serious one,⁵⁰ and that if the antisocial energy of the criminal population could be turned into lawful and useful channels, the resulting economic advantage to the country would be great.

When, however, the attempt is made to estimate in dollars and cents the amount of economic injury to the com-

⁴⁹ Except that some figures as to losses suffered by the Federal Government due to mail robberies and burglaries of post offices are given in Part 8 (pp. 305-306, *infra*), for comparison with the data there presented as to private losses due to direct crimes against property.

⁵⁰ This loss is in addition to the affirmative economic harm done to the community by certain of the criminal acts of such persons, such as crimes against the person and destruction of property.

munity due to the loss of the potential productive labor of persons engaged in criminal pursuits, the problem presented is an insoluble one. In the first place, it is impossible to ascertain how many persons are in fact engaged in criminal pursuits and to what extent. Second, it is impossible to determine what each such person would contribute to the economic welfare of the community if he were engaged in productive labor. Finally, even if these two factors could be determined, it would still be necessary to consider whether the amount which the persons now engaged in crime might earn at productive labor could be regarded in its entirety as a potential addition to the community's wealth and income.

3. *Loss of productive labor of prisoners.*—There is also undoubtedly a considerable loss to the community through the loss of productive labor of persons imprisoned for crime. This loss is most obvious in the case of prisoners who are maintained in idleness, but it may exist in cases where prisoners are employed at useful work, since it is possible that those prisoners would be able to do other work of more value to the community if they were not in prison. Moreover, much prison employment is part-time only.

The difficulties in the way of placing a monetary valuation upon the loss of productive labor of prisoners are, however, very serious. While the problem of determining the number of persons in prison is not a difficult one, the problem of ascertaining what those persons would be able to earn if they were not in prison, over and above the value of their work in prison, if any, is fully as difficult as the problem of determining what criminals would earn at honest labor. Nevertheless, although it is not possible to develop any exact figures, some indication of the order of magnitude of this loss may perhaps be worked out. This question is considered later in this report.⁵¹

4. *Loss of productive labor of law enforcement officers.*—If it were not necessary to employ some members of the community in preventing, suppressing and punishing crime, the persons now so employed could engage in other occupations more directly related to the production of wealth. There is,

⁵¹ See pp. 424-427, *infra*.

therefore, a definite indirect loss to the community due to the fact that some of its members must be employed in putting down crime and in the administration of criminal justice.

When an attempt is made to put a monetary value on this loss, difficulties at once arise. While the number of law enforcement officers may be determined, it is wholly impossible to ascertain what additional contribution to the wealth of the community each would make if he were engaged in some other calling. The question of whether the order of magnitude of this loss may be roughly estimated is discussed in a later part of the report.⁵²

It should be noted in connection with this general subject that it would obviously be improper to include both the public cost of administration of criminal justice and the potential amount that enforcement officers could earn in other more directly productive occupations as elements of the economic cost of crime to the community.⁵³

5. *Other indirect losses.*—There are still other losses of productive labor due to the existence of crime, as, for example, in the case of criminal lawyers, persons engaged in the business of providing crime insurance or in the manufacture and sale of protective devices, jurors and witnesses in criminal cases, etc.⁵⁴ The difficulties of working out in dollars and cents the aggregate resulting loss to the community are, however, insoluble as a practical matter. While the fact of such losses must be recognized, it will readily be realized that the amounts lost can not be accurately computed on the basis of existing data.

In addition to causing losses of productive labor, the existence of crime results in the diversion to fundamentally uneconomic uses of valuable materials and machinery which are used in the manufacture of protective devices and in connection with various public and private activities in preventing and punishing crime. Here again, however, no accurate estimate of the total amount of economic loss is practicable.

6. *Cost of supporting dependents of prisoners.*—When a man is imprisoned for crime, those persons dependent on

⁵² See pp. 427-433, *infra*.

⁵³ For a discussion of the interrelation between these two factors and of their relation to the aggregate cost of crime, see p. 66, *infra*.

⁵⁴ As to other such losses, see pp. 433-435, *infra*.

him are frequently forced to resort to public or private charity for support. The amount of money which is spent for the support of such persons is, of course, an economic burden resulting from crime as far as the members of the community who contribute that money are concerned.

While the amount of this cost is undoubtedly substantial,⁵⁵ it is very difficult to ascertain. Aid, whether public or private, is ordinarily given to the indigent dependents of persons in prison for crime on the same basis as any other indigent persons, and the amount of investigation required to determine how much such aid is extended to dependents of prisoners as distinguished from other persons would be inordinately great. While this amount is theoretically ascertainable, practically it is not. Moreover, the amount disbursed to support indigent dependents of prisoners is a transfer, and so is not an economic loss to the community as a whole, any more than are amounts disbursed for charity generally.

In this connection, it should be noted that if the loss of productive labor of prisoners is to be regarded as an element of the cost of crime to the community, amounts expended for the support of dependents of prisoners can not be so regarded.

7. *Summary and reference to detailed studies.*—There are certain indirect costs or losses to the community due to crime which are different in character from public expenditures for the administration of criminal justice, private expenditures for protection against crime, or losses to individuals or to the State due to criminal acts. Such indirect losses include (a) the loss of productive labor of persons engaged in criminal pursuits; (b) the loss of productive labor of persons imprisoned for crime; (c) the loss of productive labor of persons engaged in the enforcement of the criminal law; and (d) a variety of other losses of productive labor and of losses due to the uneconomic use of valuable materials and machinery. While these indirect

⁵⁵ For example, 5.9 per cent of the women receiving mothers' pensions in Wayne County, Mich., during the fiscal year 1929-30, were wives of inmates of State penal institutions. These dependents of prisoners received a total of \$64,691.39 in pensions during this period. (Information from an unpublished study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Detroit, Mich., made for the commission by the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research.)

losses are of large magnitude, in no case can their amount be accurately ascertained.

In view of the difficulties in the way of any accurate determination of the amounts of loss to the community due to these causes, we did not consider it worth while to attempt any extensive field investigations of these matters. Careful study has been made, however, of the problem of securing some estimate of the order of magnitude of such losses in the cases of prisoners and law enforcement officers. Part 9 of this report is devoted to the further consideration of the matters discussed in this chapter,⁵⁶ and embodies the results of that study, as well as going into further details with regard to the general subject.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TOTAL COST OF CRIME

1. *Classification of costs related to crime.*—We have now discussed in general terms the more important classes of costs and losses resulting from or related to crime. These are (a) the cost of administration of criminal justice, including police costs, prosecution costs, the cost of the criminal courts, and the cost of penal institutions, probation and parole; (b) private expenditures for protection against crime, including the cost of protective agencies, protective devices, private detective agencies, and private penal and corrective treatment; (c) losses to private individuals due to criminal acts, including crimes against the person, direct crimes against property and other crimes indirectly affecting interests of substance, private losses incidental to the administration of criminal justice, and the cost of insurance against crime; (d) losses to the State, both as an owner of property and as a collector of revenue, due to criminal acts; and (e) indirect losses and burdens imposed upon the community due to the existence of crime, including the loss of productive labor of criminals, prisoners, law enforcement officers and others, and the cost of supporting the indigent

⁵⁶ Exclusive of the question of the cost of supporting indigent dependents of prisoners. This cost was found to be impossible of ascertainment without an elaborate and expensive field study which it was not deemed practicable to make in view of the requirements of other more important investigations.

dependents of prisoners. There are, no doubt, other costs related to crime, but it is believed that these are the most important.

Before considering whether and to what extent these various classes of costs may be added together, if and when ascertained, so as to produce significant total figures as to the aggregate cost of crime, a further distinction must be made. We must differentiate between (a) those classes of costs which form part of the *immediate* cost of crime; (b) those which form part of the *ultimate* cost of crime to the community as a whole; and (c) those which form part of both immediate and ultimate cost.⁵⁷

In general, it may be said that expenditures or losses which involve merely *transfers* of money or property form part of the immediate cost of crime, but are not, at least in their entirety, part of the ultimate cost to the community. In this class fall public expenditures for the administration of criminal justice, private expenditures for protection against crime, losses due to criminal acts other than those due to crimes against the person or involving the actual destruction of or injury to property, expenditures for insurance against crime, and expenditures for the support of indigent dependents of prisoners. Expenditures of this character impose a burden on the property-owning and tax-paying portion of the community; but, while in most instances the amount of that immediate burden is measured by the sum total of such expenditures and losses,⁵⁸ the amount so expended or lost does not necessarily measure an ultimate loss to the community as a whole. For example, if a thief steals \$100 from X, X is \$100 poorer, but it by no means follows that the community as a whole is economically worse off to the extent of \$100. Indeed, to suggest an extreme instance, it may well be that the success of Robin Hood's mythical attempt at a redistribution of wealth by robbing the rich to give to the poor would have been an economic benefit to the community as a whole in Twelfth Century England. This extreme example merely emphasizes the impossibility of regarding the total

⁵⁷ Compare pp. 34-35, *supra*.

⁵⁸ Expenditures for insurance against crime form an exception. Here the measure of the aggregate net burden is not the total premiums paid, but that total less the amount of losses indemnified—i. e., the costs of administration and profits of the insurance companies.

amount of such losses to individuals due to crime as a net loss to the community; and the same considerations obviously apply to expenditures for protection against crime, whether public or private. They are part of the *immediate* cost of crime, but not necessarily part of the ultimate cost.

On the other hand, losses of the productive labor of criminals, prisoners and law enforcement officers do not form part of the immediate cost of crime, but are an element of *ultimate* cost to the community. In general, each class of losses of this character has its definite analogue in some class of expenditure or loss which forms part of the immediate cost of crime. Thus, the counterpart of expenditures for the administration of criminal justice, which are part of the immediate cost of crime, is the loss of productive labor of enforcement officers, which is an element of ultimate cost; the counterpart of private expenditures for protection against crime is the loss of productive labor of private watchmen and guards, private detectives, and persons employed in manufacturing protective devices; the counterpart of losses due to crimes against property and wealth is the loss of productive time of criminals; the counterpart of the cost of insurance against crime is the loss of productive labor of the persons engaged in the business of providing such insurance; and the counterpart of the cost of supporting indigent dependents of prisoners (and of part of the cost of penal institutions) is the loss of productive labor of prisoners. This parallel relationship brings out the fact that it would be improper to arrive at a figure for the total cost of crime by adding elements of immediate cost and elements of ultimate cost. The result of doing so would either be the addition of incommensurable quantities—as, for example, if the loss of productive labor of criminals were to be added to private expenditures for protection against crime—or an outright duplication—as, for example, if the loss of productive labor of law enforcement officers were to be added to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

There are, however, certain losses due to crime which are both immediate losses to individuals and ultimate losses to the community. These include losses due to crimes against the person and losses due to the actual destruction of or injury to property. The loss due to mayhem, for example,

affects both the individual victim and the community, and the measure of loss from an economic standpoint is the same in each case—viz., the monetary value of the lost productive labor of the injured individual. Similarly, if a building is set on fire or dynamited, the measures of immediate loss and of ultimate loss to the community are identical.

We will next consider, in the light of this analysis, the possibility of developing definite figures as to the aggregate cost of crime.

2. *The immediate cost of crime.*—The immediate cost of crime to the property-owning and tax-paying portion of the community includes, as has been pointed out, the cost of administration of criminal justice, private expenditures for protection against crime, losses due to criminal acts, and the cost of insurance against crime diminished by the amount of insured losses paid. Whether or not an accurate figure for aggregate immediate cost can be developed necessarily depends on whether satisfactory data as to its constituent elements can be obtained.

So far as the cost of administration of criminal justice is concerned, there is theoretically no insuperable obstacle to securing approximately accurate figures. The difficulties are practical and arise primarily from the large number of sources of information which would have to be canvassed.⁶⁰ For reasons which have already been outlined,⁶⁰ these practical difficulties have prevented the securing of complete figures in the present investigation.

Similar practical obstacles exist to the ascertainment of total private expenditures for protection against crime, with the further circumstance that here the problem of allocation of expenditures is insoluble in many instances.⁶¹

The problem of determining aggregate losses due to criminal acts is even more difficult. Losses due to crimes against the person are impossible of monetary evaluation, and losses due to such criminal activities as racketeering and commercialized fraud are as a practical matter almost impossible of ascertainment. Moreover, it has been impossible in this

⁶⁰ Another practical difficulty lies in the inadequacy of existing records. See pp. 186-187, *infra*.

⁶⁰ See pp. 47-48, *supra*.

⁶¹ As, for example, in the cases of watchmen and safes. See p. 50, *supra*.

investigation, due to lack of time and funds, to carry out the studies which would be necessary as a basis for even the roughest estimate of these latter losses.⁶² Even in the case of losses due to direct crimes against property, the practical difficulties encountered are enormous.⁶³

The only element of immediate cost which can be readily ascertained is that of cost of insurance. Here most of the difficulties met with in the case of other immediate costs do not present themselves, and a considerable amount of data can be secured without serious difficulty.⁶⁴

The consequence is that, while a minimum figure for the total immediate cost of crime is theoretically possible of development, to work out that figure would require much more time and money for investigation than has been available in the present instance.⁶⁵ We are therefore not in a position to make any estimate of the total immediate cost of crime even on a minimum basis.

3. *The ultimate cost of crime to the community.*—The total ultimate cost of crime to the community—i. e., the difference between what the national income would be if there were no crime and the actual national income—can not, as has already been pointed out,⁶⁶ be ascertained directly. Any attempt to work out that cost by indirect means must take account of such factors as the value of property destroyed or damaged by criminal acts, and the loss of productive labor of criminals, their victims, persons imprisoned for crime, law enforcement officers and other persons who might be usefully employed if crime did not exist.

There is no theoretical impossibility in ascertaining the value of property destroyed or damaged as a result of crime; but there are insurmountable practical obstacles. The widely scattered sources of information and the fact that many such losses are due to arson, which only infrequently

⁶² See p. 58, supra.

⁶³ For a more detailed discussion of these difficulties, see pp. 379-398, *infra*.

⁶⁴ This is not true of fire insurance. The part of the cost of such insurance which is allocable to insurance against arson is quite impossible of determination. See p. 413, *infra*, note 23.

⁶⁵ Only minimum figures could be secured in any event, since it would, we believe, be quite impossible to secure complete and accurate figures as to some private costs of protection and as to most losses due to criminal acts, regardless of the amount of time and money spent in investigation.

⁶⁶ See p. 34, supra.

is detected as such,⁶⁷ prevent any satisfactory ascertainment of this factor.

When we come to losses of productive labor, an accurate answer becomes theoretically as well as practically impossible.⁶⁸ The most that is possible is some rough indication of the order of magnitude of such losses, and this is not of any substantial assistance in arriving at an accurate total figure for the ultimate cost of crime.

Moreover, even if the value of destroyed property and lost productive labor could be accurately determined, there would still remain the question whether adding the money values of such losses would give a result which represented the ultimate cost of crime to the community. The only way to answer this question would be to determine that cost independently by direct methods—and this is impossible.⁶⁹ Hence we are forced to the conclusion that it is impossible to arrive at any reliable figure for the total ultimate cost of crime to the community. The nature and importance of that cost can be indicated, but its amount can not be evaluated in dollars and cents.

4. *Conclusion.*—It will be apparent, we believe, from the preceding discussion: (a) that the ultimate economic cost of crime to the community as a whole can not be ascertained; and (b) that the burden on individuals of the immediate cost of crime can not be ascertained with accuracy—even a rough minimum approximation of that cost requiring an expenditure of vastly more time and money in investigation than has been available in connection with the preparation of this report. Accordingly, this report does not attempt any lump-sum estimate of the total cost of crime on either basis. Any attempt at such an estimate would, in the nature of the

⁶⁷ See the detailed discussion in a later part of the report, pp. 379-381, *infra*.

⁶⁸ The reason why this is the case have already been outlined. See pp. 60-64, supra.

⁶⁹ See p. 34, supra. Compare pp. 436-437.

case, be a mere guess.⁷⁰ All that we have found it usefully possible to do is to indicate the nature and magnitude of the cost of crime through the studies of various economic aspects of the crime problem which are presented in the succeeding parts of this report.

The fact that no single lump-sum figure for the cost of crime to the country can be worked out does not seem to us to impair the usefulness of the material which it has been possible to gather. It should not require the finding of some striking single-sum figure to dramatize the problem of reducing the wastes of crime, economic and social. The absence of such a single-sum figure does not affect the importance of using the available data in deciding what costs can be eliminated or reduced, in determining whether the sums expended for the administration of criminal justice are being spent in a way to effect their purpose, and in securing the light which a comparative study of costs and methods in various communities may throw on the problem of efficient and economical crime control.

Data as to costs furnish no direct aid in the solution of problems of law enforcement. Ascertainment of the facts as to the economic effects of crime and as to the financial aspects of criminal justice is merely one of the steps necessary in order to make it possible to survey the crime problem as a whole. It is hoped that this report will serve to fill in, to some extent, the economic background of the commission's study of the problems of law observance and enforcement, and to furnish raw material for further study in the future.

⁷⁰This is indicated by the wide variation in the "estimates" of the annual cost of crime to the United States which have appeared in print from time to time. These have varied from less than \$1,000,000,000 to \$18,000,000,000. See, for example, Anderson, *The State Program for Mental Hygiene*, *Journal of Social Forces*, vol. 1, p. 92 (1923) (\$2,500,000 per day, or \$912,500,000 per year); Gillin, *Crime Is Our Most Expensive Luxury*, *Journal of Applied Sociology*, vol. 10, p. 213 (1926) (\$3,000,000,000 per year); Bower, *The Economic Waste of Sin*, p. 97 (New York, 1924) (\$3,329,813,788 per year); Smith, *Our Biggest Tax—The Cost of Crime*, *Literary Digest*, vol. 82, p. 34 (1924) (\$10,000,000,000 per year); Enright, *Our Biggest Business—Crime*, *North American Review*, vol. 228, p. 385 (1929) (\$11,800,000,000 to \$13,000,000,000 per year); Anonymous, *What the Criminal Costs and What to Do About It*, *American Review of Reviews*, vol. 75, p. 431 (1927) (\$13,000,000,000 per year); White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, *Preliminary Report of the Committee on Youth Outside the Home and School*, p. 405 (New York, 1930) (\$16,000,000,000 per year); Reeve, *Eighteen Billion a Year for Crime*, *New York Herald-Tribune*, Mar. 22, 1931 (\$18,000,000,000 per year).

PART 2

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON and LAURENCE F. SCHMECKEBIER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—The primary purpose of this part of the report is to present data as to the annual expenditures of the Federal Government in connection with the various major aspects of the administration of Federal criminal justice in the continental United States. A further purpose is to indicate the relative proportions of such expenditures made in connection with enforcement of certain specific Federal criminal statutes, including the prohibition laws.

2. *Geographical scope.*—This study covers the cost of Federal agencies for the enforcement of the criminal law throughout the continental United States with the exception of the District of Columbia.¹ The Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and the insular possessions of the United States, including the Philippines, Porto Rico and the Virgin Islands, are not included in the study, nor is the Panama Canal Zone.² In all of these omitted jurisdictions, the United States exercises the functions both of Federal and of local government, so that the situation is not comparable with that which exists within the continental United States outside of the District of Columbia, where the Federal Government and the States have geographically concurrent but independent jurisdiction.

¹The cost of administration of criminal justice in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia has been the subject of a separate study which is discussed later in this report in connection with studies for other cities. See p. 154, *infra*, note 8.

²No discussion of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the Territories and insular possessions is contained in this report. For a brief consideration of the published statistical material available, see Appendix A to this report (pp. 469-470, *infra*).

3. *Period covered.*—The Federal Government operates on a fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 30. This study covers the last completed fiscal period—viz., the year beginning July 1, 1929, and ending June 30, 1930.

CHAPTER II

THE FEDERAL MACHINERY FOR ADMINISTERING CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *Introductory.*—The Federal machinery for administering criminal justice, like similar State machinery, has the five general functional divisions of police agencies, prosecuting agencies, courts, penal institutions, and probation and parole agencies.³ Since the public defender system has not been adopted by the United States, these five classes of agencies may be regarded as constituting the entire Federal machinery for enforcing the criminal laws and administering criminal justice. Before any discussion of the cost of this machinery for administering criminal justice can be intelligently undertaken, it will be necessary to consider in some detail the precise nature of the Federal agencies which exercise the respective functions of police, prosecution, trial and sentence, and penal and corrective treatment.

2. *Federal police agencies.*⁴—The police agencies of the Federal Government are highly diverse. There is no single centralized Federal police force exercising general police functions throughout the United States, but police duties as to certain particular matters are imposed upon a varied group of agencies which in many cases are wholly independent of each other.⁵ Moreover, most of the bureaus and agencies exercising Federal police functions carry on impor-

³ Penal institutions and probation and parole agencies are functionally closely connected (cf. pp. 44-45, supra), but practical considerations make it desirable to separate them in most cases for the purpose of cost studies.

⁴ Compare Langeluttig, *Federal Police*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 41 (1929); *International Association of Chiefs of Police, Uniform Crime Reporting*, pp. 142-143 (New York, 1930); Ploscowe, *A Critique of Federal Criminal Statistics*, in *National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics*, pp. 161-163.

⁵ The Department of Justice, as is pointed out below (p. 73, infra), has more extensive police functions than any other department, but it is merely *primus inter pares* as far as the organization of Federal police is concerned.

tant activities of a civil or administrative nature. The question of how allocations of the cost of those agencies as between civil and criminal activities are to be made is dealt with in detail below.⁶ Here we simply list the agencies which have criminal police functions in whole or in part.⁷

The most important Federal police agencies are in the Department of Justice. The Bureau of Investigation is charged with the investigation of offenses against the United States, except those arising under the prohibition or counterfeiting laws, with the preparation of evidence for the trial of detected offenders, and with the collection of criminal identification records and police information. The Bureau of Prohibition has, since July 1, 1930, been charged with the investigation of violations of the laws relating to intoxicating liquor and the apprehension of persons violating those laws.⁸ The work of the Bureau of Investigation is largely criminal; the work of the Bureau of Prohibition is in part civil and administrative, including civil seizures and forfeitures under the prohibition laws, the holding (jointly with the Bureau of Industrial Alcohol of the Treasury Department) of hearings on liquor permits, and the determination of internal revenue taxes and penalties in cases where violations of the prohibition laws are involved.⁹

Several Federal police agencies concerned with the enforcement of the laws relating to the currency, the public revenue, and the narcotic traffic, and to some extent with the enforcement of prohibition, exist in the Treasury Department. The intelligence unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue investigates violations of the internal revenue laws and collects evidence against offenders under those laws. The Secret Service is charged with the suppression of counterfeiting, with the investigation of violations of certain fiscal legislation, and with the protection of the person of the President.

⁶ See pp. 84-85, infra.

⁷ As to the distinction between civil and criminal functions, see pp. 90-91, infra.

⁸ Prior to July 1, 1930, these functions were exercised by the Bureau of Prohibition of the Treasury Department. Since the cost data in this report are for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, the Treasury Department figures are used. See pp. 95-99, infra.

⁹ The United States marshals throughout the country are under the supervision of the Department of Justice. Their police functions are dealt with below (p. 76, infra).

It exercises criminal functions only. The customs agency service of the Bureau of Customs investigates violations of the customs laws and also makes administrative investigations. The customs border patrol has criminal police duties in preventing smuggling on land. The Coast Guard has extensive criminal police duties in connection with the preventing and detecting of smuggling, and plays a considerable part in the police work incident to the attempt to enforce prohibition; it also has a wide variety of civil duties in connection with safety at sea and other matters. The Bureau of Narcotics has very definite criminal police powers in connection with the enforcement of the antinarcotic laws, although it also exercises administrative functions in connection with the issuance of permits. Its functions, on the whole, closely parallel those of the Bureau of Prohibition in the Department of Justice. The Bureau of Industrial Alcohol (formerly a part of the Bureau of Prohibition of the Treasury Department¹⁰) does not exercise criminal functions.

The War and Navy Departments provide for the internal police of the land and naval forces, respectively. Such police activities, although largely criminal, are not considered in this study, which does not deal with military criminal justice or its agencies.¹¹ In rare instances the armed forces of the United States may be called upon for police duty, as in the case of riots and civil commotion.¹²

The postal inspection service of the Post Office Department is charged with the investigation of offenses against the postal laws, including mail thefts, forgery of money orders, and improper use of the mails, and also has extensive civil and administrative duties.

The Department of the Interior includes three agencies having limited criminal duties.¹³ The field service division

¹⁰ See note 8, supra.

¹¹ See p. 40, supra.

¹² See the discussion of this matter in pt. 1 of this report (p. 40, supra). The intelligence division of the Navy Department cooperates with other departments in the detection and bringing to trial of persons engaged in activities subversive to the Federal Government, but this function is relatively a very minor one, and may be disregarded.

¹³ The department also supervises the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors in Alaska, which is a criminal function, although exercised only outside the continental limits of the United States. The forest rangers of the National Park Service have some limited criminal duties, but their primary functions are civil in character.

of the General Land Office investigates offenses against the laws protecting the public domain, and collects evidence against offenders. The division also performs extensive civil and administrative functions. The Indian police force and the service for suppressing the liquor traffic among the Indians, both operating under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exercise criminal police jurisdiction in the Indian reservations.

The only agency of the Department of Agriculture having as its principal function criminal police duties within the continental United States is the division of game and bird conservation of the Bureau of Biological Survey, which is charged with the protection of migratory birds and the detection and arrest of offenders against the Federal migratory bird law. The Food and Drug Administration and the Plant Quarantine and Control Administration exercise criminal functions to a limited extent in the case of persistent offenders within their respective fields. Most of their activities, however, are of a regulatory character.¹⁴

Two important agencies of the Department of Labor exercise police functions. These are the Bureau of Immigration, which is charged with preventing violations of the immigration laws and with the detection of and preparation of evidence against violators of those laws,¹⁵ and the Bureau of Naturalization, which is charged with similar duties in relation to the naturalization laws. Both of these agencies have extensive administrative functions which considerably overshadow in importance their criminal duties.

¹⁴ A number of agencies of the department have extensive regulatory duties which frequently verge closely on police activity. The meat inspection and field inspection divisions of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Grain Futures Administration may be mentioned as examples. The rangers of the Forest Service have some criminal police duties, but these are relatively minor. Cf. note 13, supra.

¹⁵ The principal police agencies of the Bureau of Immigration are the immigration inspectors and the immigration border patrol. As to the very important activities of the Bureau of Immigration in connection with the deportation of aliens, see National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Enforcement of the Deportation Laws of the United States, pp. 46-132. While deportation proceedings are not technically criminal [*Zakonait v. Wolf*, 226 U. S. 272 (1912)], they are closely related to the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States, and a study of the cost of such proceedings might well have been made as part of the present investigation. It was not made because of practical limitations on the time and funds available. Cf. note 19, infra.

In the Department of Commerce the Bureau of Fisheries exercises criminal police functions in connection with the protection of the sponge fisheries of Florida and in the administration of the Federal statute regulating the transportation of black bass.¹⁶

The Department of State contains no agency exercising criminal police functions.

The Bureau of Inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission investigates violations of the interstate commerce laws and prepares evidence against offenders, in addition to performing extensive administrative and investigative duties for the commission in noncriminal matters. The other independent offices and establishments contain no agencies of importance having criminal police duties.¹⁷

The United States marshals and their deputies have both criminal and administrative duties.¹⁸ They have custody of Federal prisoners awaiting trial and sentence, have charge of the transportation of prisoners, execute bench warrants, and perform such other criminal police duties as directed by the courts to which they respectively belong. They also serve civil processes, levy attachments and executions, and perform in general the same duties as sheriffs and similar State or county officers. The marshals operate under the general control of the Department of Justice and under the specific direction of the several United States district courts.

The Federal police organization is thus a highly diverse and complex one, composed of a number of specialized

¹⁶ The statute regulating the transportation of black bass was not in force during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930. The Bureau of Fisheries also exercises police jurisdiction in protecting the seal and salmon fisheries of Alaska, but outside of the continental limits of the United States. The activities of the Steamboat Inspection Service, the Bureau of Navigation and the Radio Division in enforcing, respectively, the steamboat inspection laws, the navigation laws, and the laws relating to wireless communication are administrative rather than criminal.

¹⁷ These independent offices and establishments include the Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Tariff Commission, the Board of Tax Appeals, the Federal Farm Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Radio Commission, the Veteran's Administration, the United States Shipping Board, and a number of other establishments of minor importance. Cf. National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 163.

¹⁸ There are 91 United States marshals. On Sept. 30, 1930, there were 983 deputy marshals. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 77. Of these, 84 marshals and 866 deputies were functioning within the continental United States outside the District of Columbia.

agencies, most of which perform civil and administrative as well as criminal duties. Indeed, it is hardly an organization at all, but rather a group of independent organizations. These facts very considerably complicate the problem of determining the aggregate criminal cost of Federal police.

3. *Federal prosecuting agencies.*—General supervision over all prosecutions for Federal offenses is exercised by the Department of Justice. The antitrust division supervises prosecutions under the antitrust and related laws and for violations of the principal criminal statutes relating to interstate commerce. The division of taxation and prohibition supervises criminal prosecutions under the prohibition and internal revenue laws. The division of admiralty, alien-property matters, cases arising under the settlement of war claims act of 1928, foreign relations, matters of finance, territorial and insular affairs, cases arising under the war risk insurance act, and minor regulations of commerce supervises prosecutions under a miscellaneous group of laws relating to food and drugs, insecticides and fungicides, migratory birds, plant and animal quarantine, meat inspection and similar matters. Finally, the criminal division has general charge of the prosecution of criminal cases other than the foregoing special classes, including immigration and naturalization cases, postal cases, narcotic cases, and white slave cases, and of matters of criminal practice and procedure in all cases. All of these divisions also perform some civil functions. The division of customs, the division for the defense of claims against the United States, the division of public lands, and the division of administration have no duties in connection with prosecution.

The penal division of the office of the General Counsel, Bureau of Internal Revenue, exercises some prosecuting functions in certain cases involving violations of the internal revenue laws, although the major part of the activities of that division is in connection with civil matters, particularly the imposition and collection of civil fraud penalties.¹⁹

¹⁹ While civil fraud penalties are merely a means of enforcing statutory provisions which, at the election of the enforcing officials, may be enforced by criminal prosecution, and while such penalties are factually fines imposed without the formality of criminal proceedings, so that the cost of imposing such penalties is in a sense part of the cost of enforcing the Federal criminal laws, practical difficulties have made it necessary to exclude this element of cost from consideration. Cf. p. 146, *infra*. And see note 15, *supra*.

The immediate conduct of Federal prosecutions is the duty of the United States attorneys and their assistants. There are 84 United States attorneys in the continental United States outside the District of Columbia, one for each judicial district, and 382 assistant district attorneys. The presentation of criminal cases on preliminary hearing and to grand juries, and the trial of such cases in the United States district courts, are handled by the United States attorneys' offices for their respective districts. The district attorneys also handle criminal appeals to the circuit courts of appeals, but not appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, like all other cases in the Supreme Court to which the United States is a party, are handled by the Department of Justice under the direct supervision of the Solicitor General. The work of the United States attorneys' offices includes the handling of civil cases to which the Federal Government or its officers as such are parties, as well as the prosecution of criminal cases.

The Federal grand juries in the several judicial districts are to be regarded as part of the machinery of prosecution, although very closely related to the district courts. All Federal crimes other than minor offenses²⁰ can be tried only on indictment, so that the grand jury forms an essential part of the machinery whereby persons accused of serious Federal offenses are put on trial. The functions of Federal grand juries are wholly criminal.

4. *Federal criminal courts.*—The actual trial and sentencing of offenders against the Federal criminal laws is a function of the United States district courts. There are 84 district courts within the continental limits of the United States.²¹ These courts have both civil and criminal jurisdiction,²² and are the sole Federal courts of first instance for the trial of persons indicted for crime.²³ The clerks'

²⁰ As to what constitute "minor offenses," see National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Preliminary Report on the Enforcement of the Prohibition Laws, pp. 11, 18-20. (H. R. Doc. No. 252, 71st Congress, 2d session.)

²¹ There are also district courts for Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia performs the functions of a district court in addition to other functions.

²² See pp. 42-43, supra.

²³ Except, of course, in the Territories, the insular possessions, and the District of Columbia.

and marshals' offices for the various judicial districts are under the direct control of the respective district courts to which they pertain.

One or more United States commissioners function under the supervision of each district court, there being 1,100 such commissioners. They have, in general, the duties of committing magistrates, including the conduct of preliminary hearings, the determination of whether persons accused of crime shall be held for the grand jury, the hearing of evidence in removal proceedings, and the hearing and determination in the first instance of motions to quash search-warrants and to suppress evidence illegally obtained. The duties of the commissioners relate entirely to criminal matters.

Appeals from the district courts, in criminal as in civil cases, are to the circuit courts of appeals. There are 10 such courts,²⁴ each having jurisdiction over a particular group of district courts.²⁵ Their jurisdiction is wholly appellate.

Review of the decisions of the circuit courts of appeals in criminal cases by the Supreme Court of the United States may in the great majority of cases be had only if the Supreme Court in its discretion decides to review the case

²⁴ Exclusive of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, which hears appeals only from courts in the District of Columbia.

²⁵ The geographical jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals is as follows: *first circuit*, districts of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Porto Rico; *second circuit*, districts of Vermont, Connecticut, and New York (4); *third circuit*, districts of New Jersey, Pennsylvania (3), and Delaware; *fourth circuit*, districts of Maryland, West Virginia (2), Virginia (2), North Carolina (2), and South Carolina (2); *fifth circuit*, districts of Georgia (3), Florida (2), Alabama (3), Mississippi (2), Louisiana (2), and Texas (4); *sixth circuit*, districts of Ohio (2), Michigan (2), Kentucky (2), and Tennessee (3); *seventh circuit*, districts of Indiana (3), Illinois (3), and Wisconsin (2); *eighth circuit*, districts of Minnesota, Iowa (2), Missouri (2), Arkansas (2), Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota; *ninth circuit*, districts of California (2), Oregon, Nevada, Montana, Washington (2), Idaho, Arizona, Alaska (4 divisions), and Hawaii; *tenth circuit*, district of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma (3), and New Mexico. (The figures in parentheses following the names of certain States in the above list indicate the number of Federal judicial districts in such States, respectively.) The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has jurisdiction of appeals from the United States Court for the Canal Zone, and the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has jurisdiction of appeals from the United States Court for China.

on a petition for a writ of certiorari.²⁶ This jurisdiction to review such decisions is rarely exercised in criminal cases,²⁷ so that decisions of the circuit courts of appeals are final in most such cases, as a practical matter.

5. *Federal penal and correctional institutions.*—The Federal Government maintains 6 penal and correctional institutions for the confinement of persons convicted of violating the Federal laws. These include the Federal penitentiaries at Atlanta, Ga., Leavenworth, Kans., and McNeil Island, Wash.; the United States Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio; the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va.; and the National Training School for Boys at Washington, D. C.²⁸ In addition to these permanent institutions, four road camps are maintained at Camp Bragg, N. C., Camp Lee, Va., Camp Riley, Kans., and Camp Meade, Md.²⁹

On June 30, 1930, 4,028 prisoners were confined in the Atlanta Penitentiary, 5,261 in the Leavenworth Penitentiary, and 1,062 in the McNeil Island Penitentiary; 771 were in prison camps; 1,514 were confined in the reformatory at Chillicothe; and 467 women were inmates of the women's prison at Alderson. All these were prisoners serving terms of more than one year. In addition there were 464 prisoners confined in the National Training School for Boys.³⁰

Not all Federal prisoners are in Federal institutions. A substantial number of prisoners serving terms of over one year, and all adult prisoners serving terms of one year or

²⁶ Appeals as of right may lie in certain cases, particularly those involving constitutional questions. See U. S. C., Tit. 28, §§ 345, 347. In a very limited class of criminal cases in the State courts of last resort an appeal may lie to the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds, or the right to petition for review by certiorari may exist. See U. S. C., Tit. 28, § 344.

²⁷ During the fiscal year 1920-30, 42 petitions for certiorari were filed in Federal criminal cases. Only 1 petition was granted. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 11.

²⁸ The institution at Alderson is used for women only; the others for male prisoners only. For a more detailed description of these institutions, see National Society of Penal Information, Handbook of American Prisons and Reformatories, 1929, pp. 8-50.

²⁹ These camps were established early in 1930, the inmates being selected prisoners from Atlanta and Leavenworth. The inmates of these camps are employed in building roads and in salvaging buildings and surplus war material. See Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, pp. 55-58.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

less, are confined in State, county, or municipal penal institutions. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, persons convicted of Federal crimes were serving sentences in 22 State institutions located in 21 States,³¹ in 1 institution of the District of Columbia,³² in 22 county jails or houses of correction,³³ and in 12 municipal jails, workhouses, or houses of correction³⁴ throughout the country.³⁵ The United States pays at an agreed rate for each prisoner so confined.

Since there are, at the present time, no Federal jails, persons detained awaiting trial for Federal crimes and convicted persons awaiting transportation to the penal institutions to which they have been sentenced are confined in city and county jails on the same basis as short-term prisoners.

Appropriations have recently been made for the construction of an additional Federal penitentiary, a Federal reformatory, a hospital for defective delinquents, and a narcotic farm; and the construction of two Federal jails is contemplated.³⁶

Supervision of Federal penal and correctional institutions is exercised by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice.

6. *Federal probation and parole agencies.*—The Federal Government administers a system of probation. Until very

³¹ Arkansas (prison farm for women), Arizona (penitentiary), Colorado (penitentiary, industrial school), Idaho (industrial school), Indiana (women's prison), Iowa (men's reformatory), Kentucky (reformatory), Minnesota (reformatory), Missouri (reformatory), Maryland (training school for boys), Nebraska (reformatory for women), Nevada (penitentiary), New Mexico (penitentiary), Oregon (penitentiary), Rhode Island (penitentiary), South Carolina (penitentiary), South Dakota (penitentiary), Texas (penitentiary), Utah (industrial school), Vermont (women's prison), Washington (reformatory).

³² The National Training School for Girls, Washington, D. C.

³³ Located as follows: Arizona, 2; California, 4; Colorado, 2; Florida, 1; Georgia, 1; Massachusetts, 3; Minnesota, 1; Mississippi, 2; New Jersey, 1; South Carolina, 1; Texas, 2; Virginia, 2.

³⁴ Located as follows: Illinois, 1; Massachusetts, 7; Michigan, 1; Ohio, 1; Oklahoma, 1; Wisconsin, 1.

³⁵ See Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, pp. 66A-66B.

³⁶ See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 86, 89-90 (report of director of the Bureau of Prisons); see also Whitin, Prison Legislation in 1930, American Bar Association Journal, vol. 17, p. 303 (1931).

recently this system had been very inadequate,³⁷ but recent appropriations have made possible a much-needed increase in the number of probation officers. Probation work is carried out, in those judicial districts where the machinery has been set up, under the direction of the respective district courts, with general supervision of all probation officers by a supervisor of probation, who is under the direction of the director of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, probation was being administered in 9 of the 84 judicial districts of the continental United States outside of the District of Columbia by a force of 8 probation officers who were attempting to look after an average of 4,122 probationers, or 458 probationers per officer.

The Federal parole system also has recently been drastically reorganized. Until early in 1930, the granting, withholding and revoking of parole was in the hands of parole boards, which met at each Federal institution from time to time. Such boards were composed of the superintendent of Federal prisons,³⁸ and the warden and physician of the particular institution. This system did not work well,³⁹ and the parole boards as formerly constituted have now been superseded by a single full-time Board of Parole, which began to function toward the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.⁴⁰

General supervision of Federal parole administration is vested in a parole supervisor, who is under the direction of the director of the Bureau of Prisons.⁴¹

³⁷ One serious defect of the existing Federal system of administering criminal justice has been the failure to provide adequate probation machinery for handling juvenile delinquents. See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Child Offender in the Federal Courts, p. 8. This situation has been particularly acute since the enactment of the national motor vehicle theft act (U. S. C., Tit. 18, § 403), which has brought many minors into the Federal criminal courts.

³⁸ Now director of the Bureau of Prisons. See Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, p. 1.

³⁹ See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 93.

⁴⁰ See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 89 (report of director of the Bureau of Prisons). See also Whitin, Prison Legislation in 1930, American Bar Association Journal, vol. 17, pp. 303-304 (1931).

⁴¹ On June 30, 1930, there were 1,895 persons on parole from Federal penal and correctional institutions.

The granting of executive clemency is a matter closely related to parole, especially since such clemency may take the form of conditional commutation of sentence, which has much the same effect as parole.⁴² The pardon attorney of the Department of Justice has charge of all applications for executive clemency,⁴³ and submits recommendations to the Attorney General, and through him to the President, as to the action to be taken on such applications.

CHAPTER III

DETERMINATION OF THE COST OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *Introductory.*—The number and diversity of the agencies concerned with various aspects of the administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government, together with the fact that a majority of those agencies exercise civil or administrative as well as criminal functions, make the problem of determining the cost of Federal criminal justice a difficult one. There are two primary aspects to the problem: (a) the determination of the basic cost of each agency which has a part in administering the Federal criminal law; and (b) the allocation of such costs as between the civil and criminal functions of those agencies. This chapter will explain how these aspects of the investigation were handled, will call attention to certain items of cost which have been omitted, and will indicate the extent to which the cost figures which have been developed may be relied upon as accurate. The following 5 chapters will set forth the results of the investigation, giving figures as to criminal police cost, cost of prosecution, cost of the criminal courts, cost of penal institutions, and cost of probation and parole.

⁴² In the States of Virginia and Mississippi, a virtual system of parole is administered by the use of the executive power to grant conditional pardons, although there is no State parole law. See Wilcox, The Parole of Adults from State Institutions in Pennsylvania and Other Commonwealths, in Report of the Pennsylvania State Parole Commission to the Legislature, Pt. II, p. 112 (1927).

⁴³ Except cases arising in the Army or Navy. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, 1,331 applications were considered; 11 full pardons and 110 pardons after sentence served to restore rights to citizenship were granted, 69 sentences were commuted absolutely and 11 conditionally, and 14 remissions of fines and costs were granted. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 95 (report of pardon attorney).

2. *Securing the basic data.*—The basic cost figures for the various Federal agencies concerned with the administration of Federal criminal justice are in most cases available in the published reports of the executive departments. Where the figures were not thus available or gave insufficient detail, the executive departments or other Federal agencies concerned were requested to furnish the necessary data. The basic police figures were obtained from the records and published reports of the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The basic figures on prosecution, courts, penal and corrective institutions, and probation and parole were obtained from the records and published reports of the Department of Justice.⁴⁴

The basic cost data⁴⁵ so obtained may be regarded as substantially complete⁴⁶ and accurate.

3. *Allocation of costs.*—The most difficult problem which arises in determining the Federal cost of criminal justice is that of the correct allocation of cost between the civil and criminal functions of those agencies which exercise both. Such allocation is necessary in the case of all police and prosecuting agencies and in the case of the courts, but not in the case of penal institutions, probation and parole.

The allocations of the costs of the agencies of the executive departments and independent executive establishments having police duties were made in most cases on the basis of estimates by the heads of those agencies and other responsible officials as to the relative amount of time spent on civil and criminal matters in their respective divisions. The details of the method of allocation used in the case of each particular agency are set forth later.

The allocations of the costs of the courts, United States marshals' offices, and United States attorneys' offices were made on the basis of questionnaires sent out by the Depart-

⁴⁴ Special acknowledgement is made to Mr. John W. Gardner, general agent of the Department of Justice, for his invaluable assistance in obtaining detailed figures from the unpublished records of the department.

⁴⁵ Covering both civil and criminal functions.

⁴⁶ The data are entirely complete except for the minor omissions which are discussed later in this chapter. See pp. 87-88, *infra*.

ment of Justice, at the request of the commission, to all the clerks of district courts, marshals, and United States attorneys within the continental United States outside of the District of Columbia. The questionnaires sent out to the clerks of the district courts asked for the estimate of each clerk of the relative amount of time spent by his court on various types of civil and criminal matters, and as to the number of jury trials in civil cases,⁴⁷ during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930. The questionnaires sent to the marshals and United States attorneys asked each such official for an estimate of the relative amount of time spent by his office on the same classes of matters for the same period.⁴⁸

The necessary data for allocations of cost were obtained or estimated for all the important Federal criminal justice agencies. The allocated figures are thus wholly comprehensive. To what extent they may be relied upon as accurate is discussed in a later section of this chapter.⁴⁹

4. *Functional divisions of costs.*—In the case of many of the law enforcement functions of the Federal Government, the line between civil and criminal enforcement activities is an extremely artificial one. This is particularly true of the attempted enforcement of the prohibition laws, where civil actions in the form of suits for padlock injunctions are being increasingly employed in preference to criminal prosecutions.⁵⁰ While suits for padlock injunctions are quite different from criminal prosecutions in legal theory, the difference in practical effect between closing a man's premises and fining him is very slight. Moreover, whether civil or criminal proceedings are instituted in a particular

⁴⁷ This information was necessary in order that allocation of amounts paid out for jurors' fees might be made. See pp. 93, 115, *infra*.

⁴⁸ The major part of these data was obtained through the cordial and efficient cooperation of the Department of Justice. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. John W. Gardner, general agent of the department, for his assistance in this regard.

⁴⁹ See pp. 91-94, *infra*.

⁵⁰ During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, 56,992 criminal cases for violation of the prohibition laws were instituted, an increase of 206 cases, or 0.34 per cent, over the preceding year. During the same fiscal year 11,882 civil cases were instituted in connection with violations of the prohibition laws, an increase of 645 cases, or 5.74 per cent, over the preceding year. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 55, 57, 110.

case depends almost wholly on the discretion of the particular district attorney, and the policy followed may vary widely in different parts of the country.⁵¹ Civil proceedings to enforce prohibition have in fact a much greater functional relationship to criminal proceedings than to most other civil cases to which the United States is a party.⁵² For these reasons, and because a study of the cost of Federal criminal justice chargeable to the enforcement of prohibition was believed to be desirable, it was determined that data should be secured on the cost of prohibition enforcement by civil proceedings.

It also appeared desirable to secure the data necessary to divide the cost of Federal criminal justice so as to show the proportionate amount of cost incurred in dealing with certain specified types of Federal crimes which have become of particular importance as regards volume of cases in recent years. The three classes of offenses selected for such special investigation were violations of the prohibition laws, violations of the antinarcotic laws, and violations of the motor vehicle theft act,⁵³ these being selected for the reason that well over two-thirds of the prisoners in Federal institutions are serving sentences for violations of these laws.⁵⁴ Accordingly, it was decided to secure data as to the relative amount of time of the various law-enforcement agencies consumed in dealing with these three special types of offenses.

⁵¹ A similar discretion with respect to choosing between civil and criminal proceedings for the enforcement of the antitrust laws is vested in the Attorney General of the United States. And compare note 19, supra.

⁵² Civil actions for penalties under the navigation laws, steamboat inspection laws, customs laws, and certain laws regulating interstate commerce are also more closely allied to criminal prosecution than to ordinary civil actions.

⁵³ U. S. C., Tit. 18, § 408. This statute, commonly known as the Dyer Act, makes it a Federal offense to operate or transport a stolen motor vehicle in interstate commerce.

⁵⁴ Of the 12,332 prisoners in Federal institutions (exclusive of road camps) on June 30, 1930, 34.8 per cent were offenders under the prohibition laws, 22 per cent offenders under the antinarcotic laws, and 13.2 per cent offenders under the motor vehicle theft act—a total of 70 per cent. No other class of offenses accounted for as much as 9 per cent of the prison population. The 30 per cent of the prisoners serving terms for other offenses included violators of the postal laws (8.2 per cent), persons sentenced for non-Federal crimes in the District of Columbia (3.6 per cent), counterfeiters (3.3 per cent), violators of the immigration laws (2.1 per cent), violators of the white slave act (1.8 per cent), military prisoners (1.3 per cent), violators of the laws regulating interstate commerce (1.1 per cent) and miscellaneous Federal offenders (3.7 per cent). See Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, p. 83.

Data were accordingly obtained as to the relative amount of time of the district attorneys, district courts, and marshals occupied in dealing with (1) civil matters (*a*) in connection with prohibition enforcement (including bond forfeitures), and (*b*) other civil matters; and (2) criminal matters (*a*) in connection with prohibition enforcement, (*b*) in connection with enforcement of the antinarcotic laws, (*c*) in connection with enforcement of the motor vehicle theft act, and (*d*) other criminal matters.

Data making possible the division of the cost of the Department of Justice between these classes of activities, and the division of the cost of Federal prisons and Federal probation and parole as between these classes of offenders, were obtained from that department. Certain data as to the cost of prohibition enforcement and as to the cost of enforcement of the antinarcotic laws were obtained from the Treasury Department.

The securing of these data has made possible a division of the cost of Federal criminal justice between (*a*) cost of prohibition enforcement; (*b*) cost of enforcing the antinarcotic laws; (*c*) cost of enforcing the motor vehicle theft act; and (*d*) cost of enforcing other criminal laws. It has also made possible an estimate of the total cost of Federal enforcement of prohibition and of the antinarcotic laws, whether by civil or criminal proceedings, including the administrative cost. The detailed data as to these matters are presented and discussed in a later chapter.⁵⁵

5. *Elements of cost omitted.*—The figures which are set forth in the later chapters of this report are in all cases minimum figures, since, in several instances, it was found necessary for practical reasons to ignore entirely certain elements of cost. All these omissions are relatively minor, and will not substantially affect the accuracy of the total figures arrived at.

The first class of omissions is in connection with executive overhead. Theoretically some part of the cost of the overhead of the executive departments and independent establishments having functions in connection with the administration of Federal criminal justice should be allocated to

⁵⁵ See pp. 144-150, infra.

the administration of the criminal law.⁶⁰ Such an allocation of supervisory overhead was found to be possible and necessary in the case of the Department of Justice, and the costs for that department include in each case a pro rata proportion of such overhead. In the case of the other executive departments and establishments, however, problems of allocation were considerable and the amounts involved comparatively small, so that no allowance for general supervisory overhead was made.

The second class of omissions is in connection with the heating, lighting, and maintenance of Government buildings used only in part by law enforcement agencies. The reason for such omissions was purely a practical one, as the data could have been obtained by sufficient labor. However, since the amounts involved were not large and the labor required to secure accurate results would have been very great, it was deemed desirable to ignore this element of cost entirely. This omission affects the cost figures for the United States attorneys' offices, the courts, the marshals' offices, the United States commissioners' offices, and the offices of probation officers, as well as the figures for the cost of police agencies outside the Department of Justice. The figures for the police prosecuting activities of the Department of Justice and for penal and correctional institutions in each case include an appropriate allowance for such maintenance costs.

While the basic figures have been checked to see that capital outlays have not been included in operating costs, it has not been practicable in this investigation to determine the aggregate capital investment of the Federal Government in connection with criminal justice, nor to compute carrying charges on that investment. This omission in no way affects the accuracy of the figures given for operating costs, although it prevents these figures from representing total annual costs.

6. *Receipts.*—The character of receipts by the Federal Government in connection with the administration of criminal justice was checked to determine whether any should be regarded as credits against the cost of Federal justice.

⁶⁰ Compare p. 37, *supra*.

While large fines are imposed by the district courts,⁶⁷ and while substantial amounts are collected as bond forfeitures,⁶⁸ we have felt that these receipts, although they have lessened the tax burden due to the administration of criminal justice, should not be deducted in arriving at the amounts expended by the Federal Government for the administration of criminal law.⁶⁹

There were no sales of prison-made goods by Federal institutions; no amounts received for convict labor;⁷⁰ and no payments to the Federal Government for the subsistence and safe-keeping of prisoners of other governmental units.⁷¹ However, prisoners in Federal institutions manufacture some goods for Government use,⁷² the prisoners confined in prison camps are engaged in work on roads and in other labor for the Government,⁷³ and all Federal institutions raise at least some of their own food on prison farms and employ prison labor for the maintenance and improvement of the prison itself.⁷⁴ Figures are available as to the receipts for prison-made goods transferred to other departments of the Government,⁷⁵ and in some cases as to goods or produce used by the institutions themselves,⁷⁶ but not as to the value of prison labor. The absence of complete data is not a serious matter, however, because neither the profits on such goods nor the value of such labor should be deducted in presenting

⁶⁷ During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, fines aggregating \$8,926,064.53 were thus imposed. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 106. Of the fines so imposed, a total of \$8,922,491.27 were in prohibition cases. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

⁶⁸ During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, a total of \$4,752,646.74 was realized on fines, forfeitures, etc., in criminal cases. *Ibid.*, p. 106. Of this amount, \$3,976,576.64 was realized from fines and forfeitures in prohibition cases. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

⁶⁹ The reasons why such receipts should not be treated as such credits are discussed in pt. 3 of this report (pp. 159-160, *infra*). See also pt. 6 (p. 270, *infra*).

⁷⁰ The Federal Government has never rented convict labor either to private individuals or to the States.

⁷¹ These categories of receipts include all those which are of importance in the case of State penal institutions. Cf. pp. 211-212, *infra*.

⁷² Such as cotton duck (Atlanta) and shoes, brooms, and brushes (Leavenworth). See Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, pp. 7, 15, 16.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-58.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9 (Atlanta), 14-15, 16-17 (Leavenworth), 21-22 (McNeil Island), 36-37 (Chillicothe), 50 (Alderson).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10, 15-16.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 81 (item "Profit from farming operations").

the operating costs of the institutions.⁶⁷ There are no receipts in connection with Federal probation or parole.

The published financial reports of Federal penal institutions do not clearly indicate whether the cost of raw material, if any, purchased for use in the manufacture of prison-made goods is included in the operating costs of those institutions.⁶⁸ An investigation of the records, however, indicates that an appropriate deduction on this account is made, although no account is taken of depreciation on machinery used in the manufacture of such goods.⁶⁹

7. *Accuracy of figures developed.*—There are three possible causes of inaccuracy in the figures as to the cost of Federal criminal justice set forth in this report. These are: (a) failure to include in the investigation all Federal agencies exercising functions in connection with the administration of Federal criminal justice; (b) errors in the basic cost data obtained from the various departments; and (c) inaccuracies in the data used as the basis for allocations of cost. Before the detailed figures are presented, it will be desirable to consider the extent to which, if at all, errors may be expected as a result of each of those causes, so that the discussion which follows may be read with a clear idea of just what the figures presented are, and just how far they may be regarded as accurate.

(a) Failure to include in the investigation all Federal agencies concerned in the administration of criminal justice would not affect the accuracy of the figures presented for particular agencies, but would affect the totals. There is no substantial chance of such omission in the case of prosecuting agencies, courts, penal institutions, or probation and parole, and the totals for these agencies may be regarded as free from this possible source of error. The only opportunity for omissions is in the case of police, where many diverse agencies must be considered, and where there may be differences of opinion as to whether a given agency exercises criminal functions or not. In making this study, par-

⁶⁷ See note 59, supra. See also pp. 211-212, infra.

⁶⁸ See a discussion of this general problem in pt. 5 of this report (pp. 212-213, infra).

⁶⁹ This failure to take account of depreciation does not affect the accuracy of the figures presented as to operating cost. See p. 213, infra, note 46.

CONTINUED

7 OF 7

ticular care has been exercised to avoid both of these dangers. Detailed consideration has been given the duties of each bureau and division of each of the executive departments and of each independent executive board and establishment, so that no agency of the Federal Government having criminal police functions has been omitted by inadvertence. In determining what agencies should be excluded as not having criminal duties, it has been necessary to exercise an informed judgment. In general, there have been included, as having criminal duties at least in part, all agencies engaged in border-patrol activities and all agencies charged with effecting arrests or gathering evidence in cases of offenses or suspected offenses against the United States.⁷⁰ There have been excluded entirely protective forces on the public domain whose principal function is protection against fire;⁷¹ the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;⁷² inspection and control agencies charged with enforcing minor regulations of interstate commerce and similar statutory provisions;⁷³ and auditing agencies, even though their work may lead incidentally to the discovery of violations of the Federal criminal laws.⁷⁴ The attempt has been made to apply these principles of differentiation between civil and administrative functions and criminal functions uniformly in all cases, and it is believed that no agency omitted can fairly be said to have extensive or important criminal police duties.

(b) While it was not practicable, nor would it have been profitable, to check the accuracy of the basic figures obtained from the reports and records of the various Federal departments, the essential accuracy of those figures appears to be beyond reasonable question.

(c) The only remaining source of potential error in the figures is to be found in the character of the data used in making allocations of cost. So far as the division of costs

⁷⁰ Seeing the detailed discussion in Ch. II of this part (pp. 72-77, supra).

⁷¹ Such as the rangers of the National Park Service and the Forest Service. Cf. notes 13 and 14, supra (pp. 74, 75).

⁷² The reason for such omission is fully discussed in pt. 1 of this report (p. 40, supra). See also p. 74, supra.

⁷³ Such as the meat-inspection division of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Steamboat Inspection Service, and the Bureau of Safety of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Cf. notes 14 and 16, supra (pp. 75, 76).

⁷⁴ Such as the office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the auditing sections of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

between civil and criminal functions is concerned, this possible source of error exists only in the case of police, prosecution, and court costs, since the basic figures for penal institutions, probation and parole require no allocation. It was, however, necessary to allocate the cost of penal institutions, probation and parole among the specific classes of criminal offenses taken into consideration—i. e., prohibition violations, antinarcotic violations, motor vehicle thefts, and other Federal offenses.

The police agencies requiring allocations of cost include agencies of the Department of Justice, agencies of other executive departments and establishments, and the United States marshals. The allocations for the Department of Justice and for the police agencies of the other executive departments and establishments were made primarily on the basis of estimates by the head of each agency as to relative time spent on various types of matters—this estimate being checked in all cases by other qualified officials and wherever possible by a functional division of pay rolls⁷⁵—and the cost figures worked out on this basis may, it is believed, be regarded as reasonably accurate estimates. The data for allocation of the cost of the marshals' offices were supplied by the marshals themselves at the request of the Department of Justice, and represent estimates by those officials.⁷⁶ It is believed that they are reasonable estimates, and that the cost figures developed by using them, while not exact, should not be seriously out of line.

Allocations to determine prosecution costs were required in the case of the Department of Justice and in the case of the United States attorneys. So far as the department is concerned, an allocation on a pay-roll basis⁷⁷ was possible, and the resulting figures may, it is believed, be regarded as substantially correct. The data for allocation of the

⁷⁵ For an example of allocation of cost on a strict pay-roll basis, see National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, N. Y., reprinted as Appendix D to this report (pp. 574-581, *infra*). While this example is concerned with the allocation of the cost of a municipal police force, the principles illustrated are of general application and have been applied wherever possible in the present study.

⁷⁶ Except in the case of expenditures for the transportation and subsistence of prisoners, as to which exact figures were obtained.

⁷⁷ See note 75, *supra*.

costs of the United States attorneys' offices were obtained from those officials, and, like the data supplied by the marshals, represent the estimates of the responsible official in charge of each office. Here also it is believed that the data, while not to be regarded as exact, afford the basis for computing allocated costs which may be considered as reasonable estimates.

In the case of the district courts, the allocated figures are based on data furnished by the clerks. The largest single item of cost is that of fees of jurors and witnesses,⁷⁸ and here reasonable allocation is possible.⁷⁹ The remainder of the cost of the district courts was allocated in accordance with estimates by the clerk of each court of the relative amount of time spent by that court on specified types of matters.⁸⁰ It is believed that these estimates, like the estimates of the marshals and United States attorneys, while they can not be regarded as at all exact, do afford the basis for developing figures which should not be seriously out of line. The allocations of cost for the circuit courts of appeals have been made on the basis of the relative number of appeals decided of each specified class. Since the same amount of time for argument is ordinarily allotted to all appeals, this allocation may be regarded as substantially accurate. The allocation for the Supreme Court of the United States is based primarily upon the relative number of each class of cases disposed of, but, due to the fact that many of these cases simply involved the passing upon of applications for writs of certiorari, the tentative allocation so made has been checked and corrected in consulta-

⁷⁸ For the fiscal year 1929-30 this item accounted for \$3,993,302.31 out of a total of \$8,781,119.01 expended for the district courts in the continental United States outside of the District of Columbia, exclusive of United States commissioners' and marshals' offices.

⁷⁹ The details are given in a later chapter (pp. 114-115, *infra*).

⁸⁰ It would have been preferable to have determined the actual court days or fractions of days devoted to each class of cases and to have then made the allocation on that basis. (For an example of this method of allocating court costs, see p. 500, *infra*.) This method proved impractical of application, however, due to inadequacy of the records of the district courts. The study of the Federal courts begun by the commission was concerned with matters other than the relative amount of time spent by the district courts on various classes of cases. See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Progress Report on the Study of the Business of the Federal Courts.

tion with the clerk of the Supreme Court. The corrected allocation is believed to be an accurate estimate.

In the case of the United States commissioners, no allocation of cost as between civil and criminal functions was necessary, as the activities of the commissioners are confined to criminal cases. The division of cost of the commissioners' offices as between prohibition, antinarcotic, motor vehicle theft, and other criminal cases was made in each judicial district on the basis of the relative amount of time spent by the district court in that district on the several classes of criminal cases as shown by the clerk's report. This method, which is obviously somewhat rough, was adopted for the practical reason that, while the task of securing precise data from each of the 1,100 United States commissioners would have been tremendous, the amount involved was relatively small.

Allocations of penal institution, probation, and pardon costs were necessary in order to divide the cost of Federal criminal justice between different types of offenses.⁸¹ Allocations of penal and pardon costs have been made on the basis of the relative numbers of persons imprisoned and pardoned who were convicted of offenses of these various types. The allocated figures thus developed are believed to be substantially accurate.

The figures set forth in the following chapters may thus be used with entire confidence so far as the cost of the police and prosecution activities of the Department of Justice, the cost of the appellate courts in criminal cases, the cost of penal institutions, and the cost of pardon are concerned. The figures as to other police costs, including the cost of the police agencies of other executive departments and establishments and of the United States marshals, as to the cost of prosecution by the United States attorneys, as to the cost of the criminal work of the district courts, and as to probation costs are not exact, since they are based on allocations of cost which are frankly estimates and must be considered and used only as estimated figures. It is believed, however, that, taken as a whole, these figures represent reasonable

⁸¹ No allocation as between civil and criminal costs was necessary, since the number of civil prisoners in Federal institutions is negligible, while Federal probation and parole agencies handle criminal matters only. Cf. p. 45, *supra*. As to the allocation of probation costs by offenses, see p. 135, *infra*.

estimates and may fairly be regarded as indicating the approximate order of magnitude of the costs in question.⁸²

CHAPTER IV

COST OF FEDERAL POLICE AGENCIES

1. *Police agencies in the Department of Justice.*—For purposes of this study only one agency of the department is to be regarded as having police functions—viz., the Bureau of Investigation. While the Bureau of Prohibition now also exercises such functions, that bureau did not exist during the fiscal year 1929–30, which is the period covered by this investigation. Police activities in prohibition enforcement during that year were carried out by the Bureau of Prohibition of the Treasury Department, and the cost of such activities is given hereafter along with that of the police work of other Treasury agencies. In addition to the direct cost of the Bureau of Investigation, a pro rata part of the general administrative overhead of the Department is included in the total.⁸³

Table 1 shows the cost of the police activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, chargeable to the administration of criminal justice.

TABLE 1.—Cost of criminal police agencies in the Department of Justice, 1929–30

Agency	Total cost	Per cent criminal ¹	Criminal police cost
Bureau of Investigation.....	\$2,567,400.00	96.0	\$2,464,796.15
Overhead ²	201,417.07	96.0	193,360.39
Total.....	2,768,817.07	96.0	2,658,156.55

¹ Based on an estimate by the director of the Bureau of Investigation.

² Arrived at as follows: The total cost of Department of Justice, exclusive of overhead, for the year 1929–30 was \$1,293,820.50. The pro rata part of the cost of the overhead allocable to the Bureau of Investigation was obtained by dividing the salary cost of that bureau in Washington (\$321,292.70) by the total cost of the department, exclusive of overhead.

The extent to which the cost of the police activities of the Department of Justice is allocable to the enforcement of

⁸² The total figures for all districts are, of course, much more reliable than the detailed figures for individual districts. While the detailed figures are subject, as has been indicated in the text, to substantial errors of estimate, the probability of systematic error is slight, so that these errors of estimate may be expected to cancel out in the totals to a very considerable degree.

⁸³ The overhead has been allocated on the basis of the proportion which the cost of the Bureau of Investigation was of the total cost of the department exclusive of overhead.

the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—Cost of various criminal police activities of Department of Justice, 1929-30

Enforcement of—	Percentage of criminal police cost ¹	Cost ²
Prohibition law.....	0	0
Antinarcotic laws.....	0	0
Motor vehicle theft act.....	20.8	\$552,896.56
Other criminal laws.....	79.2	2,105,250.99
Total.....	100.0	\$2,658,150.55

¹ Based on estimate furnished by the director of the Bureau of Investigation.

² Including pro rata portion of general administrative overhead of the department.

³ From Table 1, supra.

2. *Police agencies in other executive departments and establishments.*—During the fiscal year 1930 there were 15 agencies outside of the Department of Justice having police duties, distributed among 6 of the executive departments and 1 independent commission. In most cases the work of these agencies is not entirely criminal, so that allocations of cost have been necessary.⁸⁴

The cost of the criminal law enforcement activities of the executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, is given in Table 3.

TABLE 3.—Cost of criminal police agencies in executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice, 1929-30

Department and agency	Total cost of agency	Per cent criminal	Criminal police cost
Treasury Department:			
Bureau of Internal Revenue—			
Intelligence unit.....	\$609,225.59	¹ 100.0	\$609,225.59
Secret Service.....	577,102.49	100.0	577,102.49
Customs Service—			
Customs agency service.....	664,882.51	² 50.0	482,441.25
Customs border patrol.....	2,046,672.00	³ 100.0	2,046,672.00
Coast Guard.....	27,115,163.00	⁴ 50.0	13,557,581.50
Bureau of Prohibition—			
Prohibition enforcement work.....	⁵ 9,000,000.00	100.0	9,000,000.00
Division of Narcotics ⁶	1,403,420.19	⁷ 94.0	1,406,900.19
Total, Treasury Department.....			27,679,923.03
Post Office Department:			
Postal inspection service.....	(⁸)	(⁹)	¹⁰ 387,674.08

See footnotes at end of table.

⁸⁴ See pp. 73-76, supra.

TABLE 3.—Cost of criminal police agencies, etc.—Continued

Department and agency	Total cost of agency	Per cent criminal	Criminal police cost
Department of the Interior:			
General Land Office—			
Field service division.....	\$400,000.00	¹¹ 12.5	¹¹ \$40,875.00
Indian Service—			
Indian police.....	155,771.72	100.0	155,771.72
Suppressing liquor traffic among Indians.....	49,185.03	100.0	49,185.03
Total, Department of the Interior.....			254,831.75
Department of Commerce:			
Bureau of Fisheries—			
Protection of sponge fisheries.....	¹² 3,000.00	100.0	3,000.00
Department of Agriculture:			
Bureau of Biological Survey—			
Division of game and bird conservation.....	(¹³)	(¹³)	¹³ 147,982.89
Food and Drug Administration.....	1,600,000.00	3.1	¹⁴ 50,000.00
Plant Control and Quarantine Administration.....	(¹⁵)	(¹⁵)	¹⁵ 2,000.00
Total, Department of Agriculture.....			109,982.89
Department of Labor:			
Bureau of Naturalization.....	(¹⁶)	(¹⁶)	¹⁶ 25,000.00
Bureau of Immigration—			
Immigration border patrol.....	1,868,440.60	¹⁷ 50.0	934,220.00
Other work.....	6,600,520.00	¹⁷ 10.0	660,952.00
Total, Department of Labor.....			1,620,172.00
Total, executive departments other than Department of Justice.....			30,145,584.04
Interstate Commerce Commission:			
Bureau of Inquiry.....	(¹⁸)	(¹⁸)	¹⁸ 100,000.00
Grand total, executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice.....			30,245,584.04

¹ Allocation of entire cost to criminal advised by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

² Based on an estimate by the Commissioner of Customs.

³ Allocation of entire cost to criminal advised by the Commissioner of Customs.

⁴ Based on an estimate by the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

⁵ On July 1, 1930, the Bureau of Prohibition of the Treasury Department was succeeded by the Bureau of Prohibition of the Department of Justice as regards police work in connection with prohibition enforcement; by the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department as regards enforcement of the antinarcotic laws; and by the Bureau of Industrial Alcohol of the Treasury Department as regards the administration of the permissive features of the prohibition laws.

⁶ Estimate based on division of appropriation for fiscal year 1930-1931 (originally made to the Bureau of Prohibition, Treasury Department, and later divided between the 3 bureaus mentioned in note 5, supra) on the basis of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

⁷ Now the Bureau of Narcotics. See note 5, supra.

⁸ Based on an estimate by the office of the Commissioner of Narcotics.

⁹ Not furnished.

¹⁰ Furnished by the Post Office Department.

¹¹ Criminal cost estimated by the Commissioner of General Land Office on basis of number of cases; percentage computed.

¹² Furnished by the acting Commissioner of Fisheries.

¹³ Furnished by the acting chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey.

¹⁴ Criminal cost estimated by the chief of the Food and Drug Administration; percentage computed.

¹⁵ Furnished by the chief of the Plant Control and Quarantine Administration.

¹⁶ Furnished by the Commissioner General of Naturalization.

¹⁷ Based on an estimate by the Commissioner General of Immigration.

¹⁸ Furnished by the director of the Bureau of Inquiry.

Table 4 shows the extent to which the cost of the criminal police activities of the executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice having police functions are allocable to the enforcement of prohibition, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other criminal laws.

TABLE 4.—Cost of various criminal police activities of executive departments and establishments other than the Department of Justice, 1929-30

Department and agency	Criminal police cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Other laws ²	
		Per cent	Cost	Per cent	Cost	Per cent	Cost
Treasury Department:							
Bureau of Internal Revenue—							
Intelligence unit.....	\$609,225.59					100.0	\$609,225.59
Secret Service Division.....	577,102.49					100.0	577,102.49
Customs Service—							
Customs agency service.....	482,441.25					100.0	482,441.25
Customs border patrol.....	2,046,672.00	³ 50.0	\$1,023,336.00			³ 50.0	1,023,336.00
Coast Guard.....	13,557,581.50	⁴ 100.0	13,557,581.50				
Bureau of Prohibition: ⁵							
Prohibition enforcement.....	9,000,000.00	100.0	9,000,000.00				
Division of Narcotics.....	1,406,900.19			100.0	\$1,406,900.19		
Post Office Department:							
Postal inspection service.....	387,674.98					100.0	387,674.98
Department of the Interior:							
General Land Office—							
Field service division.....	49,875.00					100.0	49,875.00
Indian Service—							
Indian police.....	155,771.72	⁶ 25.0	38,942.93			⁶ 75.0	116,828.79
Suppressing liquor traffic among Indians.....	49,185.03	100.0	49,185.03				
Department of Agriculture:							
Bureau of Biological Survey—							
Division of game and bird conservation.....	147,982.89					100.0	147,982.89
Food and Drug Administration.....	50,000.00					100.0	50,000.00
Plant Control and Quarantine Administration.....	2,000.00					100.0	2,000.00
Department of Labor:							
Bureau of Naturalization.....	25,000.00					100.0	25,000.00
Bureau of Immigration—							
Immigration border patrol.....	934,220.00					100.0	934,220.00
Other work.....	660,952.00					100.0	660,952.00
Department of Commerce:							
Bureau of Fisheries.....	3,000.00					100.0	3,000.00

COST OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Interstate Commerce Commission:							
Bureau of Inquiry.....	100,000.00					100.0	100,000.00
Total.....	30,245,584.64	⁷ 81.4	23,669,045.46	⁷ 4.9	1,406,900.19	⁷ 13.7	5,169,638.99

¹ From Table 3, supra.

² None of these agencies is concerned with the motor vehicle theft act.

³ Based on an estimate by the Commissioner of Customs.

⁴ Based on an estimate by the Commandant of the Coast Guard. See Hearings before Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations on Treasury Department Appropriation Bill for 1932, pp. 19-20.

⁵ See Table 3, supra, note 5.

⁶ Based on a detailed study of the Bureau of Indian Affairs made in 1925 by one of the writers of this part of this report (Doctor Schmeckebier).

⁷ Computed.

COST OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE

3. *The United States marshals.*—Expenditures for the United States marshals' offices may be divided into (a) general expenses, and (b) the cost of transportation and subsistence of prisoners and deputy marshals or other guards accompanying them. An allocation of cost between civil and criminal functions is necessary only in the case of general expenses, since the expense incident to transportation of prisoners is entirely criminal. This allocation has been made on the basis of estimates furnished by each of the 84 marshals within the continental United States exclusive of the District of Columbia.⁵⁵

Table 5 shows the cost of the police activities of the United States marshal in each of the 84 judicial districts within the continental United States (exclusive of the District of Columbia) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, chargeable to the administration of criminal justice.

⁵⁵ See p. 92, supra.

TABLE 5.—Cost of criminal police activities of United States marshals, 1929-30

District	Total cost ¹	Transportation and subsistence ²	General expenses			Criminal police cost ³
			Total amount ⁴	Per cent criminal ⁵	Amount allocated to criminal ⁶	
Alabama:						
Northern.....	\$30,825.80	\$7,390.74	\$25,435.12	70.0	\$10,404.55	\$23,705.32
Middle.....	17,740.87	2,504.92	15,241.95	90.0	13,717.70	10,222.08
Southern.....	18,095.00	2,471.73	10,223.27	59.5	14,520.36	10,002.09
Arizona.....	90,741.50	62,316.25	28,420.25	87.0	24,730.83	87,046.08
Arkansas:						
Eastern.....	37,812.47	6,143.87	31,668.60	74.0	23,434.08	29,578.55
Western.....	20,014.21	4,042.17	24,072.04	87.3	21,800.50	20,742.70
California:						
Northern.....	87,361.70	31,005.40	55,456.30	65.7	30,434.82	68,340.22
Southern.....	87,851.36	37,843.53	50,007.83	60.0	25,153.01	62,097.44
Colorado.....	40,872.70	17,891.84	23,011.10	77.7	17,870.07	35,741.21
Connecticut.....	17,005.71	2,731.15	14,274.56	40.0	5,073.82	8,704.07
Delaware.....	9,580.81	1,000.50	7,587.31	67.6	4,370.30	6,360.80
Florida:						
Northern.....	16,581.46	3,281.70	13,299.76	75.0	9,674.82	13,250.52
Southern.....	64,000.87	23,545.18	41,455.69	64.0	22,218.07	45,703.85
Georgia:						
Northern.....	40,055.05	7,415.75	39,539.30	85.0	33,008.01	41,024.03
Middle.....	33,504.42	4,070.09	29,434.33	90.0	20,530.70	30,015.88
Southern.....	24,045.78	5,075.07	18,970.11	90.0	17,073.11	22,748.78
Idaho.....	34,154.75	11,587.00	22,567.10	80.0	20,220.18	31,807.77
Illinois:						
Northern.....	129,503.15	34,105.30	95,397.85	60.0	47,008.03	81,894.23
Eastern.....	49,451.17	21,080.98	27,364.19	78.0	21,844.07	42,431.05
Southern.....	25,010.37	5,894.04	19,122.33	75.0	14,701.75	20,685.70
Indiana:						
Northern.....	28,803.80	11,348.03	17,454.87	70.0	12,218.41	23,567.34
Southern.....	30,047.00	13,000.54	22,031.12	80.4	10,337.29	33,003.83
Iowa:						
Northern.....	26,080.01	5,177.83	21,502.78	70.0	15,051.04	20,220.77
Southern.....	27,413.43	5,155.08	22,257.45	85.0	18,018.83	24,074.81
Kansas.....	37,104.88	10,729.72	17,375.10	90.0	15,637.04	35,367.36
Kentucky:						
Eastern.....	109,878.00	64,370.20	45,508.40	80.0	36,406.70	100,776.00
Western.....	34,276.40	9,443.08	24,833.32	85.0	21,108.32	30,561.40
Louisiana:						
Eastern.....	70,642.42	12,032.70	57,700.63	70.0	40,300.75	53,320.54
Western.....	20,754.32	8,309.78	21,444.54	65.0	13,938.05	22,248.73
Maine.....	20,235.00	4,730.25	15,400.05	54.0	8,368.10	13,107.44
Maryland.....	37,500.00	10,507.37	27,053.53	90.0	24,348.18	34,855.56
Massachusetts.....	47,089.39	7,931.53	39,157.86	35.0	13,705.25	21,036.78
Michigan:						
Eastern.....	95,359.27	54,022.58	39,333.60	60.0	23,000.22	79,622.80
Western.....	42,743.54	19,310.04	23,423.00	72.0	16,805.20	36,184.84
Minnesota.....	70,687.54	28,209.18	42,478.36	45.0	10,115.27	47,324.45
Mississippi:						
Northern.....	23,241.76	6,154.88	17,086.87	85.0	14,523.84	20,078.72
Southern.....	27,018.60	14,078.60	12,940.00	80.0	10,352.00	24,430.60
Missouri:						
Eastern.....	35,148.52	14,235.02	20,012.00	72.0	15,057.07	20,202.00
Western.....	51,014.41	20,300.80	31,553.61	75.0	23,605.21	44,026.01
Montana.....	40,032.70	9,734.05	30,298.74	60.8	18,439.70	28,173.81
Nebraska.....	28,068.00	4,010.68	24,048.38	63.0	15,717.48	19,737.16
Nevada.....	21,721.30	5,914.21	15,807.09	72.0	11,381.11	17,295.32
New Hampshire.....	15,348.42	6,371.75	8,970.07	80.0	7,181.34	13,553.09
New Jersey.....	96,485.15	13,655.89	82,829.26	60.0	49,697.50	93,353.45
New Mexico.....	40,724.02	10,300.21	30,355.71	85.0	25,802.35	45,171.50
New York:						
Northern.....	61,436.53	21,731.39	39,705.14	60.0	23,823.09	45,554.48
Eastern.....	71,364.05	6,301.55	65,062.60	50.0	32,531.25	38,832.80
Southern.....	137,035.49	22,645.70	114,389.79	60.0	68,633.87	91,279.57
Western.....	68,342.35	7,036.13	61,306.22	65.0	39,840.04	40,885.17
North Carolina:						
Eastern.....	53,843.77	10,316.81	37,527.06	85.0	31,898.78	48,214.57
Middle.....	43,631.76	15,978.04	27,653.72	76.0	20,740.29	30,718.33
Western.....	30,437.58	5,820.62	24,616.06	80.0	19,693.57	25,514.19
North Dakota.....	28,000.15	5,818.20	23,081.95	72.0	10,610.00	22,437.20
Ohio:						
Northern.....	73,404.78	34,065.06	39,738.82	60.0	23,243.20	57,009.25
Southern.....	52,692.48	11,075.82	41,616.00	85.0	35,374.10	40,440.98

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 5.—Cost of criminal police activities of United States marshals, 1929-30—C

District	Total cost ¹	Transportation and subsistence ²	General expenses			Criminal police cost ³
			Total amount ⁴	Per cent criminal ⁵	Amount allocated to criminal ⁶	
Oklahoma:						
Northern.....	\$47,018.44	\$18,071.03	\$28,646.41	94.0	\$20,928.00	\$45,899.03
Eastern.....	35,284.28	16,420.82	23,863.46	94.0	21,401.05	30,912.47
Western.....	32,712.14	14,892.93	17,819.21	63.0	12,117.09	27,009.99
Oregon.....	30,073.98	15,236.33	21,437.65	60.0	12,892.50	28,098.92
Pennsylvania:						
Eastern.....	48,413.46	5,581.18	42,832.27	38.0	10,270.27	21,857.46
Middle.....	28,141.71	8,185.60	10,956.21	60.0	11,073.73	20,189.23
Western.....	35,032.72	14,339.20	23,093.52	60.9	14,216.12	28,558.32
Rhode Island.....	10,855.78	3,035.05	13,820.13	72.9	10,074.88	13,110.53
South Carolina:						
Eastern.....	32,232.07	12,560.10	10,063.57	90.0	17,697.21	30,296.31
Western.....	20,477.83	4,781.09	21,746.14	88.0	19,130.61	23,893.30
South Dakota.....	37,744.20	13,374.17	21,370.09	84.0	20,470.88	33,845.05
Tennessee:						
Eastern.....	33,233.76	4,600.00	28,033.76	75.0	21,475.32	26,076.32
Middle.....	38,142.37	0,787.70	31,354.67	85.7	20,870.96	33,083.65
Western.....	23,500.05	4,303.08	19,220.07	76.0	14,420.23	18,783.31
Texas:						
Northern.....	60,805.70	24,004.45	36,111.25	75.0	27,083.43	51,777.88
Eastern.....	27,440.44	4,250.57	23,189.87	90.0	13,013.02	18,104.49
Southern.....	58,333.81	26,500.00	31,633.81	75.0	23,876.36	50,376.30
Western.....	77,800.74	39,209.21	38,000.53	90.0	34,740.48	73,946.69
Utah.....	20,298.07	6,107.87	14,190.20	55.4	7,891.37	13,009.24
Vermont.....	27,092.02	11,003.40	15,489.43	90.0	13,040.40	26,543.98
Virginia:						
Eastern.....	20,683.75	4,843.04	24,740.71	95.0	10,081.40	20,924.50
Western.....	27,008.03	2,093.83	24,012.60	77.5	19,307.19	21,400.72
Washington:						
Eastern.....	20,622.74	4,478.70	16,143.05	90.0	14,529.55	10,098.34
Western.....	41,611.46	10,820.05	30,791.41	75.0	23,093.56	33,913.61
West Virginia:						
Northern.....	34,309.89	14,209.62	20,100.27	70.7	15,416.01	29,626.53
Southern.....	76,076.95	51,410.04	24,665.91	90.0	22,199.32	73,600.36
Wisconsin:						
Eastern.....	17,437.01	1,562.86	15,875.05	63.0	10,001.29	11,504.15
Western.....	23,880.71	7,087.01	10,193.67	75.0	12,145.25	10,832.20
Wyoming.....	22,025.17	6,833.09	15,791.18	72.0	11,369.05	18,293.64
Total direct cost.....	3,607,381.81	1,101,109.04	2,476,271.87	70.0	1,732,700.85	2,023,810.70
Overhead.....			137,062.72	70.0	96,363.90	96,363.90
Grand total.....	3,607,381.81	1,101,109.04	2,613,334.59	70.0	1,829,064.75	2,120,174.60

¹ These figures have been supplied by each marshal; they differ somewhat from those given in Annual Report of the Attorney General, of the United States; Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 303-305, as final adjustments of these accounts had not been made when that report was prepared.

² Prisoners and guards (actual figures from each district); 100 per cent criminal.

³ Difference between 2 preceding columns.

⁴ Estimates furnished by each marshal for his district.

⁵ Arrived at by applying percentage given in preceding column to total amount of general expenses.

⁶ Total of transportation and subsistence and amount of general expenses allocated to criminal.

⁷ Computed.

⁸ Total overhead of \$550,650.88 for printing and binding, supplies, books and field examination of offices distributed among marshals, district courts, and United States attorneys according to the relative amount of general expenses of marshals (\$2,476,271.87), direct expenses of courts (\$4,787,316.70), and expenses of United States attorneys (\$2,631,357.17).

Table 6 shows the extent to which the cost of the criminal police activities of the United States marshals is allocable to the enforcement of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws.

TABLE 6.—Cost of various criminal police activities of United States marshals, 1929-30

District	Criminal Police cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other laws	
		Cost ²	Percent ³	Cost ²	Percent ³	Cost ²	Percent ³	Cost ²	Percent ³
Alabama:									
Northern.....	\$23,795.32	\$16,994.55	71.4	\$851.95	3.6	\$1,698.90	7.1	\$4,252.92	17.9
Middle.....	16,222.68	11,350.38	67.0	95.96	0.6	760.17	4.5	179.50	1.1
Southern.....	87,046.08	42,093.30	48.3	4,973.28	5.7	4,973.28	5.7	35,062.22	40.3
Arizona:									
Eastern.....	29,578.55	18,785.55	63.5	1,201.96	4.1	2,794.32	9.4	6,796.72	23.0
Western.....	26,742.76	17,276.87	64.6	1,398.77	1.5	1,624.89	6.1	7,442.13	27.8
California:									
Northern.....	68,840.22	47,637.07	69.7	6,469.30	9.5	1,230.78	1.8	12,994.07	19.0
Southern.....	62,697.44	25,078.58	40.0	6,269.74	10.0	6,269.74	10.0	25,078.58	40.0
Colorado.....	35,741.21	24,383.85	71.0	888.75	2.5	1,413.85	3.9	8,326.78	23.3
Connecticut.....	8,704.97	4,352.49	50.0	1,088.12	12.5	1,088.12	12.5	2,176.24	25.0
Delaware.....	6,369.80	5,772.15	90.6	58.94	0.9	397.11	6.2	144.62	2.3
Florida:									
Northern.....	13,256.32	10,605.22	80.0	884.85	6.7	884.85	6.7	881.58	6.6
Southern.....	45,763.85	25,484.83	55.6	6,776.35	14.8	6,776.35	14.8	6,776.32	14.8
Georgia:									
Northern.....	41,024.65	32,788.51	79.7	3,785.88	9.2	1,445.75	3.5	2,414.52	5.9
Middle.....	50,013.28	27,913.26	55.8	1,702.70	3.2	1,692.62	3.2	3,401.30	6.8
Southern.....	22,748.79	10,498.40	46.1	2,022.74	8.9	1,770.61	7.8	2,597.03	11.3
Idaho.....	31,807.77	25,351.48	79.4	1,105.15	3.5	3,474.63	10.9	3,873.51	12.2
Illinois:									
Northern.....	81,894.23	50,774.42	62.0	13,103.08	16.0	4,094.72	5.0	13,922.01	17.0
Eastern.....	42,431.05	27,198.85	64.1	1,622.24	3.8	9,248.87	21.8	4,361.09	10.3
Southern.....	20,685.79	12,411.47	60.0	1,381.02	6.7	2,756.14	13.3	4,137.16	20.0
Indiana:									
Northern.....	23,567.34	8,415.29	35.7	5,046.90	21.4	5,046.90	21.4	5,088.25	21.5
Southern.....	33,003.83	7,222.00	21.9	1,931.91	0.6	2,141.67	6.5	22,445.25	71.0
Iowa:									
Northern.....	20,239.77	17,339.07	85.7	580.22	2.9	580.22	2.9	1,730.26	8.5
Southern.....	24,074.81	12,743.36	52.9	1,417.07	5.9	5,663.15	23.5	4,251.23	17.7
Kansas:									
Northern.....	35,367.36	19,637.30	55.6	1,953.89	5.5	7,855.03	22.2	5,901.14	16.7
Southern.....	100,770.99	88,170.87	87.5	1,227.62	1.2	5,330.74	5.3	5,088.86	5.0
Kentucky:									
Northern.....	30,551.40	21,557.35	70.5	3,597.61	11.8	1,798.81	5.9	3,597.62	11.8
Western.....									

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Cost of various criminal police activities of United States marshals, 1929-30—Continued

District	Criminal police cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other laws	
		Cost ²	Percent ³	Cost ²	Percent ³	Cost ²	Percent ³	Cost ²	Percent ³
Louisiana:									
Eastern.....	\$53,329.54	\$38,088.83	71.4	\$7,620.35	14.3	\$3,803.71	7.1	\$3,816.65	7.2
Western.....	22,248.73	11,984.56	53.9	3,076.75	13.8	1,712.07	7.7	5,475.35	24.6
Maine.....	13,107.44	1,700.86	13.0	730.30	5.6	240.28	1.8	10,436.00	79.6
Maryland.....	34,855.55	30,983.87	88.9	1,544.46	4.4	772.23	2.2	1,554.99	4.5
Massachusetts.....	21,636.78	11,251.13	52.0	3,273.03	15.1	432.74	2.0	6,679.88	30.9
Michigan:									
Eastern.....	79,622.80	46,427.95	58.3	6,616.55	8.3	1,345.72	1.7	25,232.58	31.7
Western.....	36,184.84	23,624.95	65.3	1,009.43	2.8	504.71	1.4	11,045.75	30.5
Minnesota.....	47,324.45	26,275.68	55.5	7,374.12	15.6	5,255.14	11.1	8,419.51	17.8
Mississippi:									
Northern.....	20,678.72	17,026.28	82.3	244.73	1.2	1,217.48	5.9	2,190.23	10.6
Southern.....	24,430.60	21,376.78	87.5	610.77	2.5	909.11	3.7	1,533.94	6.3
Missouri:									
Eastern.....	29,292.99	17,082.83	58.3	2,042.14	7.0	4,070.05	13.9	6,097.97	20.8
Western.....	44,026.01	29,357.46	66.7	7,624.39	17.3	2,941.85	6.7	4,102.31	9.3
Montana.....	28,173.51	29,295.53	82.7	223.06	0.8	223.06	0.8	4,432.16	15.7
Nebraska.....	19,737.16	17,230.79	87.3	1,554.97	7.9	313.79	1.6	627.61	3.2
Nevada.....	17,295.32	5,783.13	33.3	1,921.05	11.1	2,643.65	15.3	6,067.49	40.3
New Hampshire.....	13,553.09	12,709.20	93.8	338.82	2.5	166.23	1.2	338.84	2.5
New Jersey.....	63,353.45	31,676.73	50.0	5,274.90	8.3	1,060.45	1.7	25,341.37	40.0
New Mexico.....	45,171.66	39,850.42	88.2	1,071.97	2.4	3,196.55	7.1	1,052.62	2.3
New York:									
Northern.....	45,554.48	18,905.11	41.5	310.94	0.7	83.16	0.2	26,555.27	57.6
Eastern.....	38,832.80	31,066.24	80.0	3,833.27	10.0	—	—	3,833.29	10.0
Southern.....	91,279.57	42,604.68	46.7	21,291.02	23.3	1,528.88	1.7	25,554.99	28.3
Western.....	46,885.17	28,849.71	61.5	3,607.09	7.7	3,607.09	7.7	10,821.28	23.1
North Carolina:									
Eastern.....	48,214.57	39,713.80	82.4	1,696.89	3.5	3,964.86	8.2	2,839.02	5.9
Middle.....	36,718.33	29,374.66	80.0	2,453.22	6.7	2,453.22	6.7	2,437.23	6.6
Western.....	25,514.10	21,049.20	82.5	959.69	3.8	316.02	1.2	3,189.28	12.5
North Dakota.....	22,437.20	7,477.13	33.3	—	—	936.82	4.2	14,023.25	62.5
Ohio:									
Northern.....	57,909.25	33,768.84	58.3	9,663.10	16.7	4,814.21	8.3	9,663.10	16.7
Southern.....	46,449.98	24,586.61	52.9	10,926.15	23.5	5,468.62	11.8	5,468.60	11.8
Oklahoma:									
Northern.....	45,899.63	41,995.30	91.5	971.34	2.1	971.34	2.1	1,961.65	4.3
Eastern.....	36,912.47	30,632.78	83.0	819.39	2.2	1,807.34	4.9	3,652.96	9.9
Western.....	27,009.99	17,202.52	63.7	1,784.79	6.6	3,295.93	12.2	4,726.75	17.5
Oregon.....	23,098.92	15,225.33	54.2	1,123.95	4.0	2,336.50	8.3	9,413.14	33.5
Pennsylvania:									
Eastern.....	21,857.45	14,380.49	65.8	1,725.88	7.9	1,725.88	7.9	4,025.20	18.4
Middle.....	20,159.23	16,127.38	80.0	338.71	1.7	338.71	1.7	3,354.43	16.6
Western.....	28,555.32	16,652.48	58.3	2,374.82	8.3	4,764.00	16.7	4,764.02	16.7
Rhode Island.....	13,119.53	6,079.74	46.4	180.70	1.4	304.76	2.3	6,545.33	49.9
South Carolina:									
Eastern.....	30,266.31	20,181.73	66.7	1,674.48	5.5	3,361.53	11.1	5,048.57	16.7
Western.....	23,868.30	23,059.76	96.7	269.51	1.1	269.51	1.1	269.52	1.1
South Dakota.....	33,845.05	16,922.53	50.0	808.38	2.4	1,616.76	4.8	14,497.38	42.8
Tennessee:									
Eastern.....	26,075.32	15,645.19	60.0	5,215.06	20.0	3,475.18	13.3	1,739.89	6.7
Middle.....	33,658.65	30,907.24	91.8	509.43	1.5	433.14	1.3	1,808.84	5.4
Western.....	18,783.31	15,026.64	80.0	1,253.68	6.7	1,253.68	6.7	1,249.31	6.6
Texas:									
Northern.....	51,777.88	34,526.83	66.7	6,895.49	13.3	6,895.49	13.3	3,460.07	6.7
Eastern.....	18,164.49	12,111.08	66.7	903.23	5.0	2,120.61	11.7	3,024.57	16.6
Southern.....	50,375.36	23,517.33	46.7	4,030.03	8.0	1,352.18	2.7	21,475.82	42.6
Western.....	73,946.69	61,609.17	83.3	8,211.94	11.1	3,308.30	4.5	817.28	1.1
Utah.....	13,969.24	9,151.69	65.5	556.49	4.0	934.27	6.7	3,326.79	23.8
Vermont.....	25,543.98	8,510.79	33.3	282.53	1.1	282.53	1.1	16,468.13	64.5
Virginia:									
Eastern.....	20,924.50	9,654.85	46.1	4,829.85	23.1	1,609.95	7.7	4,829.85	23.1
Western.....	21,400.72	8,973.75	41.9	5,026.06	23.5	1,878.28	8.8	5,522.63	25.8
Washington:									
Eastern.....	19,008.34	13,727.26	72.2	1,058.01	5.6	2,111.55	11.1	2,111.52	11.1
Western.....	33,913.61	15,819.13	46.6	2,264.51	6.7	907.97	2.7	14,922.00	44.0
West Virginia:									
Northern.....	29,626.53	17,957.66	60.6	3,402.93	11.5	2,968.68	10.0	5,297.26	17.9
Southern.....	73,609.36	65,436.26	88.9	812.17	1.1	2,436.51	3.3	4,924.42	6.7
Wisconsin:									
Eastern.....	11,564.15	9,728.15	84.1	183.76	1.6	551.27	4.8	1,100.97	9.5
Western.....	19,832.29	19,570.43	98.7	63.54	0.3	63.54	0.3	134.78	0.7
Wyoming.....	18,203.64	9,609.00	52.8	253.59	1.4	2,021.86	11.1	6,319.19	34.7
Total direct expense.....	2,923,810.79	1,912,002.12	65.4	233,422.26	8.0	193,296.83	6.6	585,089.58	20.0
Overhead.....	96,363.90	63,021.99	65.4	7,709.11	8.0	6,360.02	6.6	19,272.78	20.0
Grand total.....	3,020,174.69	1,975,024.11	65.4	241,131.37	8.0	199,656.85	6.6	604,362.36	20.0

¹ From Table 5, supra.

² Based on estimates made by each United States marshal for his own district.

³ Computed.

⁴ Distributed in proportion to direct expense.

4. *Summary of police costs.*—Table 7 shows the total cost of the police agencies of the Federal Government chargeable to the administration of criminal justice for the year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 7.—*Cost of criminal police activities of the Federal Government, 1929-30*

Agency	Police cost
Department of Justice.....	¹ \$2, 658, 156. 55
Other executive departments and establishments.....	² 30, 245, 684. 04
United States marshals.....	³ 3, 020, 174. 00
Total.....	35, 923, 915. 88

¹ From Table 1, supra.

² From Table 3, supra.

³ From Table 5, supra.

Table 8 shows the extent to which the cost of the criminal police activities of the Federal Government is chargeable to enforcement of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws.

TABLE 8.—*Cost of various criminal police activities of the Federal Government, 1929-30*

Enforcement of—	Department of Justice ¹	Other executive departments and establishments ²	United States marshals ³	Total cost	Per cent
Prohibition law.....		\$23, 009, 045. 40	\$1, 975, 024. 11	\$25, 044, 069. 57	74. 1
Antinarcotic laws.....		1, 400, 900. 10	241, 131. 37	1, 648, 031. 56	4. 8
Motor vehicle theft act.....	\$562, 896. 56		100, 656. 85	752, 553. 41	2. 1
Other criminal laws.....	2, 105, 259. 99	5, 100, 638. 09	804, 362. 36	7, 879, 261. 34	19. 0
Total.....	2, 658, 156. 55	30, 245, 684. 04	3, 020, 174. 09	35, 923, 915. 88	100. 0

¹ From Table 2, supra.

² From Table 4, supra.

³ From Table 6, supra.

⁴ These figures represent a situation which ended June 30, 1930. If the transfer of the Bureau of Prohibition from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice had been made a year earlier, the total criminal police cost of the Department of Justice would have been increased to \$11,653,156.55, and that of the other executive departments reduced to \$21,245,684.04. See Table 4, supra.

CHAPTER V

COST OF FEDERAL PROSECUTION

1. *The Department of Justice.*—The functions of the Department of Justice in connection with prosecution are primarily supervisory. The Attorney General has general supervision over all the United States attorneys directly as

well as over his own division heads.⁸⁶ No additional amount is included in prosecution costs on account of this fact, however, as supervision of the United States attorneys in criminal matters is ordinarily exercised through the division heads having charge of such matters. An appropriate proportion of the general overhead cost of the department is included in prosecution cost on the basis of the pro rata share allocable to the divisions of the department having criminal functions.⁸⁷

Table 9 gives the cost of the prosecution activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 9.—*Cost of prosecution activities of Department of Justice, 1929-30*

Division	Total cost ¹	Per cent criminal ²	Prosecution cost
Solicitor General's office.....	\$81, 300. 00	15. 0	\$12, 195. 00
Antitrust division.....	40, 599. 60	10. 0	4, 059. 99
Taxation and prohibition division.....	160, 188. 00	34. 7	57, 307. 24
Admiralty division.....	58, 780. 00	5. 0	2, 939. 00
Criminal division.....	55, 220. 00	81. 0	44, 728. 20
Direct cost.....			122, 189. 40
Overhead ³			76, 701. 74
Total cost.....			198, 891. 14

¹ Pay roll only.

² Estimate by each division.

³ Computed by taking the entire general overhead of the Department of Justice, including the cost of the Attorney General's office, amounting to \$812,173.08, and applying a percentage arrived at by dividing the direct cost of prosecution given above (\$122,189.40) by the total cost of the department exclusive of general overhead (\$1,203,829.50).

Table 10 shows the extent to which the cost of the prosecution activities of the Department of Justice is allocable to the enforcement of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor-vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws.

⁸⁶ These, in turn, exercise supervision over the work of the United States attorneys as to matters in their respective divisions. The division heads are the Solicitor General, the Assistant to the Attorney General (in charge of the antitrust division), and 7 Assistant Attorneys General. For the names of the divisions, see p. 77, supra. The Solicitor General is concerned solely with cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, but all the other division heads have some supervisory functions so far as the United States attorneys are concerned.

⁸⁷ See p. 95, supra, note 83.

TABLE 10.—Cost of various prosecution activities of Department of Justice, 1929-30

Division	Prosecution cost ¹		Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
	Per cent	Cost	Per cent	Cost	Per cent	Cost	Per cent	Cost	Per cent	Cost
Solicitor General's office.....	12.195.00	\$8,134.07	66.7	\$8,134.07	6.7	\$817.06	6.6	\$804.87	20.0	\$2,439.00
Antitrust division.....	4,659.96	56,686.90	98.3	56,686.90					100.0	4,659.96
Taxation and prohibition division.....	57,607.24								1.7	2,892.24
Admiralty division.....	2,939.00								100.0	2,939.00
Criminal division.....	44,728.20				18.5	8,283.00	9.9	4,417.60	71.6	32,027.60
Direct cost.....	122,189.40	64,820.97	53.0	64,820.97	7.5	9,100.06	4.3	5,292.47	35.2	43,045.00
Overhead.....	76,701.74	40,651.92	53.0	40,651.92	7.5	5,752.63	4.3	3,298.18	35.2	26,999.01
Total.....	198,891.14	105,472.89	53.0	105,472.89	7.5	14,852.69	4.3	8,590.65	35.2	70,044.01

¹ From Table 9, supra.² Based on an estimate by the office of the Solicitor General.³ Based on an estimate by the office of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Division of Taxation and Prohibition.⁴ Based on an estimate by the office of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division.⁵ Total from Table 9, supra, allocated pro rata on the basis of relative direct cost.⁶ Computed.

2. *The United States attorneys.*—The allocation of the cost of the United States attorneys' offices, both as between prosecution and civil litigation and as between various kinds of prosecutions, has been made for each district on the basis of an estimate by the United States attorney for such district.⁸⁸

Table 11 gives the cost of the prosecution activities of the United States attorneys' offices for each of the 84 judicial districts within the continental United States (exclusive of the District of Columbia) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 11.—Cost of prosecution activities of United States attorneys, 1929-30

District	Total cost ¹	Per cent criminal ²	Prosecution cost
Alabama:			
Northern.....	\$21,087.05	97.0	\$21,036.44
Middle.....	7,703.43	80.0	6,162.75
Southern.....	15,053.90	93.0	14,000.18
Arizona.....	32,192.47	70.0	22,534.73
Arkansas:			
Eastern.....	29,024.07	70.0	20,347.48
Western.....	11,616.20	65.0	7,550.53
California:			
Northern.....	75,504.79	40.6	30,670.30
Southern.....	70,809.00	40.0	28,347.00
Colorado.....	23,303.14	65.0	17,097.04
Connecticut.....	16,648.00	50.0	7,774.30
Delaware.....	6,403.47	85.0	5,493.95
Florida:			
Northern.....	11,135.00	55.0	6,124.25
Southern.....	35,358.06	65.0	22,932.74
Georgia:			
Northern.....	38,844.37	60.0	19,422.19
Middle.....	15,271.45	70.0	10,690.01
Southern.....	21,093.17	70.0	14,765.20
Idaho.....	22,080.05	60.0	11,040.33
Illinois:			
Northern.....	12,370.10	75.0	9,282.08
Eastern.....	25,157.27	74.0	18,616.38
Southern.....	23,002.80	75.0	17,252.10
Indiana:			
Northern.....	25,417.65	75.0	19,063.23
Southern.....	17,722.64	60.0	8,801.32
Iowa:			
Northern.....	12,896.54	60.0	7,737.93
Southern.....	19,487.21	60.0	11,692.33
Kansas.....	24,307.62	80.0	19,446.09
Kentucky:			
Eastern.....	26,173.42	90.0	23,556.08
Western.....	17,540.43	65.0	11,407.13
Louisiana:			
Eastern.....	40,951.45	65.0	26,618.44
Western.....	23,359.06	67.0	15,650.98
Maine.....	14,349.16	75.0	10,761.87
Maryland.....	35,477.40	70.0	24,834.13
Massachusetts.....	30,908.64	44.0	13,599.76
Michigan:			
Eastern.....	66,836.09	60.0	40,101.65
Western.....	10,501.00	55.0	9,103.55
Minnesota.....	53,786.75	39.0	22,926.83
Mississippi:			
Northern.....	8,941.46	80.0	7,153.17
Southern.....	15,938.32	60.0	7,969.16
Missouri:			
Eastern.....	39,465.94	73.0	28,810.13
Western.....	30,095.76	53.0	20,935.54

See footnotes at end of table.

⁸⁸ See pp. 84-85, supra.

TABLE 11.—Cost of prosecution activities of United States attorneys, 1929-30—Continued

District	Total cost ¹	Per cent criminal ²	Prosecution cost
Montana.....	\$23,166.44	45.0	\$10,424.00
Nebraska.....	31,825.24	85.0	27,051.46
Nevada.....	16,400.16	00.0	0,840.10
New Hampshire.....	15,680.65	00.0	8,213.78
New Jersey.....	60,692.17	00.0	36,415.30
New Mexico.....	23,487.40	85.4	20,058.30
New York:			
Northern.....	65,401.06	60.0	39,240.03
Eastern.....	112,332.33	64.0	71,892.09
Southern.....	309,348.57	58.5	180,968.91
Western.....	61,119.60	78.0	30,873.30
North Carolina:			
Eastern.....	18,122.39	65.0	11,770.55
Middle.....	18,203.70	68.0	12,378.56
Western.....	16,074.92	70.0	11,252.45
North Dakota.....	17,489.27	90.0	13,901.41
Ohio:			
Northern.....	47,014.57	66.0	31,029.01
Southern.....	42,207.80	80.0	33,838.29
Oklahoma:			
Northern.....	22,523.65	70.0	15,760.50
Eastern.....	26,407.77	60.0	15,844.67
Western.....	22,935.65	57.0	13,073.32
Oregon.....	27,086.36	46.0	12,193.36
Pennsylvania:			
Eastern.....	49,262.40	45.0	22,168.08
Middle.....	15,911.91	72.0	11,456.68
Western.....	57,952.84	66.0	38,248.87
Rhode Island.....	20,070.62	63.0	12,660.16
South Carolina:			
Eastern.....	16,986.23	75.0	12,739.08
Western.....	13,755.31	70.0	9,628.72
South Dakota.....	20,780.03	75.0	15,585.02
Tennessee:			
Eastern.....	20,249.40	75.0	15,187.05
Middle.....	22,769.22	65.0	14,799.09
Western.....	15,748.82	60.0	9,440.20
Texas:			
Northern.....	34,200.12	73.2	25,100.36
Eastern.....	15,240.19	76.0	11,682.55
Southern.....	37,762.06	70.0	26,434.07
Western.....	31,940.32	75.0	23,955.25
Utah.....	10,820.34	65.0	10,933.22
Vermont.....	13,682.85	37.5	5,131.06
Virginia:			
Eastern.....	40,074.63	60.0	20,037.32
Western.....	11,232.07	67.0	11,545.49
Washington:			
Eastern.....	13,513.01	87.0	11,750.32
Western.....	42,208.18	70.0	29,545.72
West Virginia:			
Northern.....	27,669.34	62.0	17,154.99
Southern.....	20,669.26	80.0	23,735.41
Wisconsin:			
Eastern.....	15,840.13	80.0	12,672.10
Western.....	15,026.83	65.0	9,767.44
Wyoming.....	12,780.24	66.0	7,101.97
Total direct cost.....	2,631,357.17	63.3	1,665,588.23
Overhead ⁴	140,473.13	63.3	92,717.40
Total cost.....	2,777,830.30	63.3	1,758,305.72

¹ Figures on salaries and expenses of district attorneys and pay of regular assistant attorneys were obtained from Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 302-305; figures on salaries of special assistant district attorneys were furnished by the Department of Justice. The total of these items is the figure given in the table.

² Estimated by each United States attorney for his district.

³ Computed.

⁴ Total overhead of \$550,650.88 for printing and binding, supplies, books, and field examination of offices distributed among marshals, courts, and district attorneys according to the relative amount of general expenses of marshals (\$2,476,271.87), direct expenses of courts (\$4,787,316.70), and expenses of United States attorneys (\$2,631,357.17).

Table 12 shows the extent to which the cost of prosecution by the United States attorneys' offices is allocable to prosecutions for violations of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other criminal laws.

TABLE 12.—Cost of various prosecution activities of United States attorneys, 1929-30

District	Prosecution cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Cost ²	Per cent	Cost ²	Per cent	Cost ²	Per cent	Cost ²	Per cent
Alabama:									
Northern.....	\$21,036.44	\$18,433.99	87.5	\$433.74	2.1	\$1,084.35	5.2	\$1,084.35	5.2
Middle.....	6,162.75	4,030.20	80.0	368.14	5.0	154.07	2.5	770.34	12.5
Southern.....	14,000.18	6,483.99	67.7	160.54	1.1	461.02	3.2	3,914.03	28.0
Arizona.....	22,534.73	7,404.27	32.9	2,897.32	12.8	2,253.47	10.0	9,979.07	44.3
Arkansas:									
Eastern.....	20,947.48	10,473.74	50.0	1,400.25	7.1	1,406.25	7.1	7,431.24	35.8
Western.....	7,550.53	4,065.67	53.8	580.81	7.7	580.81	7.7	2,323.24	30.8
California:									
Northern.....	30,079.30	11,410.28	37.2	2,260.94	7.4	528.95	1.7	16,473.13	53.7
Southern.....	28,347.99	6,378.30	22.5	1,417.40	5.0	2,126.10	7.5	18,429.19	65.0
Colorado.....	17,097.01	9,206.10	53.8	1,315.16	7.7	1,315.16	7.7	5,269.02	30.8
Connecticut.....	7,774.30	4,664.58	60.0	777.43	10.0	777.43	10.0	1,584.80	20.0
Delaware.....	5,493.95	3,878.06	70.5	323.17	5.9	046.35	11.8	046.35	11.8
Florida:									
Northern.....	6,124.25	3,340.50	54.6	222.70	3.6	890.80	14.5	1,670.25	27.3
Southern.....	22,982.74	12,376.32	53.8	1,707.90	7.7	1,707.90	7.7	7,071.62	30.8
Georgia:									
Northern.....	19,422.19	2,719.11	14.0	776.89	4.0	1,553.77	8.0	14,372.42	74.0
Middle.....	10,690.01	6,103.58	57.1	610.86	5.7	916.29	8.0	3,054.28	28.0
Southern.....	14,705.20	8,437.27	57.1	421.86	2.9	210.93	1.4	5,095.14	38.0
Idaho.....	11,040.33	5,520.10	50.0	441.01	4.0	883.23	8.0	4,105.33	38.0
Illinois:									
Northern.....	9,232.08	5,107.90	56.0	990.00	10.7	371.28	4.0	2,722.75	29.3
Eastern.....	18,016.35	12,578.04	67.0	251.57	1.4	3,019.97	16.2	2,707.30	14.8
Southern.....	17,252.10	10,351.20	60.0	1,150.14	6.7	3,300.28	13.3	3,450.42	20.0
Indiana:									
Northern.....	19,083.23	12,708.83	66.0	1,270.85	6.7	1,270.85	6.7	3,812.64	20.0
Southern.....	8,861.32	4,430.60	50.0	354.46	4.0	708.91	8.0	3,307.30	38.0
Iowa:									
Northern.....	7,737.93	3,808.96	50.0	644.83	8.3	644.83	8.3	2,570.31	33.4
Southern.....	11,692.33	4,076.93	40.0	194.87	1.7	1,948.72	16.7	4,871.81	41.0
Kansas.....	19,446.00	4,861.52	25.0	1,215.38	6.2	0,070.01	31.3	7,202.28	37.5
Kentucky:									
Eastern.....	23,556.08	13,086.71	55.5	1,308.67	5.6	1,308.67	5.6	7,852.03	33.3
Western.....	11,407.13	7,019.77	61.5	2,105.03	18.5	526.48	4.6	1,754.05	15.4
Louisiana:									
Eastern.....	26,618.44	15,152.04	56.0	4,095.15	15.4	1,228.54	4.6	6,142.71	23.1
Western.....	15,650.98	6,073.51	38.8	1,035.18	10.4	1,401.58	9.0	6,540.71	41.8
Maine.....	10,761.87	7,174.58	66.0	717.46	6.7	717.46	6.7	2,152.37	20.0
Maryland.....	24,834.18	15,064.83	64.4	1,773.87	7.1	1,773.87	7.1	5,321.01	21.4
Massachusetts.....	13,599.70	4,945.37	36.4	027.20	6.8	309.09	2.3	7,418.04	54.5
Michigan:									
Eastern.....	40,101.05	20,050.83	50.0	4,678.53	11.7	334.18	.8	15,038.11	37.5
Western.....	9,108.55	5,796.36	63.6	828.05	9.1	828.05	9.1	1,650.10	18.2
Minnesota.....	22,026.83	14,696.60	64.1	1,175.74	5.1	587.87	2.6	6,466.53	28.2
Mississippi:									
Northern.....	7,153.17	5,364.88	75.0	178.83	2.5	208.24	3.7	1,341.22	18.8
Southern.....	7,909.16	3,984.68	50.0	1,434.46	18.0	956.30	12.0	1,593.83	20.0
Missouri:									
Eastern.....	23,810.13	7,893.10	27.4	1,183.08	4.1	1,973.30	6.8	17,750.66	61.7
Western.....	20,935.54	12,633.52	60.3	2,526.70	12.1	2,887.60	13.8	2,887.60	13.8
Montana.....	10,424.90	5,791.61	55.0	231.60	2.2	231.60	2.2	4,160.97	40.0
Nebraska.....	27,051.46	9,547.57	35.4	3,182.52	11.7	3,182.52	11.7	11,138.85	41.2
Nevada.....	9,840.10	5,740.00	58.4	328.00	3.3	880.00	8.3	2,052.04	20.0
New Hampshire.....	8,213.78	5,476.86	66.7	684.48	8.3	273.79	3.3	1,779.65	21.0
New Jersey.....	36,415.30	21,242.20	58.3	3,641.53	10.0	606.92	1.7	10,924.69	30.7
New Mexico.....	20,058.30	8,291.07	41.3	164.41	.8	1,714.58	8.0	9,888.24	49.3

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—Cost of various prosecution activities of United States attorneys, 1929-30—Continued

District	Prosecution cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Cost ²	Per cent	Cost ²	Per cent	Cost ²	Per cent	Cost ²	Per cent
New York:									
Northern.....	\$39,240.63	\$20,487.43	67.5	\$2,016.04	6.7	\$3,270.05	8.3	\$0,807.11	17.5
Eastern.....	71,892.69	43,809.61	60.9	5,016.62	7.8	5,016.62	7.8	10,849.84	23.5
Southern.....	180,968.91	44,855.54	24.8	21,054.40	11.9	2,474.70	1.4	111,084.18	61.9
Western.....	39,873.33	23,145.81	70.6	2,044.70	5.1	1,533.59	3.8	8,170.14	20.5
North Carolina:									
Eastern.....	11,779.55	7,248.90	61.6	302.45	3.1	543.67	4.0	3,624.47	30.8
Middle.....	12,378.56	8,009.65	64.7	723.15	5.9	1,456.30	11.8	2,184.40	17.6
Western.....	11,252.45	9,001.90	80.0	432.25	4.3	100.75	1.4	1,007.49	14.3
North Dakota:	13,991.41	6,995.71	50.0	1,748.93	12.5	2,023.39	18.8	2,023.38	18.7
Ohio:									
Northern.....	31,029.61	9,873.06	31.8	5,041.70	18.2	2,350.73	7.6	13,164.12	42.4
Southern.....	33,838.29	10,919.14	50.0	2,114.89	6.3	2,114.89	6.3	12,089.37	37.4
Oklahoma:									
Northern.....	15,760.50	11,261.83	71.5	1,126.18	7.1	1,126.18	7.1	2,252.87	14.3
Eastern.....	15,844.07	10,563.11	66.7	1,320.39	8.3	-----	-----	5,901.17	25.0
Western.....	13,073.32	5,733.91	43.9	683.07	5.3	917.43	7.0	5,733.91	43.8
Oregon:	12,193.30	2,709.04	22.2	541.93	4.4	2,167.11	17.8	6,774.08	55.0
Pennsylvania:									
Eastern.....	22,168.08	12,315.00	55.6	1,477.87	6.7	935.25	4.4	7,389.39	33.3
Middle.....	11,459.58	7,955.90	69.4	318.24	2.8	318.24	2.8	2,861.14	25.0
Western.....	38,248.87	14,488.21	37.9	2,318.11	6.1	3,477.17	9.1	17,065.88	47.0
Rhode Island:	12,650.10	10,039.81	79.4	401.50	3.2	200.80	1.6	2,007.99	15.8
South Carolina:									
Eastern.....	12,739.68	7,043.80	55.3	849.31	6.7	2,547.93	20.0	1,698.64	13.3
Western.....	9,033.72	7,505.42	83.1	275.11	2.9	412.06	4.3	1,375.53	14.3
South Dakota:	15,535.02	7,273.01	46.7	103.90	0.6	1,974.10	12.7	6,234.01	40.0
Tennessee:									
Eastern.....	15,187.05	10,124.70	66.8	1,012.47	6.7	1,012.47	6.7	3,037.41	20.0
Middle.....	14,709.99	11,012.30	75.4	910.77	6.2	1,138.46	7.7	1,138.46	7.7
Western.....	9,449.20	6,011.50	70.0	787.44	8.3	1,102.42	11.7	944.93	10.0
Texas:									
Northern.....	25,100.30	10,029.94	42.3	2,571.70	10.2	2,297.44	9.2	6,601.22	38.3
Eastern.....	11,582.55	8,229.70	71.1	792.00	6.8	1,210.22	10.5	1,371.63	11.8
Southern.....	29,434.07	7,552.59	25.6	3,021.04	11.4	755.20	2.9	15,105.18	57.1
Western.....	23,955.25	11,170.11	46.6	1,597.02	6.7	638.81	2.7	10,540.31	44.0
Utah:	10,933.22	6,806.34	62.1	1,177.42	10.8	1,009.22	9.2	1,850.24	16.9
Vermont:	5,131.06	1,710.36	33.3	848.34	16.0	862.02	16.8	1,710.34	33.3
Virginia:									
Eastern.....	20,037.32	7,213.43	36.0	4,007.46	20.0	1,202.24	6.0	7,614.10	38.0
Western.....	11,545.40	3,446.41	29.9	2,584.81	22.4	1,206.24	10.4	4,308.03	37.3
Washington:									
Eastern.....	11,756.32	8,378.07	71.3	270.20	2.3	405.39	3.4	2,702.60	23.0
Western.....	29,545.72	16,883.27	57.1	2,110.41	7.1	844.16	2.9	9,707.88	32.9
West Virginia:									
Northern.....	17,154.00	9,130.88	53.2	553.39	3.2	1,383.47	8.1	6,037.25	35.5
Southern.....	23,735.41	22,311.28	94.0	237.35	1.0	474.71	2.0	712.07	3.0
Wisconsin:									
Eastern.....	12,072.10	9,501.08	75.0	702.01	6.3	792.01	6.3	1,584.00	12.4
Western.....	9,767.44	5,409.66	55.4	300.54	3.1	300.54	3.1	3,756.70	38.4
Wyoming:	7,161.97	5,115.70	71.4	127.80	1.8	639.46	8.9	1,278.02	17.9
Total direct cost.....	1,065,583.23	844,239.67	50.7	131,186.63	7.9	109,464.71	6.0	580,097.22	34.8
Overhead ³	92,717.40	47,007.77	50.7	7,324.68	7.9	6,119.35	6.6	32,265.69	34.8
Total cost.....	1,158,300.63	891,247.44	50.7	138,511.31	7.9	115,584.06	6.0	612,362.91	34.8

¹ From Table 11, supra.² Based on estimate made by each United States attorney for his district.³ See Table 11, supra, note 4.

3. *Note on Federal grand juries.*—As has been pointed out⁸⁹ grand juries are an essential part of the pre-trial machinery of Federal justice, and so are to be regarded as a part of the machinery of prosecution. Their function of presenting or indicting persons suspected of criminal offenses is wholly analogous to the function of the prosecuting attorneys in many States in informing against such persons.⁹⁰ Both grand jury and prosecutor have quasi-judicial functions, but both are concerned rather with deciding whether a person should be placed on trial than with determining guilt or innocence.

However, each Federal grand jury is also closely related to the district court which impanels it, and, as a practical matter, it is almost impossible, due to the way in which the accounts of the Federal Government are kept, to separate grand jury costs from trial jury costs. For these reasons, no attempt has been made to segregate grand jury costs and include them as a part of prosecution costs. The result is to show slightly lower prosecution costs and slightly higher court costs than should be shown, but the accuracy of the total figures for the cost of administration of criminal justice in the various judicial districts is not affected.

4. *Other prosecuting agencies.*—The only other agency of the Federal Government having important prosecuting functions is the penal division of the office of the General Counsel, Bureau of Internal Revenue, an agency of the Treasury Department. The total cost of that division for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, was \$119,340, of which 33½ per cent is estimated by the head of the division to be chargeable to criminal prosecutions for violations of the internal revenue laws. The cost of criminal prosecution by this agency was thus \$39,780 for that year.

5. *Summary of prosecution costs.*—The total cost of the prosecuting agencies of the Federal Government, exclusive of grand juries, chargeable to the administration of criminal justice for the year ending June 30, 1930, is shown by Table 13.

⁸⁹ See p. 78, supra.⁹⁰ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Prosecution, pp. 34-37, 124-126. Compare Moley, The Use of the Information in Criminal Cases, American Bar Association Journal, vol. 17, p. 202 (1931).

TABLE 13.—Cost of prosecution by the Federal Government, 1929-30

Agency	Prosecution cost
Department of Justice.....	\$108,891.14
United States attorneys.....	1,758,305.72
Other agencies ¹	39,780.00
Total.....	1,906,976.86

¹ From Table 9, supra.² From Table 11, supra.³ Penal division of office of General Counsel, Bureau of Internal Revenue. (See § 4, supra.)

The extent to which the cost of prosecution by the Federal Government, exclusive of grand jury costs, is chargeable to the enforcement of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws is shown by Table 14.

TABLE 14.—Cost of various prosecuting activities of the Federal Government, 1929-30

Enforcement of—	Department of Justice ¹	United States attorneys ²	Other agencies ³	Total	Per cent
Prohibition law.....	\$105,472.80	\$891,247.44	-----	\$996,720.33	49.9
Antinarcotic laws.....	14,852.00	138,511.31	-----	153,364.00	7.7
Motor vehicle theft act.....	8,520.05	115,584.00	-----	124,104.71	6.2
Other criminal laws.....	70,014.01	612,062.91	\$39,780.00	722,787.82	36.2
Total.....	198,891.14	1,758,305.72	39,780.00	1,906,976.86	100.0

¹ From Table 10, supra.² From Table 12, supra.³ From § 4, supra.

CHAPTER VI

COST OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL COURTS

1. *The district courts.*—The cost of the district courts includes (a) salaries of judges; (b) salaries and expenses of the clerks' offices; (c) pay of bailiffs and court attendants; (d) rent of court rooms;⁹¹ (e) fees of jurors; and (f) fees of witnesses. The first four of these cost factors are of similar character so far as allocation of cost is concerned; the ideal method of allocation would be based on an actual record of the amount of time spent by judges, clerks, and court attendants on various classes of cases.⁹² In the absence of records adequate to permit of an exact allocation of this sort,

⁹¹ This is an item of expense in only 20 districts in the continental United States. Most of the court rooms used by the district courts are in buildings owned by the Federal Government.

⁹² See p. 93, supra, note 80.

it has been necessary to resort to estimates of the relative amounts of time spent by each court on various types of business. Such estimates have been secured from the clerks of all but one of the 84 district courts in the continental United States outside the District of Columbia, and form the basis for the allocation of judges' salaries, clerks' salaries and expenses, pay of bailiffs and court attendants, and rent of court rooms, which make up 54.5 per cent of the total cost of the district courts.

The remaining 45.5 per cent is made up of fees of jurors and witnesses, with respect to which a more exact allocation has been possible. The records of the Department of Justice are such as to permit segregation of witness fees and jurors' fees, and such segregation has been made. Witness fees are paid by the United States only in cases, civil or criminal, to which it is a party. Hence allocation of this amount has been made on the basis of the relative numbers of civil cases to which the Government has been a party and of different types of criminal cases terminated.⁹³ Jurors' fees are paid by the Government in all jury cases, whether it is a party or not, and the available figures on jury expenses include the cost of grand juries, which deal solely with criminal matters.⁹⁴ As so many defendants plead guilty, the number of jury trials in criminal cases furnishes no guide in the distribution of jury expenses. In allocating jury expenses the cost of each civil jury trial has been estimated at \$100.⁹⁵ The remainder, which is the assumed cost of criminal jury work, has been allocated to the several classes of criminal cases in proportion to the number of cases of each class terminated.⁹⁶

Table 15 gives the cost of the criminal work of the district courts within the continental United States outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930.

⁹³ Figures on total civil and total criminal cases are given in Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 112-206. Figures on the several classes of criminal cases have been obtained from reports on file in the Department of Justice.

⁹⁴ See p. 113, supra.

⁹⁵ This method of allocation was adopted after consultation with the Department of Justice.

⁹⁶ The number of jury trials in criminal cases and in civil cases to which the United States was a party is given in Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 112-206. Data as to the number of private civil jury cases were secured for the commission by the Department of Justice through a questionnaire to the clerks of all the district courts.

TABLE 15.—Cost of the criminal business of the district courts, 1929-30

District	Direct court expenses ¹			Fees of witnesses			Fees of jurors			Total criminal cost
	Total expense	Per cent criminal ²	Criminal expense	Total expense	Per cent criminal ³	Criminal expense	Total expense	Allocated to civil ⁴	Criminal expense	
Alabama:										
Northern.....	\$39,318.64	65.9	\$25,910.98	\$8,748.99	90.4	\$7,909.09	\$10,411.55	\$4,100.00	\$6,311.55	\$40,131.62
Middle.....	18,038.69	70.0	12,627.08	6,560.61	79.9	5,241.93	5,424.80	900.00	4,524.80	22,393.51
Southern.....	23,069.91	89.0	20,532.21	12,116.84	90.3	10,941.51	9,141.60	300.00	8,841.60	40,315.32
Arizona.....	72,627.03	73.3	52,795.82	42,071.83	92.5	38,916.44	36,514.45	1,800.00	34,714.45	126,426.71
Arkansas:										
Eastern.....	35,632.29	58.0	20,695.73	14,091.57	94.2	13,274.26	18,138.40	4,900.00	13,238.40	47,208.39
Western.....	31,574.76	35.0	11,051.16	16,843.57	94.7	15,950.51	17,282.05	1,400.00	15,882.05	42,833.72
California:										
Northern.....	118,501.94	87.0	103,096.69	25,835.15	75.0	19,376.36	46,860.70	5,300.00	41,560.70	164,033.75
Southern.....	104,986.82	54.0	56,692.88	26,165.56	84.3	22,057.57	29,089.80	5,100.00	23,989.80	102,731.25
Colorado.....	43,501.15	49.4	21,489.57	22,166.74	73.2	16,226.05	28,354.20	2,400.00	25,954.20	63,669.82
Connecticut.....	48,100.22	38.0	18,312.29	1,372.69	82.9	1,137.96	3,680.60	100.00	3,580.60	23,030.85
Delaware.....	26,648.81	20.0	5,329.76	969.60	88.3	856.16	3,632.00	200.00	3,432.00	9,617.92
Florida:										
Northern.....	23,919.64	63.0	15,069.38	9,179.17	94.9	8,711.03	8,232.30	1,100.00	7,132.30	30,912.71
Southern.....	88,376.09	35.0	30,931.63	66,561.18	70.2	46,725.95	44,037.51	8,500.00	35,537.51	113,195.09
Georgia:										
Northern.....	51,864.31	56.0	29,044.01	49,438.60	82.7	40,885.72	23,836.45	3,200.00	20,636.45	90,566.18
Middle.....	42,636.23	38.0	16,201.77	25,852.47	89.8	23,215.52	25,730.05	3,400.00	22,330.05	61,747.34
Southern.....	37,051.16	77.0	28,529.40	31,122.27	84.7	17,890.56	14,276.05	1,100.00	13,176.05	59,596.01
Idaho.....	33,390.71	50.0	16,695.36	32,756.49	83.8	27,449.94	27,413.45	2,500.00	24,913.45	69,058.75
Illinois:										
Northern ⁴	146,729.61	39.9	58,545.12	34,705.07	66.5	23,078.87	56,135.80	4,200.00	51,935.80	133,559.79
Eastern.....	46,916.22	75.0	35,187.17	40,794.44	70.8	28,822.46	27,214.99	700.00	26,514.99	69,584.53
Southern.....	35,248.04	80.0	28,193.44	21,640.32	70.0	15,148.22	24,054.00	4,900.00	19,154.00	62,500.66
Indiana:										
Northern.....	42,101.92	60.0	25,261.15	16,829.09	60.7	10,215.26	17,967.15	3,200.00	14,767.15	50,243.56
Southern.....	33,508.71	30.0	10,052.61	17,832.10	83.1	14,818.48	15,567.30	1,200.00	14,367.30	39,238.39
Iowa:										
Northern.....	35,790.37	55.0	19,684.70	4,203.67	86.3	3,632.08	15,238.10	800.00	14,438.10	37,754.88
Southern.....	51,313.70	41.2	21,141.24	10,366.41	89.3	9,257.20	20,105.13	2,500.00	17,605.13	48,003.57
Kansas.....	47,269.98	51.0	24,106.16	22,113.08	63.5	14,041.81	14,909.30	2,300.00	12,609.30	50,757.27

Kentucky:										
Eastern.....	45,374.48	29.0	13,158.60	108,128.08	93.7	101,316.01	23,781.25	2,300.00	21,481.25	135,955.86
Western.....	43,374.10	15.0	6,506.11	21,610.26	91.2	19,708.56	14,253.00	700.00	13,553.00	39,767.67
Louisiana:										
Eastern.....	65,466.34	58.5	38,309.51	6,568.65	76.7	5,038.18	15,987.90	1,200.00	14,787.90	58,135.59
Western.....	31,634.10	62.0	19,613.14	14,948.40	78.6	11,749.44	13,563.90	1,600.00	11,963.90	43,326.45
Maine.....	36,413.03	22.0	8,010.87	2,630.63	82.8	2,178.16	4,711.70	1,800.00	2,911.70	13,100.73
Maryland.....	59,060.27	35.0	20,971.10	14,289.87	71.7	10,245.84	23,672.00	2,100.00	21,572.00	52,488.94
Massachusetts.....	113,620.98	22.1	25,110.24	8,031.42	70.8	5,636.25	35,161.64	5,500.00	29,661.64	60,458.13
Michigan:										
Eastern.....	90,827.47	42.0	38,147.53	38,667.79	59.7	23,054.67	74,298.10	3,360.00	70,938.10	132,230.30
Western.....	42,330.79	8.5	3,588.12	14,012.81	69.0	10,289.84	22,586.65	1,700.00	20,886.65	34,774.61
Minnesota.....	125,615.71	40.0	50,246.29	25,059.77	49.3	12,354.47	59,749.30	6,700.00	53,049.30	115,650.66
Mississippi:										
Northern.....	27,520.75	40.0	11,003.29	17,450.90	85.8	14,972.87	16,412.10	2,600.00	13,812.10	39,793.26
Southern.....	30,619.47	59.3	18,065.49	15,610.31	90.2	14,080.50	14,906.00	3,200.00	11,706.00	43,851.99
Missouri:										
Eastern.....	78,883.62	24.0	18,932.07	13,919.74	89.3	12,430.33	38,191.75	5,500.00	32,691.75	64,054.15
Western.....	99,520.22	13.5	13,435.23	26,234.02	76.0	19,937.86	45,403.10	18,800.00	26,603.10	59,976.19
Montana.....	43,190.79	80.0	34,552.63	24,375.26	56.2	13,698.90	12,211.55	1,000.00	11,211.55	59,463.08
Nebraska.....	63,472.45	22.0	13,963.94	22,681.10	74.4	16,874.74	52,358.60	2,000.00	50,358.60	81,197.28
Nevada.....	30,782.99	22.0	6,772.25	4,219.75	70.7	2,983.36	2,897.70	100.00	2,797.70	12,553.31
New Hampshire.....	31,741.95	30.0	9,522.59	5,250.96	72.7	3,817.45	17,231.45	2,200.00	15,031.45	28,371.49
New Jersey.....	145,195.82	60.0	87,117.49	27,085.67	41.3	11,186.38	53,675.00	7,700.00	45,975.00	144,278.87
New Mexico.....	47,366.48	50.0	23,683.25	18,380.02	92.6	17,019.90	10,667.65	600.00	10,067.65	50,770.80
New York:										
Northern.....	59,439.52	70.0	41,607.66	36,275.93	78.1	28,331.50	26,724.40	1,600.00	25,124.40	95,063.56
Eastern.....	177,894.20	95.0	168,999.49	10,706.82	61.2	6,552.57	77,286.15	7,400.00	69,886.15	245,438.21
Southern.....	304,381.38	22.0	66,963.90	93,197.87	63.5	63,840.54	122,475.70	62,450.00	60,025.70	100,880.14
Western.....	59,577.25	50.0	29,788.63	11,493.76	87.4	10,045.55	34,575.30	2,200.00	32,375.30	72,209.48
North Carolina:										
Eastern.....	40,677.79	68.5	27,861.28	26,660.84	90.8	24,208.04	13,909.50	1,500.00	12,409.50	64,481.82
Middle.....	27,967.65	60.0	16,780.59	32,983.60	88.5	29,190.49	18,412.80	1,200.00	17,212.80	63,183.88
Western.....	51,808.54	65.0	33,675.55	8,423.44	79.3	6,679.79	14,402.70	4,500.00	9,902.70	50,258.04
North Dakota.....	42,600.27	30.0	12,624.08	10,321.39	89.7	9,258.29	10,752.70	600.00	10,152.70	32,035.07
Ohio:										
Northern.....	101,479.46	28.0	28,414.25	10,122.51	61.7	11,798.59	35,653.30	8,360.00	26,753.30	66,966.14
Southern.....	77,671.16	33.0	25,631.48	20,039.80	75.5	15,130.05	25,916.15	3,500.00	22,116.15	62,877.68
Oklahoma:										
Northern.....	32,085.21	63.0	20,214.12	33,409.42	92.6	30,937.12	15,011.95	4,500.00	10,511.95	61,663.19
Eastern.....	28,552.57	26.0	10,031.47	23,798.86	90.1	21,442.77	16,167.90	1,900.00	14,267.90	45,742.14
Western.....	39,354.30	48.0	18,850.06	21,728.94	92.0	19,990.62	18,831.20	2,300.00	16,531.20	55,411.88
Oregon.....	58,391.58	20.0	11,678.32	12,795.54	65.4	8,368.28	36,679.70	9,890.00	26,789.70	46,326.30

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.—Cost of the criminal business of the district courts, 1929-30—Continued

District	Direct court expenses ¹			Fees of witnesses			Fees of jurors			Total criminal cost
	Total expense	Per cent criminal ²	Criminal expense	Total expense	Per cent criminal ³	Criminal expense	Total expense	Allocated to civil ⁴	Criminal expense	
Pennsylvania:										
Eastern.....	\$107,443.39	30.0	\$32,233.02	\$12,092.92	45.2	\$5,466.00	\$29,516.60	\$7,600.00	\$21,916.60	\$59,615.62
Middle.....	39,902.69	55.0	21,946.48	10,810.33	82.4	8,907.71	16,581.70	2,300.00	14,281.70	45,135.89
Western.....	94,155.49	50.0	47,077.74	37,653.41	51.4	19,353.85	40,875.10	6,800.00	34,075.10	100,506.69
Rhode Island.....	31,564.45	40.0	12,625.77	2,565.02	69.0	1,769.86	8,256.50	700.00	7,556.50	21,952.13
South Carolina:										
Eastern.....	43,259.06	75.0	32,444.30	24,220.06	95.1	23,033.28	35,949.44	3,200.00	32,749.44	88,227.02
Western.....	40,126.42	50.0	20,063.21	5,338.56	84.8	4,527.10	21,162.10	2,900.00	18,262.10	42,852.41
South Dakota.....	51,252.91	65.0	33,324.39	65,391.53	93.6	61,206.47	29,785.40	500.00	29,285.40	123,806.26
Tennessee:										
Eastern.....	40,497.11	50.0	20,248.55	14,091.95	86.9	12,245.90	18,863.85	2,600.00	16,263.85	48,758.30
Middle.....	35,971.11	40.0	14,388.44	56,171.35	88.0	49,430.81	20,215.10	600.00	19,615.10	83,434.35
Western.....	28,989.30	60.0	17,393.58	7,960.99	81.7	6,504.13	13,621.60	1,800.00	11,821.60	35,719.31
Texas:										
Northern.....	78,790.08	40.0	31,516.04	62,203.18	88.0	54,738.80	47,839.80	13,400.00	34,439.80	120,694.64
Eastern.....	33,577.38	37.0	12,423.63	11,138.08	87.7	9,768.10	20,724.20	3,000.00	17,724.20	39,915.93
Southern.....	45,745.46	75.0	34,309.10	28,254.20	91.1	25,739.63	33,108.30	1,900.00	31,208.30	91,257.03
Western.....	69,411.75	60.0	41,047.05	35,349.31	95.0	33,581.84	43,784.90	3,300.00	40,484.90	115,713.79
Utah.....	38,433.18	55.0	21,138.25	26,682.91	72.1	19,166.28	20,210.90	1,400.00	18,810.90	59,115.43
Vermont.....	29,305.70	40.0	11,722.27	3,843.47	90.9	3,493.71	12,325.95	200.00	12,125.95	27,341.93
Virginia:										
Eastern.....	53,396.66	35.0	18,683.83	8,509.53	75.5	6,424.70	7,688.10	2,200.00	5,488.10	30,601.63
Western.....	36,882.98	28.0	10,327.23	8,538.06	82.5	7,043.90	12,161.15	1,300.00	10,861.15	28,232.28
Washington:										
Eastern.....	28,217.29	70.5	19,893.19	13,795.75	87.0	12,002.30	12,933.85	600.00	12,333.85	44,229.34
Western.....	64,230.75	30.0	19,269.22	22,411.78	74.7	16,741.60	27,977.10	4,100.00	23,877.10	59,887.92
West Virginia:										
Northern.....	32,104.98	25.0	8,026.24	15,077.29	80.8	12,182.45	14,163.60	1,400.00	12,763.60	32,972.29
Southern.....	38,622.30	33.3	12,861.22	35,451.62	79.6	28,219.41	23,146.70	3,500.00	19,646.70	60,727.33
Wisconsin:										
Eastern.....	29,014.43	29.0	8,414.18	6,386.91	83.0	5,301.14	16,007.40	2,600.00	13,407.40	27,122.72
Western.....	29,708.38	27.0	8,021.26	17,443.76	76.8	13,396.81	8,872.42	1,000.00	7,872.42	29,290.49

Wyoming.....	25,636.11	51.0	13,074.41	16,461.06	72.2	11,884.80	8,372.80	100.00	8,272.80	33,232.10
Total.....	4,787,316.70	⁶ 46.0	2,203,838.53	1,889,099.32	⁶ 79.5	1,502,399.52	2,104,702.99	317,700.00	1,787,002.99	5,493,241.04
Overhead ⁷	266,515.03	⁶ 46.0	122,596.91							122,596.91
Grand total.....	5,053,831.73	⁶ 46.0	2,326,435.44	1,889,099.32	79.5	1,502,399.52	2,104,702.99	317,700.00	1,787,002.99	5,615,837.95

¹ Salaries of judges, salaries and expenses of clerk's offices, pay of bailiffs and court attendants, and rent.
² Estimates by the clerk for each district.
³ Relative number of terminated criminal cases and civil cases to which the United States was a party.
⁴ \$100 allocated to each civil jury trial.
⁵ Clerk's report not received; estimated on the basis of the other districts in the East North Central region.
⁶ Computed.
⁷ Total overhead of \$550,650.88 for printing and binding, supplies, books, and field examination of offices distributed among marshals, courts, and district attorneys according to the relative amount of general expenses of marshals (\$2,476,271.87), direct expenses of courts (\$4,787,316.70), and expenses of attorneys (\$2,631,357.17).

The extent to which the cost of the district courts is chargeable to the handling of prohibition cases, antinarcotic cases, motor vehicle theft cases, and other criminal cases is shown by Table 16.

TABLE 16.—Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the district courts, 1929-30

District	Total criminal cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Cost ²	Per cent ³	Cost ²	Per cent ³	Cost ²	Per cent ³	Cost ²	Per cent ³
Alabama:									
Northern.....	\$40,131.62	\$31,863.45	79.4	\$1,299.41	3.2	\$1,610.64	4.0	\$5,358.12	13.4
Middle.....	22,393.81	14,147.96	63.2	3,318.73	14.8	901.93	4.0	4,025.19	18.0
Southern.....	40,315.32	30,183.02	74.9	293.54	.7	461.40	1.1	9,377.36	23.3
Arizona.....	126,426.71	43,370.41	34.7	6,062.20	4.8	8,444.61	6.7	63,049.49	53.8
Arkansas:									
Eastern.....	47,208.39	36,591.93	77.5	998.65	2.1	795.64	1.7	8,822.17	18.7
Western.....	42,883.72	32,222.06	75.1	691.61	1.6	1,525.63	3.6	8,444.42	19.7
California:									
Northern.....	164,033.75	149,340.97	91.0	4,181.30	2.6	808.18	.5	9,703.30	5.9
Southern.....	102,731.25	12,518.33	12.2	3,798.16	3.7	4,572.15	4.5	81,842.61	79.6
Colorado.....	63,669.82	33,250.75	52.2	4,957.59	7.8	9,204.23	14.5	16,257.25	25.5
Connecticut.....	23,030.85	19,847.42	86.2	1,242.32	5.4	575.47	2.5	1,865.64	8.1
Delaware.....	9,617.92	7,796.30	81.0	266.49	2.8	713.00	7.4	842.13	8.8
Florida:									
Northern.....	30,912.71	24,648.96	79.7	766.53	2.5	1,195.98	3.9	4,301.24	13.9
Southern.....	113,195.09	72,973.31	64.5	11,925.35	10.5	4,471.17	4.0	23,825.26	21.0
Georgia:									
Northern.....	90,566.18	79,034.90	87.3	4,620.40	5.1	2,142.84	2.4	4,768.94	5.2
Middle.....	61,747.34	50,855.13	82.4	1,612.85	2.9	1,835.18	3.0	7,244.18	11.7
Southern.....	59,596.01	49,552.35	83.2	2,136.59	3.6	912.51	1.5	6,994.56	11.7
Idaho.....	69,058.75	45,157.82	65.4	808.63	1.2	2,651.20	3.8	20,441.03	29.6
Illinois:									
Northern.....	133,559.70	85,250.76	63.9	21,667.94	16.2	8,173.29	6.1	18,458.80	13.8
Eastern.....	90,584.53	73,552.73	81.2	3,192.27	3.5	9,943.78	11.0	3,895.75	4.3
Southern.....	62,500.66	44,225.56	70.7	4,494.16	7.2	5,554.56	8.9	8,226.38	13.2
Indiana:									
Northern.....	50,243.56	33,957.17	67.6	4,484.07	8.9	6,013.90	12.0	5,788.42	11.5
Southern.....	39,238.39	24,825.19	63.3	3,522.57	9.0	4,194.02	10.7	6,696.61	17.0

Iowa:									
Northern.....	37,754.88	34,341.87	91.0	465.57	1.2	736.86	2.0	2,210.58	5.8
Southern.....	48,008.57	31,533.94	65.7	3,218.68	6.7	2,001.23	4.2	11,249.72	23.4
Kansas.....	50,757.27	16,266.81	32.1	1,741.31	3.4	14,068.71	27.7	13,680.44	36.8
Kentucky:									
Eastern.....	135,955.86	121,418.41	89.3	1,879.44	1.4	2,030.54	1.5	10,627.47	7.8
Western.....	39,767.07	32,693.81	82.2	3,171.75	8.0	1,328.85	3.3	2,373.26	6.5
Louisiana:									
Eastern.....	58,135.59	34,544.53	59.4	6,750.34	11.6	4,502.54	7.8	12,338.18	21.2
Western.....	43,326.48	23,465.78	54.2	6,482.68	15.0	3,828.07	8.8	9,549.95	22.0
Maine.....	13,100.73	6,410.52	48.9	834.13	6.4	394.75	3.0	5,461.33	41.7
Maryland.....	62,488.94	45,479.35	72.8	1,351.26	2.6	590.60	1.1	5,667.73	9.7
Massachusetts.....	60,458.13	43,586.04	72.1	3,232.68	5.4	740.50	1.2	12,808.91	21.3
Michigan:									
Eastern.....	132,230.30	78,635.56	59.5	20,811.78	15.7	3,263.24	2.5	29,519.72	22.3
Western.....	34,774.61	27,740.93	79.8	1,464.68	4.2	432.42	1.2	5,136.58	14.8
Minnesota.....	115,650.66	83,663.87	72.3	5,211.21	4.5	2,958.84	2.6	23,816.14	20.6
Mississippi:									
Northern.....	39,793.26	33,492.52	84.2	814.34	2.0	550.42	1.4	4,935.98	12.4
Southern.....	43,851.59	32,855.91	74.9	4,092.16	9.3	2,348.64	5.4	4,555.28	10.4
Missouri:									
Eastern.....	64,054.15	40,236.97	62.8	7,073.20	11.0	3,964.56	6.2	12,779.32	20.0
Western.....	59,976.19	39,905.51	66.5	8,548.48	14.3	3,216.57	5.4	8,305.63	13.8
Montana.....	59,423.68	48,986.58	82.4	467.50	.8	525.51	.9	9,483.49	15.9
Nebraska.....	81,197.28	45,238.15	55.7	7,417.13	9.1	3,699.65	4.6	24,842.35	30.6
Nevada.....	12,553.31	8,034.75	64.0	1,512.68	12.1	602.42	4.8	2,403.46	19.1
New Hampshire.....	28,371.49	26,036.12	91.8	904.16	3.2	0	0	1,431.21	5.0
New Jersey.....	144,278.87	100,269.01	69.5	8,075.56	5.6	5,533.40	3.8	30,400.90	21.1
New Mexico.....	50,770.80	23,524.86	46.3	473.66	1.0	6,363.19	12.5	40,909.09	40.2
New York:									
Northern.....	95,063.56	76,378.46	80.4	1,310.24	1.4	420.60	.4	16,954.86	17.8
Eastern.....	245,438.21	222,296.37	90.6	9,256.86	3.8	3,557.88	1.4	10,227.10	4.2
Southern.....	180,880.14	141,635.56	78.3	7,596.56	4.0	306.55	.2	41,341.47	21.6
Western.....	72,209.48	58,575.80	81.1	1,487.14	2.1	771.25	1.0	11,375.29	15.8
North Carolina:									
Eastern.....	64,481.82	54,278.22	84.2	2,461.16	3.8	852.18	1.3	6,890.26	10.7
Middle.....	63,183.88	51,601.20	81.6	2,145.58	3.4	2,644.72	4.2	6,792.38	10.8
Western.....	50,258.04	40,118.89	79.8	4,754.85	9.5	1,832.11	3.6	3,552.19	7.1
North Dakota.....	32,035.07	7,889.17	24.6	850.59	2.7	635.69	2.0	22,659.62	70.7
Ohio:									
Northern.....	66,966.14	44,015.97	65.7	10,687.74	16.0	5,020.72	7.5	7,241.71	10.8
Southern.....	62,877.68	35,398.18	56.3	8,383.23	13.3	7,301.00	11.6	11,795.27	18.8

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 16.—Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the district courts, 1929-30—Continued

District	Total criminal cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Cost ²	Per cent ³	Cost ²	Per cent ³	Cost ²	Per cent ³	Cost ²	Per cent ³
Oklahoma:									
Northern.....	\$61,663.19	\$17,768.23	28.8	\$2,707.05	4.4	\$2,389.09	3.9	\$38,798.82	62.9
Eastern.....	45,742.14	34,413.03	75.2	2,999.74	6.6	1,871.22	4.1	6,458.15	14.1
Western.....	55,411.88	40,989.74	74.0	5,995.22	10.8	2,306.78	5.1	5,620.14	10.1
Oregon.....	46,326.30	23,390.78	50.5	1,488.28	3.2	4,226.11	9.1	17,221.13	37.2
Pennsylvania:									
Eastern.....	59,615.62	45,470.02	76.3	1,415.52	2.4	322.33	.5	12,407.75	20.8
Middle.....	45,135.89	35,094.50	77.8	2,618.57	5.8	795.05	1.8	6,624.77	14.6
Western.....	100,506.69	61,143.52	60.9	6,260.75	6.2	7,636.20	7.6	25,466.22	25.3
Rhode Island.....	21,952.13	15,771.76	71.8	1,661.50	7.5	141.57	.7	4,387.30	20.0
South Carolina:									
Eastern.....	88,227.02	60,627.73	68.7	2,618.71	3.0	6,271.40	7.1	18,709.18	21.2
Western.....	42,852.41	34,439.66	80.4	1,843.26	4.3	1,761.73	4.1	4,807.76	11.2
South Dakota.....	123,806.26	73,653.71	59.5	2,977.17	2.4	3,489.70	2.8	43,685.68	35.3
Tennessee:									
Eastern.....	48,758.30	33,904.99	69.5	2,931.70	6.0	3,940.04	8.1	7,981.57	16.4
Middle.....	83,434.35	72,379.16	86.7	3,223.04	3.9	2,352.05	2.8	5,480.10	6.6
Western.....	35,719.31	24,517.38	68.7	3,444.64	9.6	4,109.05	11.5	3,648.24	10.2
Texas:									
Northern.....	120,694.64	87,580.57	72.6	10,060.34	8.3	8,464.86	7.0	14,588.87	12.1
Eastern.....	39,915.93	30,733.87	77.0	1,856.94	4.7	2,413.03	6.0	4,912.09	12.3
Southern.....	91,257.03	33,511.90	36.7	8,113.49	8.9	1,550.74	1.7	48,080.90	52.7
Western.....	115,713.79	43,050.32	37.2	7,611.25	6.6	2,566.24	2.2	62,485.98	54.0
Utah.....	59,115.43	36,513.14	61.8	3,124.88	5.3	7,469.40	12.6	12,008.01	20.3
Vermont.....	27,341.93	9,345.45	34.2	226.38	.8	270.44	1.0	17,499.66	64.0
Virginia:									
Eastern.....	30,601.63	17,822.37	58.2	2,288.43	7.5	1,643.89	5.4	8,846.94	28.9
Western.....	28,232.28	15,785.87	55.9	4,514.70	16.0	1,261.95	4.5	6,669.76	23.6
Washington:									
Eastern.....	44,229.34	25,261.95	57.2	1,429.77	3.2	540.11	1.2	16,997.51	38.4
Western.....	59,287.92	35,094.62	58.6	2,350.32	3.9	1,297.61	2.2	21,145.37	35.3
West Virginia:									
Northern.....	32,972.29	27,234.32	82.6	817.56	2.5	1,042.32	3.2	3,878.09	11.7
Southern.....	60,727.33	41,835.51	68.9	673.19	1.1	303.30	.5	17,915.33	29.5
Wisconsin:									
Eastern.....	27,122.72	22,273.43	82.1	349.52	1.3	290.14	1.1	4,209.63	15.5
Western.....	29,290.49	26,598.51	90.7	406.22	1.4	439.41	1.5	1,876.35	6.4
Wyoming.....	33,232.10	20,170.45	60.7	1,052.61	3.2	3,022.80	9.1	8,986.24	27.0
Total, exclusive of overhead.....	5,493,241.04	3,752,571.59	68.3	318,620.56	5.8	238,416.48	4.3	1,183,632.41	21.6
Overhead.....	122,596.91	83,733.69	68.3	7,110.62	5.8	5,271.67	4.3	25,480.93	21.6
Grand total.....	5,615,837.95	3,836,305.28	68.3	325,731.18	5.8	243,688.15	4.3	1,210,113.34	21.6

¹ From Table 15, supra.² Computed as indicated in the text.³ Computed.⁴ Clerk's report not received; estimated on the basis of the other districts in the East North Central region.

2. *The United States commissioners.*—The work of the United States commissioners is entirely criminal. The total cost of the commissioners for each judicial district, and the extent to which that cost is chargeable to prohibition cases, antinarcotic cases, motor vehicle theft cases, and other criminal cases is shown by Table 17.^{96a}

^{96a}As to the method of allocation used, see p. 94, supra.

TABLE 17.—Cost of various activities of United States commissioners, 1929-30

District	Total cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount
Alabama:									
Northern.....	\$3,334.05	80.0	\$2,667.24	2.9	\$96.69	3.8	\$126.69	13.3	\$443.43
Middle.....	2,999.55	57.1	1,712.74	14.3	428.94	7.2	215.97	21.4	641.90
Southern.....	2,731.90	84.3	2,302.99	1.1	30.05	2.2	60.10	12.4	338.76
Arizona.....	9,534.35	32.8	3,127.27	4.1	390.91	7.2	686.47	55.9	5,329.70
Arkansas:									
Eastern.....	7,135.78	79.3	5,658.67	1.7	121.31	3.5	249.75	15.5	1,106.05
Western.....	3,422.53	71.4	2,443.69	2.9	99.25	2.9	99.25	22.8	780.34
California:									
Northern.....	16,093.55	95.4	15,358.02	.6	96.59	.1	16.10	3.9	627.84
Southern.....	5,675.57	9.3	527.83	3.7	210.00	3.7	210.00	83.3	4,727.74
Colorado.....	3,683.85	27.1	998.32	8.9	327.86	21.9	806.76	42.1	1,550.91
Connecticut.....	2,605.45	86.8	2,261.53	5.3	138.09	2.6	67.74	5.3	138.09
Delaware.....	1,114.65	75.0	835.99	5.0	55.73	10.0	111.47	10.0	111.46
Florida:									
Northern.....	2,589.15	79.4	2,055.79	4.8	124.28	7.9	204.54	7.9	204.54
Southern.....	12,576.80	57.1	7,181.35	8.6	1,081.60	5.7	716.88	28.6	3,596.97
Georgia:									
Northern.....	10,963.50	98.2	10,174.13	1.8	197.34	1.8	197.34	3.6	394.69
Middle.....	5,906.55	65.8	3,886.51	5.3	313.05	5.3	313.05	23.6	1,393.94
Southern.....	3,477.37	90.9	3,160.93	2.6	90.41	2.6	90.41	3.9	135.62
Idaho.....	2,767.00	51.2	1,416.70	.4	11.07	2.4	66.41	46.0	1,272.82
Illinois:									
Northern.....	12,376.10	66.9	8,279.61	10.5	1,299.49	10.0	1,237.61	12.6	1,559.39
Eastern.....	4,405.45	80.0	3,524.36	6.7	295.17	13.3	585.92	0	0
Southern.....	4,196.80	68.8	2,887.40	10.0	419.68	8.7	365.12	12.5	524.60
Indiana:									
Northern.....	2,846.68	66.7	1,898.74	8.3	236.27	16.7	475.40	8.3	236.27
Southern.....	3,503.47	66.7	2,336.81	6.7	234.73	10.0	350.35	16.0	581.58
Iowa:									
Northern.....	3,696.20	90.9	3,359.85	1.8	66.53	1.8	66.53	5.5	203.29
Southern.....	2,686.45	51.7	1,388.89	10.9	292.82	9.5	255.21	27.9	749.53
Kansas.....	2,372.50	56.9	1,349.95	2.0	47.45	17.6	417.36	23.5	557.54
Kentucky:									
Eastern.....	42,862.05	86.3	36,989.95	3.4	1,457.31	3.4	1,457.31	6.9	2,957.48
Western.....	12,861.75	80.0	10,289.40	10.0	1,286.18	4.7	604.50	5.3	681.67

63080-31-9

Louisiana:									
Eastern.....	6,945.50	50.4	3,500.53	13.7	951.53	10.3	715.39	25.6	1,778.05
Western.....	2,263.10	51.6	1,167.76	18.1	364.36	6.5	147.10	25.8	583.88
Maine.....	2,194.00	54.6	1,197.92	9.1	199.65	4.5	98.73	31.8	697.70
Maryland.....	7,153.05	82.9	5,929.88	2.9	207.44	2.8	200.29	11.4	815.44
Massachusetts.....	8,937.80	65.2	5,827.12	5.4	482.61	2.3	205.56	27.1	2,422.01
Michigan:									
Eastern.....	9,240.75	54.8	5,063.93	14.3	1,321.43	2.4	221.78	28.5	2,633.61
Western.....	1,886.85	58.8	1,103.47	5.9	111.32	5.9	111.32	29.4	554.74
Minnesota.....	12,331.70	62.5	7,707.31	7.5	924.88	5.0	616.59	25.0	3,082.92
Mississippi:									
Northern.....	1,436.10	75.0	1,077.08	5.0	71.81	5.0	71.81	15.0	215.40
Southern.....	2,153.68	67.8	1,460.11	16.9	363.95	6.8	146.44	8.5	183.06
Missouri:									
Eastern.....	5,026.28	41.7	2,471.26	25.0	1,481.57	8.3	491.88	25.0	1,481.57
Western.....	7,468.79	59.3	4,428.99	14.8	1,105.38	7.4	552.69	18.5	1,381.73
Montana.....	8,553.30	87.5	7,484.14	1.3	111.19	1.2	102.64	10.0	855.33
Nebraska.....	3,085.40	81.8	2,523.86	13.7	422.70			4.5	138.84
.....	977.15	68.2	666.42	13.6	132.89	4.6	44.95	13.6	132.89
Nevada.....	1,822.30	96.7	1,762.16	3.3	60.14				
New Hampshire.....	6,178.75	66.7	4,121.23	5.0	308.94	3.3	203.90	25.0	1,544.68
New Jersey.....	3,463.60	64.0	2,216.70	2.0	69.27	16.0	554.18	18.0	623.45
New Mexico:									
Northern.....	17,266.30	90.0	15,539.67	2.2	379.86	.7	120.86	7.1	1,225.91
Eastern.....	14,218.00	89.4	12,710.89	5.3	753.55	2.1	298.68	3.2	454.96
Southern.....	30,181.65	59.1	17,837.36	4.5	1,353.17			36.4	10,986.12
Western.....	17,623.34	80.0	14,098.67	4.0	704.93	2.0	352.47	14.0	2,467.27
North Carolina:									
Eastern.....	7,818.70	81.0	6,333.15	4.8	375.30	1.8	140.74	12.4	969.51
Middle.....	5,616.65	75.0	4,212.49	5.0	280.83	11.7	557.15	8.3	466.16
Western.....	5,847.25	81.5	4,765.51	10.8	631.50	4.6	268.97	3.1	181.27
North Dakota.....	452.70	26.7	120.87	3.3	14.94	3.3	14.94	66.7	301.95
Ohio:									
Northern.....	10,969.05	64.3	7,053.12	14.3	1,568.57	10.7	1,173.60	10.7	1,173.67
Southern.....	6,100.90	60.6	3,697.15	15.2	927.34	15.2	927.34	9.0	549.07
Oklahoma:									
Northern.....	7,706.65	74.6	5,749.16	4.8	369.92	4.8	369.92	15.8	1,217.65
Eastern.....	9,750.75	57.8	5,635.93	19.2	1,872.14	11.5	1,121.34	11.5	1,121.34
Western.....	5,454.20	87.5	4,772.43	6.9	376.34	1.5	81.81	4.1	223.62
Oregon.....	2,330.95	60.0	1,398.57			5.0	116.55	35.0	815.83
Pennsylvania:									
Eastern.....	6,786.95	75.0	5,090.21	2.6	135.74	1.0	67.87	22.0	1,493.13
Middle.....	3,791.55	72.7	2,756.46	9.1	345.03	3.6	136.50	14.6	553.56
Western.....	9,975.90	40.0	3,990.36	10.0	997.59	10.0	997.59	40.0	3,990.36

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 17.—Cost of various activities of United States commissioners, 1929-30—Continued

District	Total cost ¹		Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²	Amount	Per cent ²
Rhode Island.....	\$2,900.05	62.5	\$1,812.53	12.5	\$362.51	25.0			\$725.01	25.0
South Carolina.....	5,486.80	66.7	3,659.70	6.7	367.62	13.3	\$729.74		729.74	13.3
Eastern.....	2,922.40	80.0	2,337.92	6.0	175.34	4.0	116.90		292.24	10.0
Western.....	1,797.30	55.4	995.70	3.1	55.72	4.6	82.68		663.20	36.9
South Dakota.....	7,443.30	50.0	3,721.65	8.0	595.20	12.0	893.20		2,232.99	30.0
Tennessee.....	12,838.60	87.5	11,233.78	5.0	641.93	7.5	962.89		962.89	7.5
Eastern.....	2,894.30	58.3	1,687.38	16.7	483.35	16.7	483.35		240.22	8.3
Middle.....										
Western.....										
Texas:										
Northern.....	9,688.38	75.0	7,266.29	8.7	842.89	6.3	610.37		963.83	10.0
Eastern.....	5,189.72	64.9	3,368.13	5.4	280.24	10.8	560.49		980.86	18.9
Southern.....	20,610.34	66.7	13,747.10	20.0	4,122.07	4.0	824.41		1,916.76	9.3
Western.....	15,698.30	63.4	9,052.72	8.3	1,302.96	3.3	518.04		3,924.58	25.0
Utah.....	3,205.10	63.6	2,038.44	7.3	233.97	10.9	349.36		583.33	18.2
Vermont.....	1,256.20	50.0	628.10	1.2	15.07	1.2	15.07		597.96	47.6
Virginia:										
Eastern.....	2,304.30	62.9	1,449.40	5.7	181.35	8.6	198.17		525.38	22.8
Western.....	2,861.75	42.9	1,013.19	25.0	590.44	3.6	85.02		673.10	23.5
Washington:										
Eastern.....	1,976.25	54.9	920.26	2.4	40.23	2.1	35.20		680.56	40.6
Western.....	6,105.00	71.0	4,334.55	2.7	164.84	1.6	97.68		1,507.93	24.7
West Virginia:										
Northern.....	3,991.10	72.0	2,873.59	4.0	189.64	8.0	319.29		688.58	16.0
Southern.....	14,525.35	90.1	13,087.84	1.5	217.88	1.5	217.88		1,002.25	6.9
Wisconsin:										
Eastern.....	3,156.15	86.2	2,720.60	3.5	110.47	3.4	107.31		217.77	6.9
Western.....	4,981.70	71.8	3,875.76	3.7	184.32	3.7	184.32		737.30	14.8
Wyoming.....	14,000.00	60.8	8,520.14	2.9	24.81	11.8	100.95		269.60	24.5
National parks.....									14,600.00	100.0
Total.....	588,820.91	69.1	406,796.80	69.8	40,384.72	4.8	27,915.44		113,773.95	19.3

¹ From Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 302-305.
² Based on relative amount of time spent by the district court in each district on the several classes of criminal cases.
³ Computed.

3. *The circuit courts of appeals.*—The costs of the circuit courts of appeals chargeable to criminal justice have been computed on the basis of the relative number of civil and criminal appeals disposed of.⁹⁷ Table 18 gives such costs for each circuit court of appeals for the year ending June 30, 1930.⁹⁸

TABLE 18.—Cost of the criminal business of the circuit courts of appeals, 1929-30

Circuit	Total cost	Per cent criminal	Criminal cost
First.....	\$40,502.51	5.8	\$2,871.14
Second.....	90,184.44	7.0	0,732.01
Third.....	45,091.30	10.8	4,934.07
Fourth.....	48,431.23	10.0	8,039.69
Fifth.....	51,001.01	22.1	11,400.02
Sixth.....	67,315.24	10.4	11,039.70
Seventh.....	70,064.00	16.4	10,882.36
Eighth.....	80,820.28	21.3	17,214.72
Ninth.....	75,209.80	15.1	11,356.68
Tenth.....	60,321.19	17.8	10,737.17
Total.....	640,131.58	14.8	95,298.95

The extent to which the cost of the circuit courts of appeals is chargeable to the handling of prohibition cases, antinarcotic cases, motor vehicle theft cases, and other cases is shown by Table 19.

TABLE 19.—Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the circuit courts of appeals, 1929-30

Circuit	Total criminal cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Cost	Per cent ²	Cost	Per cent ²	Cost	Per cent ²	Cost	Per cent ²
First.....	\$2,871.14	\$940.55	32.8	0	0	0	0	\$1,930.59	67.2
Second.....	0,732.01	1,023.69	28.6	\$102.37	2.0	0	0	4,616.85	63.6
Third.....	4,934.07	3,701.00	75.0	0	0	0	0	1,233.07	25.0
Fourth.....	8,039.69	6,683.51	83.1	678.04	8.5	309.02	4.2	330.02	4.2
Fifth.....	11,400.02	5,459.06	47.6	1,455.75	12.7	0	0	4,575.21	39.8
Sixth.....	11,039.70	6,327.03	57.3	471.21	4.3	201.95	1.8	4,038.01	36.0
Seventh.....	10,882.36	5,791.50	53.3	353.32	3.2	1,201.30	11.1	3,538.23	32.4
Eighth.....	17,214.72	8,405.31	48.8	1,484.77	8.4	0	0	7,354.04	42.8
Ninth.....	11,356.68	7,144.93	62.9	827.31	7.3	0	0	3,384.44	29.8
Tenth.....	10,737.17	5,368.59	60.0	1,568.35	14.0	0	0	3,800.23	35.4
Total.....	95,298.95	51,748.77	54.3	7,001.12	7.4	1,742.27	1.8	34,806.79	36.5

¹ From Table 18, supra.
² Based on actual counts of the number of criminal cases of each kind disposed of by each circuit court of appeals during the fiscal year 1929-30.

⁹⁷ See p. 93, supra.
⁹⁸ The allocation in the table is based on reports by the clerks of each circuit court of appeals as to the number of civil and criminal appeals disposed of during the year. No attempt was made to eliminate cases from outside the continental United States. The first circuit hears appeals from Porto-Rico; the fifth circuit, appeals from the Canal Zone; and the ninth circuit, appeals from Alaska, Hawaii, and the United States Court for China; but these are relatively insignificant in number and have been ignored.

4. *The Supreme Court of the United States.*—The proper allocation as between civil and criminal business and as between various kinds of criminal business of the cost of the Supreme Court is made somewhat difficult by the fact that many cases docketed in that court are petitions for certiorari which are decided on comparatively short briefs and without hearing oral argument. It is difficult to appraise the relative amount of time occupied in considering such petitions and in hearing and deciding cases on the merits. The allocation here presented is based in part upon the relative number of petitions for certiorari considered and the relative number of decisions of the merits in various classes of cases, and in part on an estimate by the clerk of the Supreme Court.⁹⁹

Table 20 shows the cost of the criminal business of the Supreme Court and the extent to which that cost is chargeable to the handling of prohibition cases, antinarcotic cases, motor vehicle theft cases, and other criminal cases.

TABLE 20.—*Cost of various kinds of business of the Supreme Court, 1929-30*

Type of case	Decided on merits ¹		Certiorari petitions ²		Percent adopted ⁴	Cost
	Number ³	Percent	Number ³	Percent		
Civil cases:						
Prohibition cases ⁵	4	2.94	12	1.83	2.0	\$7,307.62
Other cases.....	123	90.44	580	88.28	89.5	327,016.14
Total civil.....	127	93.38	592	90.11	91.5	334,323.76
Criminal cases:⁶						
Prohibition law.....	3	2.21	28	4.27	3.0	13,153.72
Antinarcotic laws.....	1	.73	2	.30	.2	730.76
Motor vehicle theft act.....	0	0	1	.15	.1	305.38
Other criminal laws.....	6	3.08	34	6.17	4.0	16,807.54
Total criminal⁶.....	9	6.02	65	9.80	8.5	31,057.40
Total civil and criminal.....	136	100.00	657	100.00	100.0	365,381.16

¹ Where several cases were disposed of in a single opinion, they have been counted as 1 case. Per curiam decisions are included.

² Petitions granted and denied.

³ Count made by Mr. Sydney Waldocker, of the New York bar.

⁴ After consultation with the clerk of the Supreme Court.

⁵ Includes prohibition cases coming up from the State courts.

⁶ Includes criminal cases coming up from the State courts.

5. *Summary of criminal court costs.*—The total cost of the Federal courts chargeable to the administration of criminal justice during the year ended June 30, 1930, is shown in Table 21.

⁹⁹ Acknowledgment is made to Hon. Charles Elmore Cropley, clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, for cooperation in this regard.

TABLE 21.—*Cost of the criminal business of the Federal courts, 1929-30*

District courts:	
Courts.....	¹ \$5,615,837.05
Commissioners.....	² 588,820.91
Circuit courts of appeals.....	³ 95,208.95
Supreme Court.....	⁴ 31,057.40
Total.....	6,331,015.21

¹ From Table 15, supra.

² From Table 17, supra.

³ From Table 18, supra.

⁴ From Table 20, supra.

The extent to which the cost of the Federal courts is chargeable to the handling of criminal cases involving violations of the prohibition laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws is shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22.—*Cost of various kinds of criminal business of the Federal courts, 1929-30*

Enforcement of—	District courts ¹	United States commissioners ²	Circuit courts of appeals ³	Supreme Court ⁴	Total	Per cent
Prohibition laws.....	\$3,836,305.28	\$406,796.80	\$51,748.77	\$13,153.72	\$4,308,004.57	68.1
Antinarcotic laws.....	325,731.18	40,334.72	7,001.12	730.76	373,797.78	5.9
Motor vehicle theft act.....	243,688.15	27,915.44	1,742.27	365.38	273,711.24	4.3
Other criminal laws.....	1,210,113.34	113,773.95	34,806.79	10,807.54	1,375,501.62	21.7
Total.....	5,615,837.95	588,820.91	95,208.95	31,057.40	6,331,015.21	100.0

¹ From Table 16, supra.

² From Table 17, supra.

³ From Table 19, supra.

⁴ From Table 20, supra.

CHAPTER VII

COST OF FEDERAL PENAL INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT

1. *Permanent penal institutions.*—The cost of each of the 6 permanent Federal penal institutions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, is shown in Table 23:

TABLE 23.—*Cost of Federal penitentiaries and reformatories, 1929-30*

Institution	Location	Operating cost
United States Penitentiary.....	Atlanta, Ga.....	¹ \$1,167,463.22
United States Penitentiary.....	Leavenworth, Kans.....	¹ 1,598,864.11
United States Penitentiary.....	McNeil Island, Wash.....	¹ 413,306.28
United States Industrial Reformatory.....	Chillicothe, Ohio.....	¹ 655,789.54
Federal Industrial Institution for Women.....	Alderson, W. Va.....	¹ 330,781.47
National Training School for Boys.....	Washington, D. C.....	² 207,082.00
Total.....		4,370,266.62

¹ From Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, p. 81, adjusted to eliminate credits of profits on farm operation.

² From Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 290.

The details of the operating cost for the 5 permanent Federal penal institutions for adults are given in Table 24:

TABLE 24.—*Analysis of operating cost of Federal penitentiaries and reformatories for adults, 1929-30*

Expenditure ¹	Atlanta	Leavenworth	McNeil Island	Chillicothe	Alderson	Total
Salaries and wages.....	\$317, 623. 11	\$486, 393. 07	\$144, 823. 50	\$188, 070. 30	\$142, 365. 04	\$1, 279, 880. 11
Subsistence.....	383, 321. 07	619, 673. 00	106, 063. 86	232, 394. 30	60, 189. 30	1, 301, 550. 33
Other expenses.....	304, 725. 74	462, 027. 10	114, 764. 14	178, 329. 40	116, 851. 16	1, 176, 697. 54
Commitments and releases ²	161, 789. 70	130, 370. 88	47, 644. 70	56, 305. 45	17, 375. 01	414, 070. 64
Total.....	1, 167, 463. 22	1, 598, 864. 11	413, 300. 28	655, 789. 54	336, 781. 47	4, 172, 204. 62

¹ This classification follows that used in this report (pt. 5, pp. 218-219, *infra*) in giving analyses of operating costs of State penal institutions, with the addition of the classification of "Commitments and releases" expenditures.

² Includes transportation, clothing, and gratuities allowed to released prisoners and other expenses incident to commitments and discharges.

The annual operating cost per inmate of permanent Federal penal institutions for adults is shown in Table 25:

TABLE 25.—*Operating cost per inmate of Federal penitentiaries and reformatories for adults, 1929-30*

Institution	Operating cost ¹	Average population ²	Annual cost per inmate
Atlanta.....	\$1, 167, 463. 22	3, 725	\$313. 41
Leavenworth.....	1, 598, 864. 11	4, 482	356. 73
McNeil Island.....	413, 300. 28	1, 010	409. 21
Chillicothe.....	655, 789. 54	1, 477	444. 00
Alderson.....	336, 781. 47	450	738. 56
Total.....	4, 172, 204. 62	11, 150	\$374. 10

¹ From Table 24, *supra*.

² Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, p. 79.

³ This figure differs slightly from those given in Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, p. 82, because prison farm receipts have not been deducted from cost. See Table 23, *supra*, note 1. As to the reason for not deducting farm profits, see pp. 88-89, *supra*.

The extent to which the cost of Federal penal institutions is chargeable to the confinement of persons convicted of violating the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws is shown in Table 26.

TABLE 26.—*Cost of Federal penitentiary and reformatory confinement of adults, by offenses, 1929-30*

Violation of—	Per cent of total prisoners ¹	Cost
Prohibition law.....	26.2	\$1, 218, 283. 75
Antinarcotic laws.....	25.7	1, 072, 256. 50
Motor vehicle theft act.....	14.2	592, 453. 06
Other criminal laws.....	30.9	1, 280, 211. 22
Total.....	100.0	\$4, 172, 204. 62

¹ Percentages based on mean of total prisoners and of prisoners in each group at beginning and end of the fiscal year. Compare the percentages of prisoners of each group at the end of the fiscal year given in note 64, *supra*.

² From Table 24, *supra*.

2. *Prison camps.*—The cost of the four Federal prison camps for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, is shown in Table 27.¹

TABLE 27.—*Cost of Federal prison camps, 1929-30*

Camp Riley, Kans.....	\$3, 461. 31
Camp Meade, Md.....	5, 444. 34
Camp Bragg, N. C.....	21, 694. 71
Camp Lee, Va.....	9, 681. 08
Total.....	40, 582. 34

The extent to which the cost of Federal prison camps is chargeable to the confinement of persons convicted of violating the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other criminal laws is shown in Table 28.

TABLE 28.—*Cost of Federal prison camp confinement for various offenses, 1929-30*

Violation of—	Per cent of total prisoners ¹	Cost
Prohibition law.....	29.2	\$11, 850. 04
Antinarcotic laws.....	25.7	10, 429. 66
Motor vehicle theft act.....	14.2	5, 762. 60
Other criminal laws.....	30.9	12, 539. 95
Total.....	100.0	\$40, 582. 34

¹ Same percentage as used in Table 26 for Federal penitentiaries. Data are not available regarding offenses committed by prisoners in road camps.

² From Table 27, *supra*.

3. *Prisoners in State, county and municipal institutions.*—As has already been pointed out,² a substantial number of

¹ Information furnished by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

² See pp. 80-81, *supra*.

Federal prisoners, including almost all such prisoners who are serving sentences of one year or less, are confined in State, county or municipal penitentiaries, houses of correction, jails, or other penal institutions.

The total cost of prisoners confined in such institutions during the fiscal year 1929-30 was \$3,786,510.³ The extent to which such cost was incurred in connection with the imprisonment of violators of the prohibition law, the anti-narcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws is shown by Table 29.

TABLE 29.—Cost of confinement of Federal prisoners in State, county and municipal penal institutions, by offenses, 1929-30

Violation of—	Per cent ¹	Cost
Prohibition law.....	65.3	\$2,472,591.03
Antinarcotic laws.....	5.9	223,404.09
Motor vehicle theft act.....	5.0	189,325.50
Other criminal laws.....	23.8	901,189.38
Total.....	100.0	3,786,510.00

¹ Percentage based on mean of total prisoners and prisoners in each group at beginning and end of the fiscal year as shown by the records of the Department of Justice.

4. *The National Training School for Boys.*—The operating cost of the National Training School for Boys during the fiscal year 1930 amounted to \$207,062,⁴ which is allocable between various classes of offenders as shown by Table 30.

TABLE 30.—Cost of National Training School for Boys, by offenses, 1929-30

Violation of—	Per cent ¹	Cost
Prohibition law.....	28.8	\$59,633.66
Antinarcotic laws.....	.6	1,242.37
Motor vehicle theft act.....	47.7	98,768.57
Other criminal laws.....	22.0	47,417.20
Total.....	100.0	207,062.00

¹ Based on number of prisoners committed. See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 315.

5. *General administration.*—The cost of the supervisory activities of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice is shown by Table 31.

¹ Information furnished by Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

⁴ Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, p. 299.

TABLE 31.—Cost of Bureau of Prisons, 1929-30

Agency	Total cost	Per cent penal	Penal cost
Bureau of Prisons.....	\$168,589.20	100.0	\$168,589.20
Department overhead.....	812,173.68	113.0	105,582.58
Total.....			274,171.78

¹ Arrived at as follows: The total cost of the Department of Justice exclusive of overhead for the fiscal year 1929-30 was \$1,293,829.50. The pro rata part of the cost of the overhead allocable to the cost of the Bureau of Prisons is obtained by dividing the cost of that bureau (\$168,589.20) by the total cost of the department, exclusive of overhead.

This total cost of general administration is allocable to offenses as shown in Table 32.

TABLE 32.—General administration cost of Federal penal treatment, by offenses, 1929-30

Offense	Per cent ¹	Cost
Prohibition law.....	20.2	\$80,058.16
Antinarcotic laws.....	25.7	70,462.15
Motor vehicle theft act.....	14.2	38,932.39
Other criminal laws.....	30.9	84,719.03
Total.....	106.0	274,171.78

¹ Based on mean of total prisoners and of prisoners in each group in permanent Federal penal institutions for adults at the beginning and end of the fiscal year. The allocation is made on this basis for the reason that the work of the Bureau of Prisons was, during the fiscal year 1929-30, practically confined to the supervision of the permanent Federal institutions for adults.

6. *Summary of costs of penal treatment.*—The total cost of penal treatment by the Federal Government for the year ended June 30, 1930, is shown in Table 33.

TABLE 33.—Cost of Federal penal treatment, 1929-30

Penal agency	Cost
Permanent Federal penal institutions for adults ¹	\$4,172,204.62
Federal prison camps ²	40,582.34
Federal prisoners in State, county and municipal penal institutions ³	3,786,510.00
National Training School for Boys ⁴	207,062.00
General administration ⁵	274,171.78
Total.....	8,480,530.74

¹ From Table 25, supra.
² From Table 27, supra.
³ From Table 29, supra.

⁴ From Table 30, supra.
⁵ From Table 31, supra.

The extent to which the cost of Federal penal treatment is incurred in connection with persons imprisoned for violating the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act and other Federal criminal laws is shown in Table 34.

TABLE 34.—Cost of Federal penal treatment for various offenses, 1929-30

Violations of—	Permanent Federal institutions for adults ¹	Federal prison camps ²	State, county and municipal institutions ³	National Training School for Boys ⁴	General administration ⁵	Total	Per cent
Prohibition law.....	\$1,218,283.75	\$11,850.04	\$2,472,591.03	\$59,653.86	\$80,058.16	\$3,842,416.84	45.3
Antinarcotic laws.....	1,072,256.59	10,429.65	223,404.09	1,242.37	70,462.15	1,377,794.86	16.3
Motor vehicle theft act.....	522,453.06	5,762.69	159,323.50	98,768.57	38,932.89	925,242.21	10.9
Other criminal laws.....	1,289,211.22	12,539.95	901,189.38	47,417.29	84,719.08	2,335,076.83	27.5
Total.....	4,172,204.62	40,592.34	3,786,510.00	207,062.00	274,171.78	8,490,530.74	100.0

¹ From Table 26, supra.² From Table 28, supra.³ From Table 29, supra.⁴ From Table 30, supra.⁵ From Table 32, supra.

CHAPTER VIII

COST OF FEDERAL PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON

1. *Introductory.*—As has already been indicated,⁵ Federal probation and parole were not administered on any extensive scale in the fiscal year 1929-30. Hence, while this study as a whole covers only that year, and while the figures for probation, parole and pardon costs included in the totals for the year are the actual figures, it has been thought desirable to include tables showing the estimated expenditures for probation and parole for the current fiscal year so as to give some idea of how current costs of this character may be expected to run.⁶

The cost figures here presented as to Federal probation, parole, and pardon costs have been obtained from the reports of the Department of Justice. The division of probation costs between various types of criminal cases has been made on the basis of the relative amount of time spent on such classes of cases by the district courts having probation officers attached.

2. *Probation.*—Table 35 gives the cost of Federal probation by districts for the fiscal year 1929-30, and also presents data as to the extent to which the cost of probation is allocable to various types of offenses on the basis of the relative amount of time spent by the district court in each district in which probation was administered during that year on different types of criminal cases.

It will be noted that only 9 out of the 84 judicial districts in the continental United States had probation systems in operation during the year ending June 30, 1930. The situation for the current fiscal year is very different, as is shown in Table 36, which gives estimated expenditures by districts for the year ending June 30, 1931, compared with actual expenditures for the preceding year.

⁵ See pp. 81-82, supra.⁶ This has not been necessary with the other Federal costs of administering criminal justice, as no sudden changes in the cost of police, prosecution, courts, and penal institutions have taken place during the current fiscal year. The shift of prohibition enforcement from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice (cf. p. 73, supra) did not, of course, affect total police costs.

TABLE 35.—Cost of Federal probation for various offenses, 1929-30

District	Total cost ¹	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal	
		Per cent ²	Cost	Per cent ²	Cost	Per cent ²	Cost	Per cent ²	Cost
Alabama: Northern	\$121.41	80.0	\$97.13	2.9	\$3.52	3.8	\$4.61	13.3	\$16.15
Georgia: Middle	3,037.26	65.8	1,998.52	5.3	160.97	5.3	160.97	23.0	716.80
Illinois: Eastern	3,077.04	80.0	2,461.63	6.7	206.16	13.3	409.25	-----	-----
Indiana: Northern	14.99	66.7	10.00	8.3	1.24	16.7	2.51	8.3	1.24
Massachusetts	3,768.59	65.2	2,457.12	5.4	203.50	2.3	86.68	27.1	1,021.29
New York: Southern	2,166.66	59.1	1,280.50	4.5	97.50	-----	-----	36.4	788.00
Pennsylvania:									
Eastern	3,046.61	75.0	2,284.96	2.0	60.93	1.0	30.47	22.0	670.25
Western	2,967.92	40.0	1,187.17	10.0	296.79	10.0	296.79	40.0	1,187.17
West Virginia:									
Southern	3,321.77	90.1	2,992.01	1.5	49.83	1.5	49.83	6.9	229.20
Total	21,522.25	68.0	14,760.94	5.0	1,080.44	4.9	1,041.11	21.5	630.76

¹ From Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 302-305.

² Based on relative amount of time spent by the district court for each district on various classes of criminal cases. See p. 135, supra.

³ Computed.

TABLE 36.—Estimated expenditures for Federal probation, 1930-31

District	Estimated expenditures, 1930-31 ¹	Actual expenditures, 1929-30 ²	District	Estimated expenditures, 1930-31 ¹	Actual expenditures, 1929-30 ²
Alabama:			New York:		
Northern	\$3,200.00	\$121.41	Northern	\$3,200.00	-----
Southern	3,000.00	-----	Southern	7,900.00	\$2,166.66
Arkansas: Eastern	3,200.00	-----	Eastern	3,000.00	-----
Arizona	3,600.00	-----	Western	3,200.00	-----
California:			North Carolina:		
Northern	3,400.00	-----	Eastern	3,000.00	-----
Southern	3,200.00	-----	Middle	3,200.00	-----
Connecticut	3,200.00	-----	Western	3,200.00	-----
Florida: Southern	3,500.00	-----	Oregon	3,400.00	-----
Georgia:			Ohio:		
Middle	3,200.00	3,037.26	Northern	3,200.00	-----
Northern	4,800.00	-----	Southern	3,400.00	-----
Southern	3,200.00	-----	Oklahoma: Northern	3,200.00	-----
Illinois:			Pennsylvania:		
Eastern	3,600.00	3,077.04	Eastern	7,900.00	3,046.61
Northern	7,900.00	-----	Middle	3,600.00	-----
Southern	3,200.00	-----	Western	8,000.00	2,967.92
Indiana: Northern	3,200.00	14.99	Rhode Island	3,200.00	-----
Iowa: Southern	3,000.00	-----	South Carolina:		
Kansas	3,200.00	-----	Western	3,000.00	-----
Kentucky:			South Dakota	3,200.00	-----
Eastern	7,900.00	-----	Tennessee:		
Western	3,200.00	-----	Middle	3,200.00	-----
Louisiana: Eastern	3,200.00	-----	Western	3,000.00	-----
Maryland	3,200.00	-----	Texas:		
Massachusetts	7,900.00	3,768.59	Northern	3,600.00	-----
Michigan:			Southern	3,400.00	-----
Eastern	3,200.00	-----	Eastern	3,200.00	-----
Western	3,200.00	-----	Western	3,200.00	-----
Minnesota	8,400.00	-----	Washington: Western	3,200.00	-----
Missouri:			West Virginia:		
Eastern	3,200.00	-----	Southern	7,900.00	3,321.77
Western	3,200.00	-----	Total	221,100.00	21,522.25
Montana	3,600.00	-----	Office of supervisor of probation	6,400.00	-----
Nebraska	3,200.00	-----	Grand total	227,500.00	21,522.25
Nevada	3,200.00	-----			
New Jersey	3,200.00	-----			
New Mexico	3,400.00	-----			

¹ Estimated by the supervisor of probation, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

² From Table 35, supra.

Under the new arrangement, the Federal probation officers will also have charge of field work in connection with parole, so that a portion of the estimated expense for the fiscal year 1930-31 is properly chargeable to parole activities.

3. *Parole.*—It is impossible to estimate the amount expended for parole activities during the fiscal year 1929-30, as all parole work was done by prison officers who had other duties. The cost of parole for that year is therefore absorbed in the cost of penal treatment given in the preceding chapter.⁷ It is safe to say, however, that the cost of parole activities was slight.

The parole situation for the current fiscal year is quite different.⁸ Table 37 gives estimated expenditures for parole for the year ending June 30, 1931.⁹

TABLE 37.—Estimated expenditures for Federal parole, 1930-31

Board of parole	\$30,200
Office of supervisor of parole	8,440
Parole officers at institutions	14,100
Total	61,740

In addition, a portion of the expenses of probation officers will properly be chargeable to parole, since, as has been stated, the probation officers will do the field work in connection with paroled prisoners.

4. *The pardon attorney.*—As has already been pointed out,¹⁰ the work of the pardon attorney of the Department of Justice is closely allied functionally to the parole activities of the department, and the cost of his office is therefore considered in connection with probation and parole costs. The cost of the pardon attorney for the year ending June 30, 1930, divided to indicate the parts of that cost allocable to prohibition cases, antinarcotic cases, motor vehicle theft cases, and other criminal cases, is shown in Table 38.

⁷ See pp. 120-134, supra.

⁸ See Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States: Fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, pp. 89-93 (report of Director Bureau of Prisons).

⁹ Estimated by the supervisor of parole, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

¹⁰ See p. 83, supra.

TABLE 38.—Cost of office of Federal pardon attorney chargeable to various offenses, 1929-30

Violation of—	Per cent ¹	Cost
Prohibition law.....	70	\$22,569.40
Antinarcotic laws.....	5	1,612.10
Motor vehicle theft act.....	5	1,612.10
Other criminal laws.....	20	6,448.40
Total.....	100	\$32,242.00

¹ Estimated by the pardon attorney, Department of Justice.

² From the records of the Department of Justice; includes proportionate share of overhead.

5. *Summary of probation and pardon costs.*—Table 39 gives the total cost of Federal probation and pardon for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930,¹¹ and indicates the extent to which such cost is chargeable to the probation and pardon of violators of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act and other criminal laws.

TABLE 39.—Cost of Federal probation and pardon for various offenses, 1929-30

Violations of—	Probation cost ¹		Pardon attorney ²		Total	
	Amount	Per cent ³	Amount	Per cent ³	Amount	Per cent ³
Prohibition law.....	\$14,769.94	68.6	\$22,569.40	70.0	\$37,339.34	69.3
Antinarcotic laws.....	1,080.44	5.0	1,612.10	5.0	2,692.54	5.0
Motor vehicle theft act.....	1,041.11	4.9	1,612.10	5.0	2,653.21	5.0
Other criminal laws.....	4,630.76	21.5	6,448.40	20.0	11,079.16	20.7
Total.....	21,522.25	100.0	32,242.00	100.0	53,764.25	100.0

¹ From Table 35, supra.

² From Table 33, supra.

³ Computed.

CHAPTER IX

THE COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF ADMINISTERING THE CRIMINAL LAW

1. *General summary.*—Table 40 shows the total cost of administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government for the year ended June 30, 1930.

¹¹ Parole costs are included in the cost of penal and correctional institutions. See p. 137, supra.

TABLE 40.—Cost of Federal criminal justice, 1929-30

Agency	Cost	Per cent
Police (criminal):¹		
Department of Justice.....	\$2,058,156.55	5.0
Other executive departments and establishments.....	30,245,584.04	67.4
United States marshals.....	3,020,174.69	5.7
Total police.....	35,323,915.28	68.1
Prosecution:⁴		
Department of Justice.....	198,891.14	.4
United States attorneys.....	1,758,305.72	3.3
Other agencies ⁵	39,780.00	(⁶)
Total prosecution.....	1,996,976.86	3.7
Courts:⁷		
District courts.....	5,015,837.95	10.6
United States commissioners.....	588,820.91	1.1
Circuit courts of appeals.....	95,298.95	.2
Supreme Court.....	31,057.40	.1
Total courts.....	6,331,015.21	12.0
Penal institutional treatment:⁸		
Permanent Federal institutions for adults.....	4,172,204.62	7.9
Federal prison camps.....	40,582.34	.1
State, county and municipal institutions.....	3,780,510.00	7.2
National Training School for Boys.....	207,002.00	.4
General administration.....	274,171.78	.5
Total penal institutional treatment.....	8,480,530.74	16.1
Probation and pardon:⁹		
Probation.....	21,522.25	(⁶)
Pardon.....	32,242.00	(⁶)
Total probation and pardon.....	53,764.25	.1
Aggregate cost.....	62,786,202.94	100.0

¹ From Table 7, supra.

² If the Bureau of Prohibition had been transferred to the Department of Justice a year earlier, this figure would be 22.0 per cent.

³ If the Bureau of Prohibition had been transferred to the Department of Justice a year earlier, this figure would be 40.4 per cent.

⁴ From Table 13, supra.

⁵ Penal division of General Counsel's office, Bureau of Internal Revenue.

⁶ Less than 0.1 per cent.

⁷ From Table 21, supra.

⁸ From Table 33, supra.

⁹ From Table 30, supra.

The per capita cost of the administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government in the year 1929-30, was \$0.430, and the total cost was 1.37 per cent of the entire expenditures of the Federal Government.¹²

2. *Geographical distribution of cost.*—Table 41 shows the distribution of the cost of administration of criminal justice by districts and by geographical regions. It covers the cost of United States marshals, United States attorneys, the district courts, United States commissioners, and probation officers only.¹³

¹² Population data from the 1930 census. Total United States expenditures from general and special funds, not including trust funds, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, were \$3,862,030,019.80. See Budget Statement, 1932, p. A 93.

¹³ No useful purpose would, it is believed, be served by an attempt to allocate the other elements of the cost of Federal criminal justice to judicial districts or geographical subdivisions.

TABLE 41.—Geographical distribution of specified Federal costs of criminal justice, 1929-30

Division and district	Criminal police cost (marshals) ¹	Prosecution cost (U. S. attorneys) ²	Court costs		Probation cost ³	Total cost	
			District courts ⁴	Commissioners ⁴		Amount	Per capita ⁵
New England:							
Maine.....	\$13, 107. 44	\$10, 761. 87	\$13, 100. 73	\$2, 194. 00		\$39, 164. 04	\$0. 049
New Hampshire.....	13, 553. 09	8, 213. 78	28, 371. 49	1, 822. 30		51, 960. 66	. 112
Vermont.....	25, 543. 98	5, 131. 06	27, 341. 93	1, 256. 20		59, 273. 17	. 165
Massachusetts.....	21, 636. 78	13, 599. 76	60, 458. 13	8, 937. 30	\$3, 768. 59	108, 400. 56	. 026
Rhode Island.....	13, 110. 53	12, 650. 16	21, 952. 13	2, 900. 05		50, 612. 87	. 073
Connecticut.....	8, 704. 97	7, 774. 30	23, 030. 85	2, 605. 45		42, 115. 57	. 026
Total.....	95, 656. 79	58, 130. 93	174, 255. 26	19, 715. 30	3, 768. 59	351, 526. 87	. 043
Middle Atlantic:							
New York—							
Northern.....	45, 554. 48	39, 240. 63	95, 063. 56	17, 266. 30		197, 124. 97	
Eastern.....	38, 832. 80	71, 892. 69	245, 438. 21	14, 218. 00		370, 381. 70	. 098
Southern.....	91, 279. 57	180, 968. 91	190, 880. 14	30, 181. 65	2, 166. 66	495, 476. 93	
Western.....	46, 885. 17	39, 873. 33	72, 209. 48	17, 623. 34		176, 591. 32	
New Jersey.....	63, 353. 45	36, 415. 30	144, 278. 87	6, 178. 75		250, 226. 37	. 062
Pennsylvania—							
Eastern.....	21, 857. 45	22, 168. 08	59, 615. 62	6, 786. 95	3, 046. 61	113, 474. 71	
Middle.....	20, 159. 23	11, 456. 58	45, 135. 89	3, 791. 55		80, 543. 25	. 040
Western.....	28, 555. 32	38, 248. 87	100, 506. 69	9, 975. 90	2, 967. 92	180, 254. 70	
Total.....	356, 477. 47	440, 264. 39	953, 128. 46	106, 022. 44	8, 181. 19	1, 864, 073. 95	. 071
East North Central:							
Ohio—							
Northern.....	57, 909. 25	31, 029. 61	66, 966. 14	10, 969. 05		166, 874. 05	
Southern.....	46, 449. 98	33, 838. 29	62, 877. 68	6, 100. 90		149, 266. 85	. 043
Indiana—							
Northern.....	23, 567. 34	19, 063. 23	50, 243. 56	2, 846. 68	14. 69	95, 735. 80	
Southern.....	33, 003. 83	8, 861. 32	39, 238. 30	3, 503. 47		84, 607. 01	. 056
Illinois—							
Northern.....	81, 894. 23	9, 282. 08	133, 459. 79	12, 376. 10		237, 112. 20	
Eastern.....	42, 431. 05	18, 616. 38	90, 584. 53	4, 405. 45	3, 077. 04	159, 114. 45	. 066
Southern.....	20, 685. 70	17, 252. 10	62, 500. 66	4, 196. 80		104, 635. 35	
Michigan—							
Eastern.....	79, 622. 80	40, 101. 65	132, 230. 30	9, 240. 75		261, 195. 50	
Western.....	36, 184. 84	9, 108. 55	34, 774. 61	1, 886. 85		81, 954. 85	. 071
Wisconsin—							
Eastern.....	11, 564. 15	12, 672. 10	27, 122. 72	3, 156. 15		54, 515. 12	
Western.....	19, 832. 29	9, 767. 44	29, 290. 49	4, 981. 70		63, 871. 92	. 040
Total.....	453, 145. 55	209, 592. 75	729, 388. 87	63, 663. 90	3, 092. 03	1, 458, 883. 10	. 058
West North Central:							
Minnesota—							
Iowa—							
Northern.....	47, 324. 45	22, 926. 83	115, 650. 06	12, 331. 70		198, 233. 04	. 077
Southern.....	20, 229. 77	7, 737. 93	37, 754. 88	3, 696. 20		69, 418. 78	
Missouri—							
Eastern.....	24, 074. 81	11, 692. 33	49, 003. 57	2, 686. 45		86, 457. 16	. 063
Western.....	29, 292. 99	28, 810. 13	64, 054. 15	5, 926. 28		128, 083. 55	. 072
North Dakota—							
Eastern.....	44, 026. 01	20, 935. 54	59, 976. 19	7, 468. 79		132, 406. 53	
Western.....	22, 437. 20	13, 991. 41	32, 035. 07	452. 70		68, 916. 38	. 101
South Dakota—							
Eastern.....	33, 845. 05	15, 585. 02	124, 806. 26	1, 797. 30		175, 033. 63	. 253
Western.....	19, 737. 16	27, 051. 46	81, 197. 28	3, 085. 40		131, 071. 30	. 095
Nebraska—							
Eastern.....	35, 367. 36	19, 446. 09	50, 757. 27	2, 372. 50		107, 943. 22	. 057
Total.....	276, 334. 80	168, 176. 74	613, 234. 73	39, 817. 32		1, 097, 563. 59	. 083
South Atlantic:							
Delaware—							
Maryland.....	6, 369. 80	5, 493. 95	9, 617. 92	1, 114. 65		22, 596. 32	. 099
Virginia—							
Eastern.....	34, 855. 55	24, 834. 18	52, 488. 94	7, 153. 05		119, 331. 72	. 073
Western.....	20, 924. 50	20, 037. 32	30, 601. 63	2, 304. 30		73, 867. 75	
West Virginia—							
Northern.....	21, 400. 72	11, 545. 49	28, 232. 28	2, 361. 75		63, 540. 24	. 057
Southern.....	29, 626. 53	17, 154. 99	32, 972. 29	3, 991. 10		83, 744. 91	. 150
North Carolina—							
Eastern.....	73, 609. 36	23, 735. 41	60, 727. 33	14, 525. 35	3, 321. 77	175, 919. 22	
Middle.....	48, 214. 57	11, 779. 55	64, 481. 82	7, 818. 70		132, 294. 64	. 108
Western.....	36, 718. 33	12, 378. 56	63, 183. 88	5, 616. 65		117, 897. 42	
South Carolina—							
Eastern.....	25, 514. 19	11, 252. 45	50, 253. 04	5, 847. 25		92, 871. 93	
Western.....	30, 266. 31	12, 739. 68	88, 227. 02	5, 486. 80		136, 719. 81	. 124
Total.....	23, 808. 30	9, 628. 72	42, 852. 41	2, 922. 40		79, 271. 83	

See footnotes at end of table.

03660—31—10

TABLE 41.—Geographical distribution of specified Federal costs of criminal justice, 1929-30—Continued

Division and district	Criminal police cost (marshals) ¹	Prosecution cost (U. S. attorneys) ²	Court costs		Probation cost ³	Total cost	
			District courts ⁴	Commissioners ⁴		Amount	Per capita
South Atlantic—Continued							
Georgia—							
Northern.....	\$41,024.66	\$19,422.10	\$90,566.18	\$10,963.50		\$161,976.53	} \$0.129
Middle.....	30,615.83	10,690.01	61,747.34	5,906.55	\$3,037.26	111,997.04	
Southern.....	22,743.78	14,765.20	59,596.01	3,477.37		100,587.36	
Florida—							
Northern.....	13,256.52	6,124.25	30,912.71	2,539.15		52,832.63	} .169
Southern.....	45,763.85	22,982.74	113,195.09	12,576.80		194,518.48	
Total.....	504,777.85	234,564.69	879,660.89	94,655.37	6,359.03	1,720,017.83	.112
East South Central:							
Kentucky—							
Eastern.....	100,776.99	23,558.08	135,955.86	42,862.05		303,150.98	} .152
Western.....	30,551.40	11,407.13	39,767.67	12,861.75		94,587.95	
Tennessee—							
Eastern.....	26,075.32	15,187.05	48,758.30	7,443.30		97,463.97	} .118
Middle.....	33,653.65	14,799.99	83,434.35	12,838.60		144,731.59	
Western.....	18,783.31	9,449.29	35,719.31	2,894.30		66,546.21	
Alabama—							
Northern.....	23,795.32	21,036.44	40,131.62	3,334.05	121.41	88,418.84	} .079
Middle.....	16,222.68	6,162.75	22,293.81	2,999.55		47,778.79	
Southern.....	16,992.09	14,000.18	40,315.32	2,731.90		74,039.49	
Mississippi—							
Northern.....	20,678.72	7,153.17	39,793.26	1,430.10		69,061.25	} .073
Southern.....	24,430.60	7,969.16	43,851.99	2,153.56		78,405.31	
Total.....	311,965.08	130,721.24	530,121.49	91,555.16	121.41	1,064,484.38	.108
West South Central:							
Arkansas—							
Eastern.....	29,578.55	20,947.48	47,208.39	7,135.78		104,870.20	} .100
Western.....	26,742.76	7,550.53	42,883.72	3,422.53		80,599.54	
Louisiana—							
Eastern.....	53,329.54	26,618.44	58,135.59	6,945.50		145,029.07	} .109
Western.....	22,248.73	15,650.98	43,326.48	2,263.10		83,489.29	
Oklahoma—							
Northern.....	45,899.63	15,766.56	61,663.19	7,706.65		131,036.03	} .142
Eastern.....	36,912.47	15,844.67	45,742.14	9,750.75		108,250.03	
Western.....	27,009.99	13,073.32	55,411.88	5,454.20		100,949.39	
Texas—							
Northern.....	51,777.88	25,100.36	120,694.64	9,688.38		207,261.26	} .120
Eastern.....	18,164.49	11,582.55	39,915.93	5,159.72		74,852.69	
Southern.....	50,375.36	26,434.07	91,257.03	20,610.34		183,676.80	
Western.....	73,946.69	23,955.25	115,713.79	15,698.30		229,314.03	
Total.....	435,986.09	202,524.21	721,952.78	93,865.25		1,454,328.33	.119
Mountain:							
Montana.....	28,173.81	10,424.90	59,463.03	7,553.30		108,615.09	.202
Idaho.....	31,807.77	11,040.33	69,058.75	2,767.00		114,673.85	.258
Wyoming.....	18,203.64	7,161.97	33,232.10	2,855.50		61,453.21	.272
Colorado.....	35,741.21	17,097.04	63,669.82	4,283.85		120,791.92	.117
New Mexico.....	45,171.56	20,058.30	50,770.80	3,463.60		119,464.26	.282
Arizona.....	87,046.08	22,534.73	126,426.71	9,534.35		245,541.87	.564
Utah.....	13,969.24	10,933.22	59,115.43	3,205.10		87,222.99	.172
Nevada.....	17,295.32	9,840.10	12,553.31	977.15		40,665.88	.447
Total.....	277,408.63	109,090.59	474,290.00	37,639.85		898,429.07	.243
Pacific:							
Washington—							
Eastern.....	19,008.34	11,756.32	44,229.34	3,676.25		78,670.25	} .133
Western.....	33,913.61	29,545.72	59,887.92	6,105.00		129,452.25	
Oregon.....	28,098.92	12,193.36	46,326.30	4,330.95		90,949.53	.695
California—							
Northern.....	68,340.22	30,679.30	164,033.75	18,098.55		281,151.82	} .086
Southern.....	62,697.44	28,347.99	102,731.25	9,675.57		203,452.25	
Total.....	212,038.53	112,522.69	417,208.56	41,886.32		783,676.10	.096
Grand total.....	2,923,810.79	1,665,588.23	5,493,241.04	588,820.91	21,522.25	10,692,983.22	.087

¹ From Table 5, supra.
² From Table 11, supra.
³ From Table 15, supra.

⁴ From Table 17, supra.
⁵ From Table 35, supra.
⁶ By divisions and States.

⁷ Includes \$2,000 for National Park commissioner.
⁸ Includes \$600 for National Park commissioner.
⁹ Includes \$4,000 for National Park commissioners.

3. *Cost of enforcing various types of laws.*—Table 42 shows the division of Federal criminal police, prosecution, criminal court, penal, and probation and pardon costs as between the enforcement of the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws.

TABLE 42.—*Cost of Federal criminal justice chargeable to various offenses, 1929-30*

Agency	Prohibition		Antinarcotic		Motor vehicle theft		Other criminal		Total	
	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
Police ¹	\$25,644,069.57	-----	\$1,648,031.56	-----	\$752,553.41	-----	\$7,879,261.34	-----	\$35,923,915.88	-----
Prosecution ²	966,720.33	-----	153,364.00	-----	124,104.71	-----	722,787.82	-----	1,966,976.86	-----
Courts ³	4,308,604.57	-----	373,797.78	-----	273,711.24	-----	1,375,501.62	-----	6,331,015.21	-----
Penal institutional treatment ⁴	3,842,416.84	-----	1,377,794.86	-----	925,242.21	-----	2,335,076.83	-----	8,480,530.74	-----
Probation and pardon ⁵	37,339.34	-----	2,692.54	-----	2,653.21	-----	11,079.16	-----	53,764.25	-----
Total.....	34,828,550.65	66.0	3,555,680.74	6.9	2,078,264.78	3.9	12,323,706.77	23.2	52,786,202.94	100.0

¹ From Table 8, supra.

² From Table 14, supra.

³ From Table 22, supra.

⁴ From Table 34, supra.

⁵ From Table 39, supra.

The table on the preceding page gives a reasonable estimate¹⁴ of the relative cost of enforcing the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act, and other Federal criminal laws through criminal proceedings. It does not show the cost of law enforcement by civil or administrative action.

Noncriminal procedure for law enforcement is common even in the case of laws which have criminal sanctions. The most important examples of this are the prohibition law and the antitrust laws, although there are numerous others.¹⁵ If the complete cost of enforcing the criminal laws is to be obtained, account should be taken of this fact. It has not been practical to secure data on the cost of administrative or civil enforcement of all Federal criminal statutes, but this has been possible in the case of the prohibition and antinarcotic laws.

In the case of the prohibition law, two classes of non-criminal costs are encountered: (a) the cost of administrative proceedings in the Bureau of Prohibition and the Bureau of Industrial Alcohol; and (b) the cost of civil proceedings by injunction suits or otherwise to enforce the law.¹⁶ In the case of the antinarcotic laws, the only class of noncriminal costs is the administrative and civil expense of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department. Data as to the Bureau of Prohibition and the Bureau of Narcotics were obtained from the Treasury Department; data as to the relative amounts of time spent by the marshals, the United States attorneys, and the Federal courts on civil prohibition cases were obtained by questionnaires.¹⁷

Table 43 gives the cost of both civil and criminal prohibition enforcement by judicial districts, but does not include the cost of the Department of Justice or of the Bureau of Prohibition of the Treasury Department.

¹⁴ Cf. pp. 94-95, supra.

¹⁵ Such as, for example, the customs and internal revenue laws, certain of the postal laws, and certain other regulatory statutes. Cf. p. 75, supra, note 15, and p. 77, supra, note 19.

¹⁶ Including proceedings to forfeit bonds in prohibition cases. See p. 87, supra.

¹⁷ The same questionnaires served to obtain this information and that as to the relative time spent on various types of criminal cases.

TABLE 43.—Cost of prohibition enforcement, by districts, 1929-30

District	Cost of civil enforcement				Cost of criminal enforcement ¹	Total cost
	Marshal ¹	Prosecution ¹	Court ¹	Total		
Alabama:						
Northern.....	\$585.88	\$433.74	\$608.42	\$1,628.04	\$34,530.69	\$36,158.73
Middle.....	762.10	624.41	1,803.87	3,190.38	15,718.64	19,209.02
Southern.....	81.12	150.54	230.70	462.36	32,480.01	32,942.37
Arizona.....	568.63	1,609.02	144.05	2,322.20	40,007.68	42,329.88
Arkansas:						
Eastern.....	316.00	598.50	350.82	1,275.32	42,250.60	43,525.92
Western.....	0	1,161.20	315.75	1,476.95	34,665.75	36,142.70
California:						
Northern.....	13,300.63	2,705.00	2,370.04	18,475.47	164,698.99	183,174.46
Southern.....	12,576.00	17,717.50	6,280.21	36,573.71	13,046.16	49,620.87
Colorado.....	414.20	1,315.16	3,430.56	5,159.92	34,249.07	39,409.99
Connecticut.....	1,493.40	2,332.29	663.90	4,489.59	22,108.95	26,598.54
Delaware.....	409.71	323.17	1,332.44	2,065.32	8,632.29	10,697.61
Florida:						
Northern.....	664.00	1,113.50	478.39	2,255.89	26,704.75	28,960.64
Southern.....	2,408.74	5,308.71	8,837.01	16,554.46	80,154.00	96,708.46
Georgia:						
Northern.....	3,053.99	358.44	1,037.29	4,449.72	80,209.03	84,658.75
Middle.....	1,474.27	1,527.15	852.72	3,854.14	54,741.04	58,595.78
Southern.....	948.50	2,160.32	1,111.53	4,160.35	52,713.28	56,873.63
Idaho.....	925.25	1,104.03	667.81	2,697.09	46,574.52	49,271.61
Illinois:						
Northern.....	36,728.17	1,732.65	13,930.31	52,491.13	93,630.37	146,121.50
Eastern.....	4,651.01	2,012.58	2,345.81	9,009.40	77,077.00	86,086.40
Southern.....	1,072.23	2,300.28	2,810.84	6,183.35	47,112.06	53,295.41
Indiana:						
Northern.....	2,618.23	2,541.77	0,315.20	5,475.20	35,855.01	41,330.21
Southern.....	559.53	886.13	1,075.44	3,121.10	27,162.00	30,283.10
Iowa:						
Northern.....	2,150.28	1,280.05	1,789.52	5,219.85	37,701.72	42,921.57
Southern.....	1,112.87	389.74	607.08	2,109.69	32,022.83	34,132.52
Kansas.....	868.76	121.54	2,836.02	3,826.32	17,616.76	21,443.08
Kentucky:						
Eastern.....	4,550.85	1,308.67	463.74	6,323.26	158,408.36	164,731.62
Western.....	1,241.07	1,754.94	4,337.41	7,334.02	42,983.21	50,317.23
Louisiana:						
Eastern.....	8,650.44	4,095.15	5,993.77	18,739.36	38,045.06	56,784.42
Western.....	428.89	1,167.98	940.02	2,536.89	24,633.54	27,170.43
Maine.....	1,239.73	1,434.92	1,820.56	4,495.21	7,608.44	12,103.65
Maryland.....	1,032.14	7,095.48	2,302.41	10,430.03	51,409.23	61,839.26
Massachusetts.....	12,217.25	2,781.77	4,885.70	19,884.72	49,413.16	69,297.88
Michigan:						
Eastern.....	9,833.42	13,367.22	22,706.87	45,907.51	83,690.49	129,607.00
Western.....	3,279.35	3,312.20	634.90	7,226.51	20,630.40	27,856.91
Minnesota.....	10,991.34	7,064.41	46,477.81	64,533.56	91,371.18	155,904.74
Mississippi:						
Northern.....	512.01	447.07	550.42	1,510.50	34,569.00	36,079.50
Southern.....	647.00	790.92	300.19	1,738.11	34,316.02	36,054.13
Missouri:						
Eastern.....	627.38	789.32	3,155.34	4,572.04	42,707.70	47,279.74
Western.....	3,155.30	2,526.70	497.00	6,179.00	44,334.50	50,513.50
Montana.....	16,407.03	6,949.93	6,478.02	29,834.98	50,470.72	80,305.70
Nebraska.....	498.97	1,501.26	13,903.94	15,904.17	47,762.01	63,666.18
Nevada.....	3,793.70	3,280.03	2,164.81	9,238.54	8,697.17	17,935.71
New Hampshire:						
Northern.....	1,615.80	1,368.04	4,443.87	7,427.71	27,798.28	35,225.99
New Jersey.....	12,424.39	9,103.83	14,519.58	36,047.80	104,438.04	140,485.84
New Mexico.....	3,035.57	1,020.03	473.06	4,528.66	25,741.56	30,270.22
New York:						
Northern.....	8,814.54	19,620.32	1,188.79	29,623.65	91,018.13	121,641.78
Eastern.....	26,025.00	29,206.41	5,336.83	60,568.24	235,007.26	295,575.50
Southern.....	28,597.45	28,400.07	15,219.07	72,216.59	150,472.62	222,689.21
Western.....	16,326.56	6,645.56	2,978.80	25,950.92	72,674.47	98,625.39
North Carolina:						
Eastern.....	1,125.84	906.12	2,644.06	4,676.02	60,611.37	65,287.39
Middle.....	2,765.37	728.15	1,398.38	4,891.90	55,813.09	60,705.69
Western.....	1,230.85	1,607.40	4,662.77	7,501.11	44,884.40	52,385.51

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 43.—Cost of prohibition enforcement, by districts, 1929-30—Continued.

District	Cost of civil enforcement				Cost of criminal enforcement ²	Total cost
	Marshal ¹	Prosecution ¹	Court ¹	Total		
North Dakota	\$1,846.50	\$1,748.93	\$420.80	\$4,016.29	\$8,010.04	\$12,026.33
Ohio:						
Northern	387.39	4,701.46	2,029.59	7,118.44	51,069.09	58,187.63
Southern	2,080.83	2,114.89	3,883.56	8,079.28	39,095.33	47,174.61
Oklahoma:						
Northern	286.47	1,126.13	320.86	1,733.51	23,517.39	25,250.90
Eastern	114.82	792.23	1,929.13	2,835.08	40,043.06	42,884.04
Western	297.29	229.39	275.48	772.13	45,762.17	46,534.30
Oregon	1,280.20	1,354.82		2,641.08	24,789.35	27,430.43
Pennsylvania:						
Eastern	17,089.55	12,315.60	6,446.60	30,751.75	50,500.23	87,311.98
Middle	3,991.24	3,182.38	3,990.27	11,163.89	37,850.98	49,014.85
Western	5,923.38	8,113.40	9,415.55	23,452.33	65,133.83	88,586.21
Rhode Island	1,534.03	4,417.52	3,156.45	9,108.00	17,584.29	26,692.29
South Carolina:						
Eastern	192.33	1,698.62	2,162.95	4,053.90	64,287.43	68,341.33
Western	434.02	275.10	802.53	1,511.55	30,777.58	32,290.13
South Dakota	243.70	103.00	512.53	800.13	74,049.41	75,569.54
Tennessee:						
Eastern	2,863.38	1,012.47	2,024.86	5,900.71	37,626.64	43,527.35
Middle	2,696.50	2,270.92	5,395.67	10,369.09	83,612.94	93,982.03
Western	192.27	787.44	2,898.93	3,878.64	26,204.76	30,083.40
Texas:						
Northern	1,083.34	1,855.96	4,727.40	7,666.70	94,846.89	102,513.59
Eastern	3,478.48	914.41	671.55	5,064.44	34,102.00	39,166.44
Southern	4,775.07	1,888.15	2,287.21	8,950.43	47,259.00	56,209.43
Western	772.01	1,597.02	2,082.35	4,451.38	45,088.76	49,540.14
Utah	1,532.44	1,652.03	5,764.98	8,949.45	38,551.58	47,501.03
Vermont	774.47	1,710.36	1,465.29	3,950.12	9,973.55	13,923.67
Virginia:						
Eastern	1,237.04	4,007.46	1,067.03	6,311.53	10,331.77	25,644.20
Western	1,494.75	861.60	737.66	3,094.01	16,769.06	19,863.07
Washington:						
Eastern	807.20	675.65	1,269.78	2,752.63	26,182.21	28,934.84
Western	2,155.40	2,110.41	2,505.00	6,770.81	39,429.17	46,199.98
West Virginia:						
Northern	2,170.83	2,213.55	642.10	5,026.48	30,107.01	35,134.39
Southern	986.04	1,483.46	772.45	3,242.55	54,022.85	58,165.40
Wisconsin:						
Eastern	2,540.00	2,376.02	1,740.87	6,656.89	24,094.03	31,650.92
Western	3,836.48	3,758.71	5,941.68	13,536.87	30,444.27	44,029.14
Wyoming	2,529.50	2,557.85	3,845.42	8,930.80	20,660.50	29,591.30
Total	350,291.66	287,145.00	314,977.88	952,415.44	4,143,047.52	5,095,462.96

¹ Based on estimates made by court officers.² From Tables 16 and 17.

Table 44 gives the total cost of prohibition enforcement for the United States for the year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 44.—Cost of Federal prohibition enforcement, 1929-30

Agency	Criminal enforcement ¹	Civil enforcement ²	Total
Police:			
Executive departments	\$23,669,045.46	\$3,851,536.00	\$27,520,581.46
Marshals	1,975,024.11	360,291.66	2,325,315.77
Total police	25,644,069.57	4,201,827.66	29,845,897.23
Prosecution:			
Department of Justice	105,472.89		105,472.89
United States attorneys	891,247.44	287,145.00	1,178,393.34
Total prosecution	996,720.33	287,145.00	1,283,865.33
Courts:			
District courts	3,836,305.28	314,977.88	4,151,283.16
United States commissioners	406,796.80		406,796.80
Circuit courts of appeals	51,748.77	18,010.14	69,758.91
Supreme Court	13,163.72	7,307.02	20,470.74
Total courts	4,308,014.57	340,295.04	4,648,309.61
Penal treatment	3,842,416.84		3,842,416.84
Probation and pardon	37,339.34		37,339.34
Grand total	34,828,556.65	4,820,269.20	39,648,825.85

¹ From Table 42, supra, and detailed tables there referred to.² From data obtained as described in the text (p. 146, supra).³ Exclusive of \$962,884 expended in enforcing the laws imposing taxes on the manufacture of industrial alcohol.

Table 45 shows the relative expenditures for prohibition enforcement by civil and criminal proceedings.

TABLE 45.—Cost of Federal prohibition enforcement by civil and criminal proceedings, 1929-30

Method of enforcement	Cost ¹	Per cent
Criminal	\$34,828,556.65	87.8
Civil	4,820,269.20	12.2
Total	39,648,825.85	100.0

¹ From Table 44, supra.

Table 46 shows the total cost of enforcing the antinarcotic laws for the year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 46.—Cost of enforcement of the Federal antinarcotic laws, 1929-30

Proceedings	Cost	Per cent
Criminal: ¹		
Police	\$1,048,031.56	97.8
Prosecution	153,364.00	
Courts	373,797.78	
Penal treatment	1,377,794.86	
Probation and pardon	2,692.54	
Civil: ²	86,520.00	2.4
Total	3,642,200.74	100.0

¹ From Table 42, supra.² From data obtained as described in the text (p. 146, supra).

On the basis of the figures in the preceding tables, it is possible to compute an estimated minimum figure for the cost of the enforcement of the Federal criminal laws which will include the cost of prohibition and antinarcotic law enforcement by civil and administrative proceedings. Table 47 gives such an estimate for the year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 47.—*Cost of Federal enforcement of Federal criminal laws, 1929-30*

Enforcement of—	Criminal cost	Civil cost	Total cost
Prohibition law ¹	\$34,828,550.65	\$4,829,200.20	\$39,657,810.85
Antinarcotic laws ²	3,555,080.74	86,520.00	3,642,200.74
Motor vehicle theft act ³	2,078,264.78	2,078,264.78
Other criminal laws ⁴	12,323,706.77	(4)	12,323,706.77
Total.....	52,786,202.94	4,915,780.20	57,701,992.14

¹ From Table 45, supra.

² From Table 40, supra.

³ From Table 42, supra.

⁴ See p. 146, supra.

Table 48 shows the minimum Federal per capita cost of enforcing the prohibition law, the antinarcotic laws, the motor vehicle theft act and other Federal criminal laws by all types of proceedings during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

TABLE 48.—*Per capita cost of Federal enforcement of Federal criminal laws, 1929-30*

Enforcement of—	Cost ¹	Per capita
Prohibition law.....	\$39,657,810.85	\$0.32
Antinarcotic laws.....	3,642,200.74	.030
Motor vehicle theft act.....	2,078,264.78	.017
Other criminal laws ²	12,323,706.77	.100
Total.....	57,701,992.14	.740

¹ From Table 47, supra.

² Incomplete, since no account is taken of civil enforcement. See p. 146, supra.

During the year ending June 30, 1930, the expenditures of the Federal Government in enforcing the prohibition law through civil and criminal proceedings were 1.03 per cent of its total expenditures for all purposes. The minimum aggregate allocable expenditures of the Federal Government for law enforcement of all kinds by both civil and criminal process amounted to 1.49 per cent of its total expenditures for all purposes.

CHAPTER X

RECOMMENDATION AS TO PERMANENT FEDERAL STATISTICS AS TO THE COST OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The canvass of the present Federal financial statistics as to the administration of justice made in preparing this part of this report has shown that those statistics are reasonably satisfactory except that they do not separate civil from criminal costs. A satisfactory system of governmental cost accounting should, it is believed, make this segregation, not only because of the desirability of knowing how much the Federal Government spends each year to enforce the criminal law but also because of the desirability of information as to how much civil litigation of various types costs the taxpayers of the country. Our study has indicated that the necessary allocations of cost can be made with the aid of a comparatively small amount of information supplemental to that already available in existing financial records. More accurate results could be reached and less labor would be required if the necessary data for these allocations were assembled currently.

The most difficult problem in connection with developing adequate Federal statistics as to the cost of criminal justice is that of how to deal with police agencies outside of the Department of Justice.¹⁸ This problem could, it is believed, be solved by requiring each such agency to report its expenditures and the relative amount of time devoted by its officers and employees to various criminal and other matters to an appropriate Federal bureau.¹⁹ The Department of Justice can readily compile data for its own police agencies and for the United States marshals.

The problem of developing complete figures as to the cost of prosecution and of the criminal courts is less difficult, since most of the necessary data are already available in the Department of Justice. Some modification of existing financial records and an arrangement for the periodic reporting by

¹⁸ The United States marshals are, for statistical purposes, a branch of the Department of Justice. See p. 73, supra, note 9.

¹⁹ This is in substance the commission's recommendation with regard to Federal criminal statistics other than financial. See Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 17, 164, 181-182. Compare International Association of Chiefs of Police, Uniform Crime Reporting, pp. 141-147 (New York, 1929).

United States attorneys and commissioners and clerks of Federal courts of time spent on different classes of cases are all that would be necessary to create a workable system for determining these costs with a sufficient degree of accuracy for cost-accounting purposes.

Reasonably satisfactory statistics as to Federal penal and corrective institutions are now available. It is believed, however, that the number and cost of Federal prisoners in non-Federal institutions should be published. When an adequate system of financial statistics for State penal institutions is developed, the system used by Federal institutions should be made uniform with it.²⁰

It is believed to be desirable that Federal financial statistics as to the administration of justice be developed in such a way as to supply information as to how much of the cost of the Federal machinery of justice is chargeable to the more important classes of cases. A rough beginning along this line, so far as criminal cases are concerned, has been made in this report; but the further development of such figures is desirable, and their year-by-year compilation and publication should serve a highly useful purpose.

Adequate and regularly published figures as to the cost of Federal criminal justice do not exist; they could easily be made to exist; and we believe that they should exist. It is therefore recommended that an appropriate Federal bureau be authorized and required by law to compile and publish annually statistics as to the cost of Federal criminal justice in its various aspects and as to the cost of other law-enforcement activities of the Federal Government, along the general lines indicated in this part of this report.

²⁰ It is believed that the system for State institutions should be developed with the aid of the officials of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice. See p. 100, *infra*, note 55.

PART 3

PUBLISHED STATISTICAL MATERIAL ON STATE AND MUNICIPAL COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON and JOHN H. LIBBY*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—The importance of the cost of criminal justice as an element of the immediate cost of crime has been adverted to in Part 1 of this report,¹ and a detailed analysis of the cost to the Federal Government of criminal-law enforcement has been made in Part 2.² The Federal cost, however, is but one part, and by no means the largest part, of the aggregate cost of criminal justice in the United States. The enforcement of the criminal law is primarily a State function, exercised either directly or through municipal subdivisions. This part and the 3 succeeding parts of this report are therefore devoted to the consideration of various aspects of State and municipal costs.

The obvious first step in any study of the cost of administration of criminal justice by the several States and their municipal subdivisions is an inventory and appraisal of the published material. The function of this part of the report is the making of a comprehensive inventory of the statistical material available as to State and municipal costs, and the critical appraisal of the value of that material; no attempt will be made here to discuss in detail the financial data con-

*Mr. Simpson is responsible for the form of this part of the report and for the statements made herein with regard to the figures published by the Bureau of the Census; Mr. Libby is responsible for the statements made herein with regard to the extent and character of available State, county and municipal statistical reports.

¹ See pp. 37-40, *supra*.

² See pp. 71-102, *supra*.

tained in the material.³ This part thus has the same purpose with regard to financial statistics as to State and municipal criminal law enforcement agencies as that of the report made to the commission by Prof. Sam B. Warner with regard to criminal statistics other than financial.⁴

2. *Character of material dealt with.*—This part of the report is concerned solely with basic statistical data bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice by the several States and their municipal subdivisions contained in regularly published official reports. Unofficial reports, official reports not made at regular intervals, reports which have been discontinued,⁵ mimeographed reports, and reports printed only in newspapers have not been considered.⁶ Moreover, secondary material on the subject, although considered later in this report,⁷ is not dealt with here. The material here considered is thus confined to Federal, State and municipal statistical publications containing data as to State and municipal costs. The Federal publications dealing with this subject are for the most part in the form of reports of the Bureau of the Census. The State and municipal reports are of many sorts—budgets, reports of expenditures, reports of law enforcement officials and agencies, and various other official reports of States, counties and municipalities.

3. *Geographical scope of study.*—The material here dealt with is confined to that relating to the cost of administration of criminal justice by States and municipal subdivisions within the continental United States, including the District of Columbia.⁸ No attempt has been made to discuss the

³ This latter task will be attempted, as to certain classes of costs with respect to which reliable published figures exist, in later parts of the report. See pp. 192-243, *infra*. Some slight duplication may be found as between this part of the report and such later parts, due to the fact that it has been regarded as desirable to make each part substantially complete in itself, even at the cost of some repetition, but the effort has been made to reduce such repetition to a minimum.

⁴ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 19-147.

⁵ All series of reports in which there have been no reports published since 1927 have been arbitrarily regarded as discontinued. See p. 155, *infra*.

⁶ The reasons for ignoring such reports are those succinctly set forth by Professor Warner in his report on nonfinancial criminal statistics. See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 28-29.

⁷ For a discussion of available secondary material, see Appendix A (pp. 463-467, *infra*).

⁸ While the District of Columbia is a Federal municipal corporation, it is entirely analogous to State municipal units of similar character, and so is dealt with here rather than in the part of the report dealing with Federal costs. See p. 71, *supra*, note 1.

material relating to the Territories and to municipal corporations outside the continental United States.⁹

4. *Period covered by study.*—The only material dealt with in this study is that currently available in the form of regularly recurring reports. It was therefore unnecessary, in making the study, to go back for a long period to see what statistical data had been available at various times in the past. The limit of investigation was arbitrarily set at 1924, and reports for earlier years were neither looked for nor examined when found. Moreover, where it was found that reports in any series examined had not been published since 1927, such series was automatically eliminated from consideration, as was any series which it affirmatively appeared had been discontinued.

5. *Material examined.*—The attempt has been made to examine all current official reports containing figures as to State and municipal police costs, prosecution costs, court costs, penal institution costs, and parole costs. The method followed in locating this material and examining it is described in detail in the bibliographical appendix to this report.¹⁰ Over 2,000 printed reports of various kinds were examined, and of these 788 were found to contain some relevant data.¹¹ In general, the material examined included (a) publications of the Bureau of the Census, and (b) State and municipal publications available in either (1) the Library of Congress, (2) the New York Public Library, or (3) the collection of reports containing criminal statistics assembled for the commission by Prof. Sam B. Warner at the Harvard Law School, together with (4) certain State and municipal publications which were not available in either library or in Professor Warner's collection, but which were obtained directly by correspondence.

6. *Comprehensiveness of study.*—It is believed that the inventory of the available published material discussed in

⁹ The statistical material as to costs of this character is briefly considered in the bibliography which forms Appendix A of this report. See pp. 469-470, *infra*.

¹⁰ See pp. 467-468, *infra*.

¹¹ A complete list of these latter appears as part of the bibliography in Appendix A to this report (pp. 468, 470-483, *infra*). Reports which, while containing data as to the cost of law enforcement agencies, do not give that cost separately, but include it as part of a lump-sum total for "Cost of public safety," "Cost of police and fire departments," etc., are not included in the 788 reports listed herein as containing relevant data.

this section, as set forth in Appendix A to this report,¹² is substantially complete. In so far as financial statistics are to be found in reports containing criminal statistics of other kinds,¹³ the material may be regarded as almost complete because based on an examination of all the material collected by Professor Warner, which is a practically complete collection.¹⁴ In so far as the material contained in census publications is concerned, the list of publications given in the bibliographical appendix to this report and discussed here has been checked by the Bureau of the Census, and may be regarded as complete. Finally, in so far as the balance of the material is concerned, it was collected by two investigators working entirely independently, one in the Library of Congress, and one in the New York Public Library, so that any report available in both libraries, to be omitted, must have escaped the scrutiny of both investigators. It is possible that this may have occurred in some cases, and that a few reports which were available in only one of these libraries may have been missed by the investigator there,¹⁵ but it is not believed that this has happened in any substantial number of cases. By and large, therefore, any material omitted is not available in either of the two largest libraries of the country and is not contained in any publication of the Bureau of the Census nor in any State or municipal report containing criminal statistics other than financial. In view of these facts, the list of material given in the bibliography¹⁶ is believed to be comprehensive, and the discussion of that material in this part of the report proceeds on that basis.

7. *Order of discussion.*—The next chapter of this part will deal with certain general problems which arise with regard to all statistical data relating to the cost of administration of criminal justice. Following that discussion, chapters will be devoted to the available statistics on (a) cost of police, (b) cost of prosecution, (c) cost of the criminal courts, (d) cost of penal institutions, and (e) cost of probation and parole.

¹² See pp. 468-483, *infra*.

¹³ These include many police reports, reports of prosecutors and clerks of courts, reports of penal institutions, and reports of probation and parole agencies.

¹⁴ See the discussion of the completeness of Professor Warner's collection in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 31.

¹⁵ Most of the reports found to contain material were located independently in both libraries.

¹⁶ See Appendix A (pp. 468-483, *infra*).

The last chapter of this part will summarize the extent and value of the existing statistics, and will make certain recommendations looking to their extension and improvement.

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS WHICH ARISE IN DETERMINING STATE AND MUNICIPAL COSTS OF ADMINISTERING CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *Introductory.*—As a preliminary to the detailed consideration of the available statistics, it is essential to consider the major problems which arise in connection with attempts to determine State and municipal costs of administration of criminal justice, in order to afford a basis for appraising the completeness and adequacy of the statistical material available. Four matters require particular consideration: (a) the problem of allocation of costs between the civil and criminal functions of those agencies of law enforcement and administration which exercise both functions; (b) the problem of how to deal with capital expenditures; (c) the problem of how receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice should be treated; and (d) the problem of the accounting classification of expenditures of criminal law enforcement agencies. This chapter will discuss these problems, and will summarize the essential requirements which statistical material must meet in order to afford a satisfactory basis for the determination of State and municipal costs of the administration of criminal justice.¹⁷

2. *Allocation of costs as between civil and criminal activities.*—The most important and difficult practical problem encountered in determining the cost of administration of criminal justice arises in connection with those agencies of law enforcement which have both civil and criminal functions. The police, for example, almost invariably carry on certain administrative activities, such as traffic control; prosecuting officers may also represent cities, counties or States in civil litigation; many courts exercise both civil and criminal jurisdiction; jails and similar institution are sometimes used to confine civil prisoners; and some probation departments handle domestic relations cases.¹⁸ In all such cases, an allocation

¹⁷ This chapter will also discuss the question of the fiscal periods covered by State and municipal financial reports.

¹⁸ These facts have already been briefly discussed. See pp. 41, 42, 44, 46, *supra*.

of cost as between the civil and criminal activities of the particular law enforcement agency must be made in order to determine the proportion of the cost of that agency which is properly to be included in the cost of administration of criminal justice.¹⁰ Satisfactory statistics relating to the cost of administering criminal justice must either make this allocation or contain the data necessary in order to enable it to be worked out.

3. *Capital expenditures.*—In order to present an accurate picture of annual costs, capital expenditures made in any particular year must be segregated from operating costs. Moreover, in order to show the entire cost of administration, account must be taken of annual carrying charges on capital investment. The latter requirement is less important than the former, since failure to take account of carrying charges on capital merely results in a minimum figure which includes only operating costs, whereas failure to eliminate capital expenditures from operating costs will result in an affirmative distortion of the figures. Hence it is essential to satisfactory cost statistics that capital expenditures either be excluded entirely or be stated separately; and it is desirable that the data necessary for computing annual carrying charges on capital investment be given.

All outlays for buildings and for major items of equipment which have a normal useful life of two years or more may be considered as capital expenditures.²⁰ Ordinary expenditures for repairs and maintenance and for minor items of equipment are not capital outlays, but form a part of operating cost.²¹ The application of these principles of distinction is in most cases comparatively easy so far as expenditures by public law-enforcement agencies are concerned; since, in

¹⁰ Compare National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities*, reprinted as Appendix C to this report (p. 525, *infra*), and *Outline of Project for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice*, reprinted as Appendix E to this report (p. 017, *infra*).

²⁰ While this useful life test is not universally applicable in the case of business enterprises [*United States v. Redon Coal Co.*, 30 F. (2d) 425, 426 (1930); *Marsh Fork Coal Co. v. Lucas*, 42 F. (2d) 83, 85 (1930)], it is applicable to investments in property used in connection with the administration of criminal justice. Compare *Duffy v. Central R. R. Co. of New Jersey*, 268 U. S. 85 (1925); *Goodell-Pratt Co.*, 3 B. T. A. 30, 35 (1925); *Esquerre*, *Applied Theory of Accounts*, p. 226 (New York, 1914).

²¹ See *San Francisco & Portland Steamship Co. v. Scott*, 263 Fed. 854 (1918); *Zimmerman v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 28 F. (2d) 769 (1928); *Illinois Merchants Trust Co.*, 4 B. T. A. 103 (1926); *Libby & Blouin, Ltd.*, 4 B. T. A. 010 (1926).

general, capital outlays are confined to expenditures for buildings, for furniture and fixtures, and for motor and signal equipment.²² It is probable, therefore, that most statistical reports which purport to eliminate or segregate capital outlays from operating expenses may be regarded as doing so correctly.

The computation of carrying charges on capital investment requires the ascertainment of two independent factors: (a) the cost of the capital investment involved; and (b) the rate of the carrying charge. The determination of the first factor for any particular year requires data going back into past years except in the unusual case where the entire investment has been made in the year under investigation. The determination of the second factor requires the fixing of appropriate depreciation and interest rates.²³ The problem of determining carrying charges is thus a complicated and difficult one, and it will not be surprising if we find, as we shall,²⁴ that annual statistical reports seldom contain the data necessary for determining such charges.

In the case of equipment of relatively short life (such, for example, as police motor equipment), some of which is purchased in almost every year, a fairly satisfactory substitute for a depreciation charge may be arrived at by taking the average annual expenditures for such equipment over the preceding 5 or 10 years.²⁵ To this limited extent it may be possible to work out the approximate amount of annual carrying charges from annual reports which do not contain data sufficient to permit such charges to be completely ascertained, provided that expenditures for equipment are included, stated separately, and provided that reports for prior years are available.

4. *Treatment of receipts.*—To a certain extent, although in most instances only to a comparatively slight extent, the

²² This is the case so far as police, prosecution, courts, and probation and parole are concerned. Special problems, analogous to those met with in the case of ordinary business enterprises, may arise in the case of penal institutions which carry on manufacturing or other industrial activities and so make use of machinery.

²³ On depreciation and interest rates, see p. 200, *infra*.

²⁴ See p. 172, *infra* (police), and p. 181, *infra* (penal institutions).

²⁵ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities*, reprinted as Appendix C to this report (pp. 520-530, *infra*), and *Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, N. Y.*, reprinted as Exhibit D to this report (p. 601, *infra*).

machinery for the administration of criminal justice may be made to appear to pay its own way. The most usual examples of this are the collection of fines and the sale of prison-made goods. From the standpoint of the direct burden on the taxpayer, such receipts are to be regarded as credits against the cost of administering criminal justice, but from the standpoint of the student of costs of administration they can not be so regarded. To do so would make impossible any comparative cost studies, since the practice with regard to fines, the disposition of prison-made goods, etc., differs greatly as between various States and municipalities.²⁶ Moreover, the important question in studies of cost is how much is spent and for what, not how the money so spent is obtained. Finally, to treat such receipts as credits against the cost of the administration of justice might tend to give rise to the unsound inference that the larger the amount collected in fines and penalties, from the sale of prison-made goods, etc., the more advantageous the situation to the tax-paying public, whereas the contrary may well be the case in many instances.²⁷ The omission of figures as to receipts of this character from reports containing data as to the cost of law-enforcement agencies is, therefore, not a serious defect from the standpoint of the student of administrative costs, although the inclusion of such figures is highly desirable from other standpoints.

There are, however, certain classes of receipts which should be treated, at least in part, as credits against the cost of criminal justice—viz., payments made to States or municipal subdivisions for direct services rendered to some other governmental unit or private person. The most important example of such receipts are payments made by the Federal Government or by other States or municipalities as compensation for confining prisoners in penal institutions, but there may be other payments of this character, as, for example, compensation paid to a city for authorizing the use of its policemen as private guards. Satisfactory financial statis-

²⁶ For example, some penal institutions manufacture goods for State use only, and no money credit is given the institution for such goods, while in other institutions prison-made goods are actually sold.

²⁷ Compare National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities*, reprinted as Appendix C to this report (pp. 530-531, *infra*).

tics should therefore contain the data necessary to make appropriate deductions of this character where required.

A problem closely related to the question of the proper treatment of receipts arises in connection with expenditures by penal institutions in connection with the manufacture of prison-made articles. Where such articles are manufactured, whether for State or municipal use or for sale, the cost of the raw material used and of repairs to the machinery utilized in such manufacture should be eliminated from the cost of administration of the institution.²⁸ Satisfactory statistics as to the cost of penal institutions must either make these deductions where required or contain data which will enable them to be made.

5. *Classification of expenditures.*—Satisfactory statistics on the cost of administration of criminal justice should make possible an appropriate classification of costs, both as between different law enforcement agencies²⁹ and as between various classes of expenditures by each agency. The first of these requirements is obviously important—a report which lumps together police and prosecution costs, or, as frequently, prosecution and court costs, is of little value. The second requirement is, however, of almost equal importance. There must be at least a certain amount of classification of the expenses of each individual agency if statistics are to be of maximum value.³⁰

The minimum degree of classification permissible depends, of course, on the purpose for which the figures are to be used. For purposes of most general studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice, a classification of expenditures into (a) pay roll; (b) expenditures for supplies, repairs and maintenance; and (c) general overhead, including such items as pensions, rent, and the like, may be sufficient. In the case of penal institutions, a fourth category, subsistence of

²⁸ This cost should also be deducted from gross revenues in determining the receipts of the institution.

²⁹ Separate classification of the cost of law enforcement agencies and other governmental agencies is, of course, essential. See p. 155, *supra*, note 11.

³⁰ Reference has already been made to the necessity for segregating capital expenditures. See p. 158, *supra*. Such segregation is assumed in the following discussion.

prisoners, is desirable.³¹ Financial statistics should permit classification of costs at least to this extent.

6. *Requisites of satisfactory cost statistics.*—Statistical material relating to costs of the administration of criminal justice, in order to afford a reasonably satisfactory basis for the study of such costs, should satisfy the following tests:

(a) Separate figures should be given for police, prosecution, court, penal, probation and parole costs.

(b) The figures for each class of costs should be presented in such a way as to permit classification as between pay roll, expenditures for supplies and maintenance and general overhead, and, in the case of penal institutions, subsistence of prisoners.

(c) The basis should be given for the allocation, as between civil and criminal functions, of the costs of agencies exercising both.

(d) Capital expenditures should be eliminated from operating cost and stated separately.

(e) Receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice which are not proper credits against cost should be stated separately.

(f) The amount and character of receipts properly to be credited against cost should be shown.

(g) In the case of penal institutions which manufacture prison-made goods, the basis should be given for eliminating from operating expense the cost of raw material and of repairs to machinery used in such manufacture.

Statistics relating to the cost of criminal justice which fulfill these requirements will be substantially satisfactory for most purposes even though they do not contain data as to capital investment and carrying charges thereon. Statistics which do not satisfy these tests, on the other hand, can be of only limited use in any study of criminal justice costs. In the following 5 chapters the available statistics on the cost of police, prosecution, courts, penal institutions, and probation and parole will be subjected to these tests. Before

³¹ For a further discussion of this classification, see National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities*, reprinted as Appendix C to this report. [See p. 533, *infra* (police costs); p. 537, *infra* (prosecution costs); p. 540, *infra* (court costs); p. 544, *infra* (penal institution costs).] The classification is not presented as ideal—it is far from ideal from an accounting standpoint—but rather as a minimum classification.

doing so, however, brief consideration will be given to the question of the fiscal periods covered by State and municipal financial statistics.

7. *Fiscal periods covered by existing statistics.*—There is little uniformity in the fiscal periods covered by existing statistics relating to the cost of administration of criminal justice. This lack of uniformity is primarily the result of the wide variation in the fiscal years used by the States and municipalities of the country. Twenty-nine of the States, following the example of the Federal Government, operated in 1928 on the basis of a fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 30; ³² 7 on a fiscal year beginning October 1 and ending September 30; ³³ 6 on a calendar-year basis; ³⁴ 3 on a fiscal year beginning December 1 and ending November 30; ³⁵ and the remaining 3 on the basis of other fiscal years.³⁶ The District of Columbia, like the Federal Government and a majority of the States, operates on a fiscal year beginning in the middle of the calendar year.³⁷ A majority of the larger cities, however, follow the calendar-year basis. Out of the 250 largest cities of the country, 59.2 per cent operated in 1928 on the calendar-year basis, 12 per cent on the basis of a fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 30, and the remaining 28.8 per cent on the basis of a variety of other fiscal years.³⁸ There is a similar variation in the fiscal years of counties and of smaller cities, so that the situation is extremely chaotic. The Bureau of the Census has repeatedly urged that the States and the larger cities, at least, adopt a

³² Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

³³ Alabama, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Oregon, and Wyoming.

³⁴ Georgia, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, Ohio, and South Carolina.

³⁵ Colorado, Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

³⁶ Pennsylvania, June 1 to May 30; Texas, Sept. 1 to Aug. 31; and Washington, Apr. 1 to Mar. 31.

³⁷ The above data are derived from *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 42-43 (U. S. Census, 1931).

³⁸ See *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928*, pp. 84-88 (U. S. Census, 1931). In some cities the fiscal year used did not even begin with the first day of a calendar month. Thus, while Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, and Norristown, Pa., operated on a calendar-year basis, all the other cities in Pennsylvania over 30,000 in population had a fiscal year beginning on Jan. 8. St. Louis, Mo., operated on a fiscal year beginning Apr. 10; Battle Creek, Mich., on a fiscal year beginning Mar. 21; St. Joseph, Mo., on a fiscal year beginning Apr. 10; and Stamford, Conn., on a fiscal year beginning Dec. 10.

uniform fiscal year,³⁹ but as yet this goal appears to be far distant.

These differences in the fiscal periods of the various governmental units which exercise the functions of administering criminal justice in the United States are necessarily reflected in the statistics of those units as to expenditures for the administration of criminal justice, and the result is that such statistics for any such unit, even if they meet the tests specified in the preceding section,⁴⁰ will not be absolutely comparable with those for many similar governmental units. It is believed, however, that this difficulty is not an extremely serious one. Changes in the amount of public expenditures for criminal justice are in most cases gradual, and, in the absence of unusual circumstances, no serious error will be introduced by comparing figures for cities having slightly different fiscal periods. The Bureau of the Census has for years published comparative statistics of States and cities on the basis of a "census year" which includes all fiscal periods ending within a specified year, and such figures have been generally regarded as satisfactory. Therefore, while the variation in fiscal periods covered by statistics relating to State and municipal costs of criminal justice is somewhat troublesome, and while the adoption by all the States of a uniform fiscal period for themselves and for their municipal subdivisions would be extremely desirable, the usefulness of the statistical material available is not seriously impaired by the present lack of uniformity in this regard.

CHAPTER III

STATISTICS ON POLICE COSTS

1. *Extent of material.*—State and municipal police costs include (a) the cost of State police forces,⁴¹ (b) the cost of county police officers, such as sheriffs;⁴² and (c) the cost of municipal police forces.⁴³ This section discusses the extent

³⁹ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, p. 5; Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of over 30,000, 1928, p. 15.

⁴⁰ See p. 162, supra.

⁴¹ For a detailed discussion, see pt. 4 of this report (pp. 192-204, infra).

⁴² See Molay, The Sheriff and the Constable, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 28 (1929).

⁴³ On constables in the smaller municipalities, see Smith, The State Police, pp. 13, 14, 10-22, 23, 26, 27 (New York, 1925).

of the published statistics relating to such costs. The following sections discuss the character of these statistics and apply to them the tests of adequacy developed in the preceding chapter.⁴⁴

(a) *State police costs.*—There are two sources of statistical data on State police expenditures—the publications of the Bureau of the Census and the publications of the States themselves.

The figures as to State police costs published by the Census include (a) "payments for all policemen carried on the pay roll of the State";⁴⁵ (b) "amounts paid to policemen and others as rewards offered by the State for the arrest of criminals"; and (c) "payments for operating police stations, lock-ups, and other buildings used for the temporary detention of persons arrested and awaiting trial."⁴⁶ Separate figures are given for "payments by the State for the enforcement of prohibitory laws."⁴⁷ These data are reported for all 48 States.⁴⁸ The last published figures are for the census year 1928.⁴⁹

State reports of police expenditures are available for 14 States, all of which have regularly organized forces of some kind. This material is dealt with in detail in a later part of the report dealing specifically with State police costs⁵⁰, and so need not be further discussed here.

⁴⁴ See p. 162, supra.

⁴⁵ Including both State police forces having general criminal functions and State traffic police.

⁴⁶ Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, p. 26 (U. S. Census, 1928).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 28. While the instructions describing the data to be obtained are not in terms confined to expenditures for the enforcement of prohibitory laws against liquor, examination of the original work sheets of the Bureau of the Census indicates that, out of the 15 States reporting such expenditures for 1928, 11 reported expenditures for enforcement of such prohibitory laws only. In one case (Indiana), expenditures for antitrust law enforcement were reported, apparently by mistake; in another case (Louisiana), expenditures for enforcing prohibitory laws against narcotics were alone reported; in two other cases (Oregon and Rhode Island) expenditures for both antinarcotic and prohibition enforcement were reported.

⁴⁸ For 1928 expenditures for police were reported by 42 States. In the case of 31 States, the reported expenditures for police exceeded \$10,000; in the case of 19 States, they exceeded \$100,000; and in the case of 2 States, New York and Pennsylvania, both having regular State police forces, they exceeded \$1,000,000. See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 76, 77. Separate expenditures for prohibition enforcement were reported by 15 States, two of which (Nebraska and Wisconsin) did not report any general police expenditures. *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 79.

⁴⁹ More exactly, the figures are for the last fiscal year of each State closing on or prior to Dec. 31, 1928. See Instruction for Compiling Financial Statistics of States, pp. 3, 4.

⁵⁰ See pt. 4 (pp. 192-204, infra).

Indiana alone reports the cost of police for all of the cities in the State.⁵¹ Massachusetts alone has a uniform system of police accounting for its municipalities.⁵²

(b) *County police costs.*—The Census does not collect or publish any figures as to county costs, except (a) for 9 cities over 300,000 in population where city and county are merged, so that county figures are included in city figures;⁵³ and (b) for 16 counties containing cities of size comparable with the cities just referred to, where county costs are collected and a pro rata share thereof added to the reported city costs.⁵⁴ For the latter group the amount of the county police cost allocated to each city is given separately in a special table,⁵⁵ but total county figures are not shown.

County reports containing police cost figures are available for only 5 of the 3,073 counties of the United States. None of these reports include figures for the police costs of the cities and towns within the county.

(c) *Municipal police costs.*—The Bureau of the Census reports the total cost of police for the cities of the United States over 30,000 in population in 1920 or according to later special censuses, the latest report published being for the year 1928.⁵⁶ The figure for police costs reported for each city is a single lump sum, which includes (a) "all payments for the police department" of the city, except amounts paid "policemen detailed for food regulation and inspection, sanitation and parks"; (b) "all amounts paid to policemen and others as rewards offered by the city for the arrest of criminals"; and

⁵¹ See Statistical Report for the State of Indiana for the Year ending Sept. 30, 1930, pp. 142-144. A few other States, including Connecticut and Michigan, publish State totals for police costs which include municipal costs.

⁵² Information from an unpublished study by Messrs. W. G. Mulligan, Jr., and D. B. Stookay. See p. 468, *infra*.

⁵³ New York, N. Y.; Philadelphia, Pa.; St. Louis, Mo.; Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; San Francisco, Calif.; Washington, D. C.; New Orleans, La.; and Denver, Colo. See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of over 30,000, 1928, p. 14. In some cases (e. g., Boston) this merger is only partial, although the census does not so state.

⁵⁴ Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Newark, N. J.; Kansas City, Mo.; Seattle, Wash.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Rochester, N. Y.; Jersey City, N. J.; and Louisville, Ky. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 16-25. These are all the cities over 300,000 in population where city and county are not merged. See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having over 30,000 Population, pp. 11, 12.

⁵⁵ See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of over 30,000, 1928, pp. 20, 21. Some county police expenditures are shown for 12 of the 16 counties in question.

⁵⁶ See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of over 30,000, 1928, pp. 270-283. The figures are for the most recent fiscal year of each city closing on or prior to Jan. 31, 1929. See Instructions for Compiling Financial Statistics of Cities Having over 30,000 Population, p. 6.

(c) "payments for operating police stations, lock-ups and other buildings used for the temporary detention of persons arrested and awaiting trial."⁵⁷ The amount of police pensions is separately reported.⁵⁸

Municipal reports containing figures on police costs are available for 361 of the 3,165 incorporated cities and towns of the United States which are classed as urban under the 1930 census.⁵⁹ Of these 361 municipalities, 104 are in Massachusetts, 28 in Pennsylvania and 23 in Connecticut, with the remaining 206 scattered throughout the country. The geographical distribution of the cities and towns for which reports are available are shown in the following table.⁶⁰

TABLE 1.—Geographical distribution of urban communities reporting police costs

Region	Number of communities	Number reporting	Per cent reporting
New England.....	232	170	73.3
Middle Atlantic.....	718	59	8.2
East North Central.....	657	40	7.0
West North Central.....	351	29	8.3
South Atlantic.....	340	19	5.3
East South Central.....	193	7	3.6
West South Central.....	323	5	1.5
Mountain.....	130	4	3.1
Pacific.....	221	22	9.9
Total.....	3,165	361	11.4

⁵⁷ Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having over 30,000 Population, p. 30.

⁵⁸ See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of over 30,000, 1928, pp. 316-323.

⁵⁹ The communities so classified are, in general, those over 2,500 in population. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 7. For further details as to the Census classification, see pp. 248-249, *infra*.

⁶⁰ The geographical classification is that of the Bureau of the Census. The New England region includes Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut; the Middle Atlantic region, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; the East North Central region, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin; the West North Central region, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas; the South Atlantic region, Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; the East South Central region, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi; the West South Central region, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; the Mountain region, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada; and the Pacific region, Washington, Oregon and California. The New England region contains 6.7 per cent of the population of the continental United States; the Middle Atlantic region, 21.4 per cent; the East North Central region, 20.6 per cent; the West North Central region, 10.8 per cent; the South Atlantic region, 12.8 per cent; the East South Central region, 8 per cent; the West South Central region, 9.9 per cent; the Mountain region, 3 per cent; and the Western region, 6.8 per cent. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 10.

The paucity of available reports is clearly apparent from the above table. For the entire United States outside of New England, containing 93 per cent of the total population and 91.9 per cent of the urban population of the country, reports are available for only 6.5 per cent of the cities and towns over 2,500 in population. There are no figures whatever for 10 States.⁶¹ In the case of 24 more States, there are reports for less than 10 per cent of the urban communities in each State.⁶² In only 4 States are there reports for over 50 per cent or more of the urban communities, and all these are in New England.⁶³ While more reports, proportionately, are available for the larger cities than for the smaller towns and villages, there is a serious lack even for the former except to the limited extent that the absence of municipal statistics is made up for by the total figures reported by the Bureau of the Census. For the smaller communities, except in New England, figures as to police costs are very scanty, and for purposes of any comprehensive survey must be regarded as practically nonexistent. There are no figures available as to the cost of constables.

2. *Character of material.*—It may be said in general of the published statistical material relating to State and municipal police costs that the figures published by the Bureau of the Census are comparable, but lacking in detail; and that the figures published by States and municipalities, while in some cases containing considerable detail, are not comparable.⁶⁴

(a) *State police costs.*—The census figures as to State police costs consist of lump-sum totals for two items: cost of police, including amounts of rewards paid and expenditures for State jails and lockups, and cost of prohibition enforcement.⁶⁵ No further details are given, and no basis is

⁶¹ Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, and West Virginia. These States, however, contain only 3.2 per cent of the urban population of the country.

⁶² Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin. These States contain 77.1 per cent of the urban population of the country.

⁶³ Connecticut, 70 per cent; Maine, 69.2 per cent; Massachusetts, 83.0 per cent; New Hampshire, 100 per cent. These four States contain 8.7 per cent of the urban population of the country.

⁶⁴ Police statistics for the cities and towns of the State of Massachusetts are an exception. See p. 166, *supra*. These figures are reported on a uniform basis and are both comparable and reasonably detailed.

⁶⁵ See p. 165, *supra*.

afforded for the segregation of police expenditures proper from amounts paid as rewards,⁶⁶ or for the division of such expenditures into the three basic classifications of pay roll, expenditures for supplies and maintenance and general overhead. State police pensions are not included in police costs, and the lumping together of all pensions to former State employees makes it impossible to determine the amount of pensions to former policemen.⁶⁷ Figures are collected as to receipts in connection with State police activities,⁶⁸ but are not published separately.⁶⁹ No figures are published by the Census as to capital outlays in connection with State police activities nor as to investments in property used for police purposes.⁷⁰ In figuring annual police costs, however, capital outlays are eliminated.⁷¹

State figures as to police costs, with a single exception,⁷² relate only to the cost of State police forces. The figures are reasonably detailed in most instances,⁷³ but are not entirely comparable. In no case is the data given for any allocation of cost between the civil and criminal activities of State police forces.⁷⁴

(b) *County police costs.*—County figures are so nearly nonexistent⁷⁵ that a detailed discussion is hardly worth while; but it may be noted that the few county reports relating to police costs which do exist are neither comparable nor sufficiently detailed to meet the tests for satisfactory cost statistics previously discussed.⁷⁶

⁶⁶ An examination of the original work sheets of the Bureau of the Census has indicated, however, that reward payments form only a very small part of total reported police costs.

⁶⁷ See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 00, 01.

⁶⁸ See *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States*, p. 26.

⁶⁹ Receipts in connection with police, fire protection, the militia, fish and game protection, and the regulation of trades and businesses are all lumped together under the general classification of receipts from earnings of State departments concerned with protection to persons and property. See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 70, 71.

⁷⁰ Figures are published as to capital outlays in connection with protection to persons and property other than expenditures for armories, and as to the value of State property other than armories used in that connection. See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 08, 09, 106, 107. Police property and outlays are thus included with the property and outlays of a number of other departments. Compare note 69, *supra*.

⁷¹ See *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States*, p. 9.

⁷² Indiana. See note 51, *supra*.

⁷³ Except in the case of Rhode Island, where only a lump-sum total is reported. See *Fourth Annual Report of the Department of State Police*, p. 12 (1929).

⁷⁴ The State police figures are considered in greater detail in pt. 4 (pp. 192, 204, *infra*).

⁷⁵ Such figures are available for less than 0.2 per cent of the counties of the United States. See p. 166, *supra*.

⁷⁶ See p. 162, *supra*.

(c) *Municipal police costs.*—The census figures as to municipal police costs, available for 250 cities for 1928, resemble in general the census statistics as to State costs of police. Lump-sum figures are given for expenditures for the police department of each city⁷⁷ and for police pension payments.⁷⁸ No details are given, and no basis is afforded for the classification of police costs as between pay roll, expenditures for supplies and maintenance and general overhead. No separate data on police receipts are given.⁷⁹ Figures are given, however, as to capital outlays during the year for police purposes⁸⁰ and as to the value of police property.⁸¹

The most striking characteristics of the reports on police costs published by cities themselves is the lack of uniformity of accounting methods employed.⁸² Even some of the larger cities show only total cost,⁸³ or only total police pay roll,⁸⁴ or include police pensions and pay roll in a single account.⁸⁵ Out of the 361 cities for which reports are available, 339 report pay roll separately, 224 segregate expenditures for maintenance of plant, and 216 segregate expenditures for transportation. Separate accounts for purchases of motor equipment appear in 145 cases, but otherwise equipment accounts are unusual. The variations in classification as between different cities are considerable, even in the case of cities in the same State. In many cases, it is wholly impossible to ascertain whether capital outlays have or have not been included in operating cost. Receipts, in the form of fines, are reported in 211 cases.⁸⁶ There is no allocation of cost as between the criminal and administrative functions of the police, nor is the data necessary for making such an allocation included in any of the reports.

3. *Value of material.*—The published material on State police costs is reasonably comprehensive. Census figures

⁷⁷ See *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000; 1928*, pp. 270-283.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 316-323.

⁷⁹ The grouping of receipts is like that adopted in the case of the State statistics. *Ibid.*, pp. 244-251. Cf. note 69, *supra*.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 364-371.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 396-403.

⁸² With the exception of Massachusetts cities and towns. See note 64, *supra*.

⁸³ For example, Youngstown, Ohio.

⁸⁴ For example, Kansas City, Mo.

⁸⁵ For example, Rochester, N. Y. Pay roll and pensions are lumped together as payments for "personal service."

⁸⁶ These, in most cases at least, are properly to be classified as court receipts. In addition, 25 cities report police receipts in the form of fees.

are available for all the States, and State figures for most of the States having State police forces. The census figures are comparable, but do not segregate State police costs proper from amounts paid for rewards, permit any classification of police expenditures, make possible any allocation of cost as between civil and criminal activities, nor provide data for determining what receipts, if any, are to be considered as credits against police costs. Capital expenditures are, however, eliminated in all cases. The State figures are more detailed. Speaking generally, they separate police costs proper from reward payments, and permit of some classification of police costs proper, but do not make possible any allocation of cost between civil and criminal activities. In the majority of cases sufficient data on receipts are given, and most of the reports either eliminate or segregate capital outlays. Taking the census and State reports together, while neither class of reports separately nor both combined meet all the requirements of wholly satisfactory police cost figures, they do present a very considerable amount of useful data on a reasonably comprehensive geographical basis.

The published material on county police costs is negligible in quantity and poor in quality, and may be ignored as practically nonexistent.

Published material on municipal police costs does not exist to any satisfactory extent except for cities and towns in certain of the New England States,⁸⁷ and for the 250 largest cities of the country reported upon by the Bureau of the Census. The census figures, though comparable and geographically quite comprehensive, do not segregate police costs proper from amounts paid for rewards,⁸⁸ permit any classification of police expenditures (except that police pensions and capital outlays are segregated), make possible any allocation of cost between civil and criminal activities, nor provide data as to what receipts are to be treated as credits against police costs. The police cost statistics of municipalities themselves are in most cases more detailed, but vary greatly in the accounting methods used—so much so that these figures, except those for cities and towns in the State of Massachusetts, are of little

⁸⁷ Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. See note 63, *supra*.

⁸⁸ This is probably not a very serious defect in most instances. Cf. note 69, *supra*.

value for comparative purposes. In most instances, police costs proper are separated from reward payments; some classification of police costs proper, although not on a comparable basis, is attempted; capital expenditures are eliminated; and some data is given as to receipts. In no case are sufficient data given to make possible an allocation of cost between civil and administrative police activities. Taking the census and municipal reports together, the available material on municipal police costs is far from being either satisfactory or comprehensive.⁸⁹

None of the published reports as to police costs, either State, county or municipal, contain any figures as to carrying charges on capital investment, nor, with the exception of the census figures as to the larger cities, as to investment in police property.⁹⁰ This omission, however, while theoretically of some importance, does not of itself seriously impair the usefulness of such figures as exist.⁹¹

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICS ON THE COST OF PROSECUTION

1. *Introductory.*—State and municipal prosecution costs may be borne by (a) the State, (b) counties, or (c) cities and villages. The prosecuting officer may have civil functions, so that the possible necessity for an allocation of cost must be considered; but questions as to elimination of capital outlays from operating expense and as to the proper treatment of receipts seldom arise. In the case of prosecution, moreover, the question of capital investment and carrying charges thereon is of very minor importance. On the other hand, certain special problems may exist. For one thing, it may be difficult to segregate grand jury costs, which are

⁸⁹ Several references have been made in the text to the fact that none of the published reports on police costs give the basis for an allocation of such costs between criminal and administrative functions. While such an allocation is essential to determining the police factor of the cost of administering criminal justice, it is unimportant for many other purposes for which police cost statistics may be used. What has been said above must be considered with this fact in mind. If failure to provide the necessary data for such allocation were the only defect of the available statistics on police costs, they would still be valuable. Their unsatisfactory character is principally the result of other defects.

⁹⁰ The census figures, moreover, are as to value of police property, not as to the actual investment in such property on the basis of original cost.

⁹¹ See p. 162, *supra*.

analytically a part of the cost of prosecution,⁹² from court expenses. So also, since the prosecutor usually occupies an office in the courthouse, the problem of allocating an appropriate part of the cost of maintenance of the building to prosecution costs will frequently arise. These special problems will be referred to later in this chapter in the course of discussing the character and value of available statistics on prosecution costs.

2. *Extent of material.*—The Bureau of the Census does not collect or publish any figures on State or municipal prosecution costs.⁹³ All the available material on that subject is to be found in State, county or municipal publications and reports.

State reports relating to prosecution costs may be of two sorts: (a) those giving figures for direct State expenditures only, and (b) those also giving figures for the various counties or other municipal subdivisions of the State. Direct State costs are, generally speaking, included in the expenditures of the State attorney general's office. Published reports of such expenditures are available for 32 States. No published State reports giving figures as to prosecution costs for municipal subdivisions have been found.⁹⁴

County reports of prosecution costs are available for 79 counties.⁹⁵ Of these 79 reports, 24 are for New York, 19 for Iowa, and 15 for California,⁹⁶ the remaining 21 being scattered among 11 States. No county reports whatever exist for 34 of the States.

City reports of prosecution costs are even fewer in number. Such reports are available for 46 cities, scattered among 20 States. Even though allowance is made for the fact that many small cities do not disburse any funds for prosecution, which is carried on entirely at county or State expense, this is a very small representation.

⁹² See pp. 42, 78, 113, *supra*.

⁹³ The cost of prosecution is reported in the census statistics as a part of the cost of the court in which the trials are conducted. See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, p. 24; Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having Over 30,000 Population, p. 36.

⁹⁴ Prosecution and court costs are, however, sometimes reported as one lump sum under the heading "Administration of Justice" or some similar designation. See, for example, Statistical Report for the State of Indiana for the Year Ending September 30, 1930, pp. 126-129.

⁹⁵ I. e., for only 2.25 per cent of the counties of the United States.

⁹⁶ The percentage representation for these States is: New York, 38.7 per cent; Iowa, 10.2 per cent; California, 25.0 per cent.

3. *Character of material.*—The State reports containing figures as to the cost of State attorney generals' offices do not afford any basis for allocating any definite portion of such costs to prosecution. Moreover, those reports are not comparable, and do not in all cases afford a satisfactory basis for classification of costs.

In general, the county reports containing data on prosecution costs are not comparable, although in most cases they give sufficient detail to make possible some classification of expenditures. In many States the county prosecutor has no civil duties, so that no question of allocation arises. In States where this is the case, the county reports may give valuable information as to that part of prosecution cost represented by the prosecutor's office. Data as to grand jury costs are in most cases inextricably mingled with data as to the cost of petit juries, and are reported as a part of court expenditures in the published reports. In no case do the county reports give figures as to the pro rata part of the cost of maintenance of the courthouse chargeable to prosecution.

The few municipal reports containing data on city costs of prosecution are subject to the same general limitations as the county reports. Moreover, the question of allocation of cost between civil and criminal functions is especially likely to arise in the case of city prosecution costs. Where it does arise, the city reports do not contain data which will enable such allocation to be made.

4. *Value of material.*—The published material containing data relative to the cost of prosecution is very scanty. Satisfactory figures as to State costs are practically nonexistent. The county material is available for less than half the counties in 3 States and for only a few scattered counties in the remaining 45 States. The material that exists is somewhat helpful as to prosecutors' salaries and office expenses, but not as to grand jury costs, and does not take account of the cost of providing and maintaining prosecutors' offices. City material is even more scanty than county material, and is not satisfactory. On the whole, the published statistical material relating to prosecution costs, whether State, county, or municipal, is too small in quantity and too poor in quality to be of much practical use.

CHAPTER V

STATISTICS ON CRIMINAL COURT COSTS

1. *Introductory.*—The highest appellate courts in all the States, and the intermediate appellate courts and some trial courts of general jurisdiction in many States, are supported directly by the State itself. Some intermediate appellate courts and many trial courts are county-supported. Finally, most of the larger cities have municipal courts of limited jurisdiction. In general, the tribunals having jurisdiction of the trial of minor offenses and of preliminary hearings in cases of serious offenses are city or county courts, those having jurisdiction of the trial of serious offenses are county or State courts, and those having appellate jurisdiction are State courts, except in a few instances where county appellate courts exist.⁹⁷ Hence State, county, and city figures must all be considered.

The most serious problem arising in connection with determining the cost of the criminal courts arises from the very common legislative practice of conferring both civil and criminal jurisdiction on the same tribunal. Where there is such dual jurisdiction, an allocation of cost must be made before the figures as to court costs have any significance in connection with the cost of administration of criminal justice. On the other hand, questions of eliminating capital expenditures⁹⁸ and of the proper treatment of receipts⁹⁹ are relatively unimportant. As in the case of prosecution, the problem of allocation of courthouse maintenance may be of importance.

2. *Extent of material.*—The Census publishes figures for the total cost of State courts for all 48 States, classified as between the cost of the State supreme court and the cost of other courts.¹ State reports containing data as to the cost of State courts are available for 40 States.

⁹⁷ The designation of courts in the text as State, county and city courts refers to the governmental units disbursing the funds to support the courts in question. County courts, and city courts to a considerable extent, are an integral part of the law-enforcement machinery of most States and try offenses against the State, and in that sense are State courts.

⁹⁸ There are comparatively few important capital outlays in connection with the courts except expenditures for buildings, which are universally segregated from operating costs.

⁹⁹ Receipts from fines and penalties are segregated in all the available reports. Receipts from court fees are uncommon in criminal cases and may be ignored.

¹ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 74-75. Compare Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, pp. 24-25.

No data on county expenditures for courts are published by the Census.² Reports containing such data are published by 109 counties, of which 26 are in New York, 19 in Iowa, 15 in California, 12 in Massachusetts, 10 in New Hampshire, 9 in Maine, and the remaining 18 scattered among 10 States.³

Figures as to municipal court costs are published by the Census for the cities of the United States over 30,000 in population.⁴ These figures show expenditures for "general municipal courts" and "all other" courts. The classification "general municipal courts" includes "so-called municipal, police, or city courts, however designated, the principal function of which is trying cases of violation of city ordinances, whether or not such courts have power to try certain civil suits." Juvenile branches of municipal courts are included in this category. The classification "all other" includes "probate courts, lunacy courts, or others which have no power to enforce city ordinances" and also "courts which have power to try felony cases in criminal proceedings, civil suits in amount beyond the jurisdiction of municipal courts, cases in equity, and juvenile courts with jurisdiction to try felonies."⁵ The cost of coroners' offices is included in this second classification.⁶ Municipal reports on court costs are published for 109 cities, located in 39 States, including 19 in Connecticut, 11 in New Hampshire, and 10 in California.⁷

3. *Character of material.*—The census figures on total court costs do not give details, but are comparable; the State, county and municipal reports give considerable detail in some cases, but are not comparable. Thirty-six States, 97

² Even in the case of the 16 counties for which figures as to the pro rata part of the county costs allocable to the large city of the county are given part, court costs are included in the cost of "general government." See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928, pp. 20-21.

³ The percentage of counties covered in the 6 States named is: New York, 41.9 per cent; Iowa, 19.2 per cent; California, 25.9 per cent; Massachusetts, 85.7 per cent; New Hampshire, 100 per cent; Maine, 56.3 per cent. No other State has as many as 10 per cent of its counties represented, and 32 States have none represented at all.

⁴ See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928, pp. 268-275.

⁵ See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having Over 30,000 Population, pp. 37-38.

⁶ *Ibid.* The propriety of this classification seems doubtful. The function of the coroner, in so far as it is criminal in its nature, is related rather more closely to the detective activities of the police and of prosecuting agencies than it is to the work of the courts. Compare p. 602, *infra*.

⁷ The percentages of cities over 2,500 in these States publishing such reports are: Connecticut, 57.6 per cent; New Hampshire, 61.1 per cent; California, 6.5 per cent. Since not all incorporated cities and towns have municipal courts, the representation for Connecticut and New Hampshire is probably quite complete.

counties and 84 cities report salaries separately; 22 States, 28 counties and 41 cities give separate figures for office supplies and expenses; 13 States, 100 counties and 37 cities give separate figures for courthouse maintenance; and 9 States, 100 counties and 20 cities report separately fees of jurors and witnesses.

Receipts in the form of fines and forfeitures are given by the Census for all the States and 250 cities,⁸ and are reported directly by 2 States, 67 counties and 35 cities. Data as to receipts in the form of fees and charges are collected by the Census,⁹ but are not separately reported. Such data are contained in 4 State, 46 county and 10 city reports.

Neither data as to capital outlays for courts nor data as to the value of property used for court purposes are published by the Bureau of the Census, either as to States or cities. Data as to outlays for equipment are reported by 10 States, 16 counties, and 10 cities; data as to outlays for land and buildings by 3 States, 22 counties, and 8 cities.

The census figures as to State and municipal court costs, and (with the exception of the reports for the city of St. Louis, Mo., and for the State of Connecticut) the available State, county and municipal reports, do not segregate civil and criminal court costs.¹⁰

4. *Value of material.*—The published statistics on court costs are, generally speaking, of little value in the investigation of the cost of criminal justice, due to the fact that no allocation of cost as between the civil and criminal work of the courts is possible on the basis of the data contained in those statistics. This is true of all of the census figures, and of the State, county and municipal figures with a very few exceptions.

The census figures, even if allocated between civil and criminal costs, would not permit any detailed classification of court expenditures; while the State and municipal reports, which give more detail in the majority of instances, are not

⁸ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 64-65; Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928, pp. 218-225.

⁹ See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, p. 25; Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities having Over 30,000 in Population, p. 37.

¹⁰ Information as to State, county and municipal reports from an unpublished study by Messrs. W. G. Mulligan, Jr., and D. B. Stookey. See p. 468, *infra*.

at all comparable, and are not generally available in the very important case of the county courts.¹¹

In general, therefore, the published statistical material on the cost of the criminal courts is neither comprehensive nor satisfactory.

CHAPTER VI

STATISTICS ON THE COST OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS

1. *Introductory.*—Three classes of penal and correctional institutions must be considered for present purposes: (a) State penitentiaries, reformatories and reform schools; (b) county penitentiaries, jails and institutions for juvenile delinquents; and (c) city jails, houses of detention and institutions for juveniles. Some of these institutions, particularly county and municipal jails, are used for the purpose of confining persons awaiting trial as well as persons convicted of crime. Such detention is really a police function, and the cost thereof a part of the cost of police,¹² but the distinction is difficult to make in practice, and hence all the statistics on city and county jail costs will be discussed together in this chapter.

Except for this question of the cost of detention as distinguished from the cost of penal treatment, the problem of allocation of costs between civil and criminal functions arises only in the case of a few city and county institutions containing civil prisoners and in the case of dependent minors in State, county and municipal institutions also taking charge of juvenile delinquents. The problem of capital expenditures is, however, of importance, as is the problem of the character and proper accounting treatment of receipts.¹³

2. *Extent of material on State institutions.*—A considerable amount of published material on the cost of State penal institutions is available, both in the publications of the Census and in reports published by the States themselves. The Census publishes total figures for State expenditures for

¹¹ Figures are available for only 3.6 per cent of the counties of the United States.

¹² See p. 30, *supra*.

¹³ The problem of the proper handling of receipts in connection with the confinement of Federal prisoners is of particular importance, since some county institutions collect more from this source on account of their Federal prisoners than it costs to operate such institutions for all prisoners.

penal and correctional institutions for both adults and minors,¹⁴ and detailed figures for individual institutions for adults.¹⁵ Such total figures have been published for all 48 States for the census year 1928; and detailed figures by institutions have been published for 1927 for all the institutions for adults in 35 States, and for some of the institutions in 41 States.¹⁶ There were 95 State penal institutions for adults in the United States on the Census list in 1927; financial figures have been published by the Census for 85 of them.¹⁷

Reports on State penal institutions for adults containing cost data are published by 45 States, including all of the States which are not included in the detailed census figures. No State reports are published by Idaho and Wyoming, but figures for both of these States are included in the detailed statistics of the census. One State, Delaware, has no State penal institution for adults.

Reports on State correctional institutions for minors are published by most of the States. The Census publishes no financial figures for such institutions except State totals.¹⁸ The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, which has undertaken the compilation of statistics as to juvenile delinquents,¹⁹ has published no institutional cost data. The Office of Education of the Department of the Interior publishes cost figures for industrial schools for delinquents which include most of the State institutions.²⁰

3. *Extent of material on county and municipal institutions.*—While reasonably comprehensive cost statistics are available with regard to State penal institutions for adults and some figures as to institutions for minors, the situation is very dif-

¹⁴ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 86-87.

¹⁵ See Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927, pp. 124-127 (U. S. Census, 1931).

¹⁶ For details, see p. 206, *infra*, note 10.

¹⁷ In the case of Oklahoma, Tennessee, Vermont and Wisconsin, figures for only part of the penal institutions in the State are available. No figures are available for institutions in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina or Utah. The Census list, moreover, is not complete. See p. 214, *infra*, note 50.

¹⁸ As to the reasons for this, see Children under Institutional Care, 1923, p. 10 (U. S. Census, 1927).

¹⁹ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 11.

²⁰ See Industrial Schools for Delinquents, 1926-27, pp. 11, 18-21 (U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1928, No. 10), and see pp. 232-236, *infra*.

ferent with regard to city and county institutions. The cost data as to these is scanty in the extreme.

Published reports as to county institutional costs are available for only 86 counties,²¹ of which 16 are in Iowa, 14 in California, 14 in New York, 12 in Massachusetts, 10 in New Hampshire, and 8 in Maine,²² with the remaining 12 scattered among 6 States. No published county reports whatever exist for 36 States. There are no census figures as to costs of county penal institutions.²³

No detailed census figures as to the cost of municipal penal and correctional institutions are available, although lump-sum total figures are published for the 250 largest cities of the country.²⁴ Statistics published by municipalities themselves are rare, being available for only 32 cities. The maximum numbers of city reports for individual States are 5 for California and 4 for Virginia.

4. *Character of material.*—As has been stated,²⁵ the statistics as to total expenditures published by the Census for all the States and 250 cities give separate figures for the cost of correction for adults and the cost of correction for minors.²⁶ The Census figures as to the cost of correction for adults include payments by the State or city to private correctional institutions for adult delinquents, and those as to the cost of correction for minor delinquents include payments made for the custody and care of truant and incorrigible school children as well as children committed for criminal offenses. No separate figures are published by the Census as to receipts by

²¹ This is only 2.83 per cent of the counties in the United States.

²² The following percentages of the counties in these States publish reports: Iowa, 16.2 per cent; California, 24.1 per cent; New York, 22.6 per cent; Massachusetts, 85.7 per cent; New Hampshire, 100 per cent; Maine, 50 per cent.

²³ The census of prisoners of 1923, which covered prisoners in county and municipal jails and other similar institutions, did not secure any financial data as to those institutions. See *Prisoners, 1923*, p. 186 (U. S. Census, 1926). Some data as to the cost of county and municipal industrial schools for delinquent minors are, however, published by the Office of Education. See note 20, *supra*.

²⁴ See *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928*, pp. 300-307.

²⁵ See p. 170, *supra*.

²⁶ See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 86-87; *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928*, pp. 300-307. The dividing line between adult and minor is placed at 18 years. See *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States*, pp. 34-35; *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having Over 30,000 Population*, p. 48. It is not made entirely clear how expenditures for institutions having inmates both over and under 18 years are to be treated. Nor is it clear how institutions having both delinquent and dependent minors are to be treated.

State or municipal institutions,²⁷ although such data are collected.²⁸ Figures as to capital outlays for penal institutions are given for each State, divided between institutions for adults and institutions for minors,²⁹ and for each of the 250 largest cities, but without such division.³⁰ Figures as to value of capital investment are given only for the States, and without division between institutions for adults and those for minors.³¹

The detailed statistics as to State penal institutions for adults published by the Census include total expenditures for maintenance, classified, wherever possible, as between (a) salaries and wages; (b) provisions; (c) fuel, light and water; and (d) other expenditures for maintenance. Separate figures are given for expenditures for additions and improvements and expenditures other than for maintenance or improvements.³² No figures are published as to receipts, nor as to total capital investment.

The State figures as to State institutions for adults are more detailed than the census figures in most instances, but are not comparable as between States. All States report separately expenditures for maintenance of plant; 43 report separately salaries and wages; 37 segregate expenditures for provisions; 32 segregate expenditures for equipment; and 30 give transportation expenses separately. Expenditures for capital account are usually stated and segregated; but figures as to aggregate capital investment are seldom given, and carrying charges on capital investment are not computed. Figures as to receipts are reported for 32 States.

State financial statistics as to State institutions for juvenile delinquents are not substantially different from those as to State institutions for adults. Where the same institution

²⁷ Such receipts are lumped with the receipts of State and municipal charities and hospitals. See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 70-71; *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000*, pp. 244-251.

²⁸ See *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States*, p. 34; *Instructions for the Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000*, p. 48.

²⁹ See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 100-101.

³⁰ See *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928*, pp. 372-376.

³¹ See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 108-109. In the city figures, charities, hospitals and correctional institutions are lumped together in reporting the value of capital investment. See *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928*, pp. 396-403.

³² See *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories: 1927*, pp. 124-127; *Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics*, p. 15 (U. S. Census, 1927).

is used both for dependent and for delinquent minors and the report of that institution indicates what proportion of the inmates fall in each class, the data necessary for an allocation of cost is available.³⁵

The few county and city reports as to the cost of jails and other county and municipal penal and correctional institutions are quite unsatisfactory in most cases. Of 86 county reports, 76 give separate figures for maintenance of plant; 66 separate figures for expenditures for provisions; 62 separate figures for salaries; 34 separate figures for equipment expenditures; and 35 report receipts, but in most instances in an unsatisfactory manner. Of 32 municipal reports, 19 give maintenance of plant separately; 25 give expenditures for provisions separately; 22 separate salaries; 13 separate equipment expenditures; and 8 report receipts. None of the county or municipal reports give figures as to total capital investment, and in many cases it is by no means clear that capital outlays have been eliminated from operating expense.

The statistics as to the cost of industrial schools for delinquents published by the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior show separately (a) expenditures for "teachers' salaries, books, etc."; (b) "other salaries and all other expenses"; and (c) expenditures for "buildings and lasting improvements." Figures are also given as to the value of buildings and grounds and of "scientific apparatus, furniture, machinery, etc."³⁴

5. *Value of material.*—The statistical material on the cost of State penal institutions is by far the most complete and satisfactory of any of the published data on any aspect of the cost of administration of criminal justice. The most valuable figures are those of the Census, but a number of the State reports are also useful. The available statistics on State institutions make possible in the great majority of cases a reasonably detailed classification of costs and eliminate capital outlays. The necessity for allocation of cost between civil and criminal functions is avoided in this instance since only criminal functions exist. Moreover, receipts which

³⁴ Cf. p. 266, *infra*.

³⁵ See *Industrial Schools for Delinquents, 1920-27*, pp. 18-21.

are not proper credits against cost are in most cases stated separately.³⁶

Weaknesses of the detailed census statistics as to penal institutions for adults are the failure to indicate the amount of receipts, if any, which are credits against cost, and the failure in some cases to eliminate from operating expense expenditures for materials and for repairs to machinery used in manufacturing prison-made goods.³⁶ The latter difficulty also arises in connection with the use of some of the State figures. The most obvious difficulty with the detailed census figures as to State institutions, however, lies in their failure to check with the total figures for State penal expenditures reported by the Census. This matter is discussed in detail in a later part of this report.³⁷

The financial statistics as to institutions for delinquent minors published by the Office of Education make use of a classification of expenditures which, however fitted it may be for purposes of a school survey, is not particularly useful to the student of institutional administration. Moreover, it may be questioned whether the figures, which are based on unchecked reports by the institutions concerned, may be relied upon to be comparable.

The county figures are very scanty, are not comparable, and, in most cases, are far from meeting the requirements of satisfactory cost statistics; and the same thing may be said of the municipal figures. Indeed, with the exceptions of the lump-sum figures for the correctional expenditures of 250 cities published by the Census, and of the figures as to industrial schools for delinquents published by the Office of

³⁶ See pp. 150-100, *supra*.

³⁶ The Bureau of the Census has endeavored to avoid these difficulties in the case of its total figures on penal costs as reported in its financial statistics of State and cities by issuing precise instructions to its agents. See *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States*, p. 34; *Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Having Over 30,000 Population*, p. 48. No such instructions appear to have been issued for the guidance of those supplying the basic figures for the detailed report of the Census on penal institutional costs as set forth in *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927*, pp. 124-127. It is understood that the only instructions provided were those contained in *Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics*, p. 15, and in the census forms, which duplicate the form set forth in those instructions. This form must be regarded as wholly inadequate in the absence of detailed and precise instructions as to its use.

³⁷ See pt. 5 (pp. 227-232, *infra*).

Education, statistics on county and municipal penal institutional costs are practically nonexistent.³⁸

CHAPTER VII

STATISTICS ON THE COST OF PROBATION AND PAROLE

1. *Introductory.*—Probation activities may be administered by the State, by counties or by cities. Such administration is frequently, although not universally, carried out under the supervision of the court which places the offender on probation. Parole, on the other hand, is usually administered by the State, since in most cases the potential parolees are prisoners in State penal institutions.³⁹

The problems of elimination of capital outlays from operating cost and of the proper treatment of receipts are not serious in the case of either parole or probation, and the problem of allocation of cost between civil and criminal cases does not arise at all in the case of parole. Some probation departments, however, have some noncriminal functions, such as the handling of domestic relations and dependency cases, and, where such is the situation, an allocation of cost may be necessary.

2. *Extent and character of material on probation costs.*—There are no separate census figures on State probation costs, and only one State, Indiana, reports such costs.⁴⁰

There are no census figures on county probation costs. Considerable data on such costs are to be found, however, in reports of county court costs in some cases. Thus, nearly every county in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania which reports court costs also reports probation costs, and the reports for Maine and New York are almost as complete. In California, where a considerable number of reports on county court costs are published, figures for probation costs are

³⁸ Some idea of the extreme paucity of the available data may be gained by considering the fact that, while only 118 county and municipal reports containing data as to penal institutions have been found, there were in 1923 some 3,400 county and municipal jails, workhouses, farms, stockades, etc. See Prisoners, 1923, p. 3.

³⁹ See p. 46, supra.

⁴⁰ See Statistical Report of the State of Indiana for the Year Ending September 30, 1930, p. 111, item (40). The census financial statistics of States include State probation costs with parole and pardon costs, giving one lump-sum figure. See p. 238, infra, note 75.

included in about half of the reports. Reports from counties in other States are practically nonexistent.⁴¹

The Census reports total municipal expenditures for "probation boards and officers" for 250 cities.⁴² Municipal statistics on probation costs are practically nonexistent, although an occasional city report includes figures on probation as a part of the data presented on municipal court costs.⁴³

The census figures on probation costs are comparable, although lacking in detail. The reports of counties and cities are not comparable, and are hardly more detailed than the census reports. Most of them give simply one lump-sum figure, and the few that do itemize at all give only "salaries" and "expenses." None of the reports give any data for allocation of costs between criminal and noncriminal functions in cases where particular probation departments exercise some functions of the latter character.

3. *Extent and character of material on parole costs.*—The census publishes figures for expenditures for "pardon and parole boards and officers" for all the States.⁴⁴ In 1928 such expenditures were shown for 33 States. The figure given for the cost of parole in each case is a lump-sum total, and includes the cost of State probation and of pardon boards and attorneys as well as the cost of parole proper.⁴⁵ No usable State-published statistics on parole costs are available.

As has been pointed out,⁴⁶ parole is in the main a State function, and it is therefore not surprising that no county or municipal reports on parole costs exist.

4. *Value of material.*—The published material on probation costs is not satisfactory. This is no doubt due largely to the fact that probation departments have very properly concentrated on nonfinancial statistics when reporting statis-

⁴¹ For example, no figures whatever as to probation costs are available for counties in the State of Iowa, although there are a number of Iowa reports giving figures as to county court costs. Cf. p. 176, supra.

⁴² See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928, pp. 300-307. Out of the 250 cities included in these statistics, 65 reported expenditures for probation.

⁴³ Only 8 such reports have been found.

⁴⁴ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 86-87.

⁴⁵ See p. 238, infra.

⁴⁶ See pp. 46, 184, supra.

tics at all;⁴⁷ but the fact remains that no comprehensive and comparable financial statistics as to probation exist.

Statistics as to parole costs are more satisfactory. While no comparable State reports are available, the Census publishes figures for all the States, which are comparable, and which, since parole is in the main a State activity, are reasonably comprehensive. The weaknesses of the census figures are that they do not make possible any classification of parole costs as between pay roll and other expenditures,⁴⁸ and do not segregate parole costs from pardon costs and State probation costs.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

1. *Summary of available statistical material.*—The foregoing detailed inventory and appraisal of the available statistical material relating to the cost of administration of criminal justice shows that such material is far from being either comprehensive or satisfactory.

Statistics on police costs are available for most of the States having State police forces. Figures as to expenditures for sheriffs and other county police agencies are practically nonexistent. Figures as to municipal police costs are available in unitemized form for the 250 largest cities, and in more detailed form for a total of 361 communities—most of them in New England—out of the 3,165 urban communities of the United States. The statistics which are available are far from satisfactory, since the only comparable figures are those of the Census, which are simply unitemized and unallocated lump-sum totals, and the figures for cities and towns in Massa-

⁴⁷ See, for example, Twenty-first Annual Report of the Division of Probation of the New York Department of Correction (1927), which gives a very full account of probation work in New York, but contains no cost statistics whatever. Professor Warner has said, with regard to probation statistics other than financial: "Probation is a young and vigorous development . . . and material improvement in its statistics is to be expected in the near future." (National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 74.) This will no doubt prove true of financial statistics as to probation as well as of other probation statistics.

⁴⁸ This is a less serious defect in the case of parole than in the case of some other criminal justice costs (the cost of penal institutions, for example), since much the largest part of the cost of parole is the item of salaries. Travelling expenses, office rent and maintenance, office supplies, etc., are also items of some importance, but in most cases are small in comparison with payments for personal service.

CONTINUED

2 OF 7

chusetts. In no case are police costs reported in satisfactory form on a State-wide basis for any State and its municipal subdivisions.

Statistics on the cost of prosecution are extremely scanty and unsatisfactory. Such figures are available only for a few scattered counties and cities, and those which are available are neither comparable nor adequate.

Statistics on the cost of the criminal courts are available for the city of St. Louis, Mo., and the State of Connecticut. While financial statistics as to court costs generally exist for the States, for the 250 largest cities of the country, and for some counties and smaller cities and towns, these general statistics are of little value in studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice, since no allocation of cost between the civil and criminal activities of the courts is made. Moreover, except for the census figures as to the States and 250 cities, which are simply unitemized totals, the statistics which do exist can not be regarded as comparable.

Statistics on the cost of State penal and correctional institutions are available in fairly satisfactory form.⁴⁰ However, figures as to city and county institutions, especially jails and lockups, are practically nonexistent.

Statistics on probation costs are neither complete nor adequate, but fairly satisfactory figures as to the combined cost of State parole, probation and pardon are available.

The available published statistical material is entirely inadequate to permit a comprehensive study of the cost of administration of criminal justice for the United States as a whole. However, the material is not wholly without value. It is sufficient to aid materially in making studies of State police costs, and of municipal police costs in the larger cities throughout the country and in many smaller cities in New England, and to enable reasonably complete studies of the cost of State penal institutions and of the cost of parole and pardon to be made without field investigation. But this is as far as it goes. No satisfactory study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States as a whole or in any State or municipal subdivision can be made solely on the basis of existing published statistics.

⁴⁰ Even these statistics, however, are subject to quite serious defects. See part 5 (pp. 205-243, *infra*) for a detailed discussion.

2. *Requirements of satisfactory financial statistics.*—Satisfactory statistics as to the cost of administration of criminal justice must be comprehensive, comparable, and accurate, must provide for a reasonable degree of classification of costs, and must supply the data for making allocations of cost between the criminal functions and the civil or administrative functions of those law-enforcement agencies which exercise both.

(a) To be comprehensive, figures must be available for all or at least a statistically adequate proportion of each type of governmental unit, State and municipal, having law-enforcement functions. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts and New Hampshire have made an excellent start toward comprehensive police-cost figures; Maine and New Hampshire toward comprehensive figures as to court costs; and Massachusetts and New Hampshire toward comprehensive figures as to the cost of county penal institutions. The Bureau of the Census has made large progress toward comprehensive figures as to police and court costs for the States and the larger cities, and as to the cost of State penal and correctional institutions and parole and pardon agencies.

(b) To be comparable, the available figures must be compiled on a uniform basis, preferably in accordance with a uniform system of accounting, and must all relate to the same fiscal period. This has been achieved in Massachusetts with regard to municipal police costs, and, except for variations in fiscal years,⁵⁰ by the Bureau of the Census in substantially all its statistics.⁵¹

(c) To be accurate, the figures must not only be correctly computed and transcribed, but the accounting principles adopted must be correct. Thus, capital outlays must be eliminated from operating cost and separately reported if reported at all; receipts must be properly dealt with; expenditures by penal institutions for raw material used in manufacturing prison-made goods must be eliminated from the operating expenses of the institution; and maintenance costs must be properly allocated. This requirement of accuracy

⁵⁰ See pp. 163-4, supra, as to variations in fiscal periods.

⁵¹ With the exception of its detailed figures on State penal institutions for adults, where it is by no means clear that comparability has been attained. See p. 183, supra.

is attained by most of the census figures,⁵² and by some, but by no means all, of the State and municipal figures. Where accuracy is not attained, it appears in most cases to be the result of faulty accounting methods.

(d) A reasonable degree of classification of expenditures should subdivide police, prosecution, criminal court and probation and parole costs at least into the three categories of pay roll, expenditures for supplies and maintenance and general overhead. In the case of penal institution costs, the additional subdivision of expenditures for subsistence should be provided.⁵³ This requirement is met by the detailed census figures as to the cost of State penal institutions for adults and by many State and municipal statistics as to police and court costs.

(e) The segregation of civil or administrative costs from criminal costs requires either (1) the actual separation of the machinery for administering justice into agencies concerned solely with civil and administrative matters and agencies concerned solely with criminal matters, so that separate reporting of actual expenditures is possible; or (2) the making of appropriate allocations of cost. The first method is not normally feasible—although such physical separation sometimes takes place for reasons other than statistical convenience; but the second method is entirely practical in all cases, although requiring some labor. No State or municipal subdivision, however, attempts any such allocation at present, nor does the Bureau of the Census; and the making of such allocations does not appear to have been advocated in the past, although very recently it has been suggested as desirable in the reporting of municipal court costs.⁵⁴ Ideally, such allocations should be made for police costs in all cases, for prosecution costs in all cases where the prosecuting officer also exercises civil functions, for the cost of all courts which exercise both civil and criminal jurisdiction, for the cost of city and county jails and similar institutions which are used in part to confine civil prisoners, for

⁵² The detailed census figures as to State penal institutions for adults appear to a certain extent to be an exception. See note 51, supra.

⁵³ As has been stated (p. 162, supra, note 31), this degree of classification represents a minimum requirement, not what is most desirable from the standpoint of scientific accounting.

⁵⁴ National Committee on Municipal Reporting, Public Reporting, pp. 54-56, 59 (New York, 1931). See especially p. 55, note 1.

institutions for minors which have as inmates both delinquent and dependent children, and for probation costs wherever probation departments handle noncriminal cases.

Statistics meeting the specifications outlined in this section would not only be immediately usable in studying the cost of criminal justice, but would also be very much more valuable for all purposes than existing figures. The requirements of comprehensiveness, comparability, accuracy and reasonably detailed classification are essentials of all good financial statistics. The only matter that is of importance principally in connection with ascertaining the cost of administration of criminal justice is that of allocation of costs between civil and criminal functions; and this is no more than intelligent governmental cost accounting should require in any event. The building up of a nation-wide system of financial statistics as to police, prosecution, criminal courts, penal and correctional institutions, and probation and parole, which would be adequate for the determination of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the various cities and counties of the country, in the several States, and for the country as a whole, would thus also be of definite value for many other purposes.

3. *Recommendations as to financial statistics.*—We submit to the commission the following recommendations as to desirable developments of financial statistics as to police, prosecution, the criminal courts, penal and correctional institutions, and probation and parole:

(a) A uniform system of State, county and municipal accounting for police, prosecution, court, institutional, probation and parole expenditures should be worked out.⁶⁵ This system should be sound from an accountancy standpoint; should deal specifically with the problems peculiar to such accounting, such as the treatment of capital outlays, receipts, purchases of raw materials by penal institutions for manufacture, and the allocation of maintenance; and should provide a reasonable degree of accounting classification of

⁶⁵ The accounting system for State and municipal penal institutions should be worked out in consultation with the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in such way as to provide a uniform system for both State and Federal institutions.

operating expenses.⁶⁶ A fiscal period beginning January 1 and ending December 30 should be recommended for all cities and counties.⁶⁷ Specific provisions should be made for the allocation of costs between the civil and criminal functions of agencies exercising both, and accurate and practicable methods of allocation should be definitely prescribed.

(b) Each State should adopt this uniform system; should keep its own accounts in accordance therewith; should require annual financial reports on the basis thereof from all of its counties and municipalities; and should provide for the preparation of a consolidated report bringing together State, county and municipal figures as to the cost of police, prosecution, criminal courts, penal and correctional institutions, and probation and parole.

(c) The Bureau of the Census should be authorized and directed to collect and consolidate such State reports, and to publish consolidated statistics as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States borne by the several States and their municipal subdivisions.⁶⁸

The carrying into effect of these recommendations would result in the building up of a body of financial statistics relating to the administration of justice which would, we believe, be of great value to the Federal Government, to the States and their municipal subdivisions, and to the public.

⁶⁶ This classification should be worked out by accounting experts, and would doubtless be substantially more detailed than the minimum classification into pay roll, supplies and repairs, and general overhead which has been referred to in earlier sections of this part. Cf. note 53, supra.

⁶⁷ It would be desirable to recommend the same fiscal year for States, also, but this might be impracticable in view of the fact that a substantial majority of the States are now committed to a fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 30. See p. 163, supra.

⁶⁸ The general scheme of these recommendations follows to a considerable extent the plan proposed by Professor Warner for the collection of criminal statistics other than financial on a nation-wide basis. See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 43-52, 89-94.

PART 4

THE COST OF STATE POLICE FORCES

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—This part of the report presents and discusses data as to that part of the cost of criminal justice which is represented by expenditures for State police forces. The cost of Federal police agencies and of the municipal police forces of the larger cities are dealt with elsewhere.¹ The purposes of this part are, first, to bring together basic data as to direct State expenditures for police protection; second, to indicate to what extent those expenditures form part of the cost of administration of criminal justice; and third, to analyze the data presented on a comparative basis.

2. *Period covered.*—The figures given in this part are for the census year 1928—i. e., for the most recent fiscal year of each State considered ending prior to December 31, 1928.² While this basis does not give exactly comparable figures, since not all of the States having State police forces operate on the basis of the same fiscal year,³ this is not a serious matter,⁴ whereas the practical difficulty of obtaining calendar-year figures would have been substantial. The year 1928 was chosen since the latest available census figures are for that census year,⁵ while reports for all State police forces

¹ See pt. 2, pp. 72-77, 95-106, supra (Federal police); pt. 6, pp. 282-289, infra (municipal police in cities over 25,000). See further, as to the precise scope of this part, pp. 100-107, infra.

² This is the basis on which the census financial statistics of States are compiled. See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, pp. 3-4 (U. S. Census, 1928).

³ Out of the 11 States having State police forces of the types here dealt with (cf. p. 107, infra), 6 have fiscal years ending June 30 (Connecticut, Maine, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and West Virginia); 2 have fiscal years ending November 30 (Massachusetts and Rhode Island); 1 has a fiscal year ending May 31 (Pennsylvania); 1 has a fiscal year ending August 31 (Texas); and 1 has a fiscal year ending September 30 (Maryland).

⁴ See the discussion of this point with regard to State and municipal statistics generally (p. 104, supra).

⁵ See discussion of the available census material on State police forces, pp. 165-166, supra.

are also available for that period. The figures for 1928 are, it is believed, reasonably representative of present State police costs, since, although there have been increases in the cost of most State police forces since that year, these increases have not been extremely large.

3. *Method of investigation.*—The data presented and discussed in this part of the report were obtained only in part from published sources. Basic cost data were obtained from the reports of the State police departments themselves,⁶ supplemented by unpublished data obtained from those departments and from the Bureau of the Census.⁷ The data used in estimating the extent to which expenditures for State police forces form part of the cost of administration of criminal justice were obtained directly from the State departments. Special acknowledgment is made to the heads of the State police forces of Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas and West Virginia, and to the Bureau of the Census, for their cooperation. Without such cooperation this study would have been impossible.⁸

The basic cost data presented in this part of the report are believed to be reasonably accurate and comparable. The figures as to the proportion of the cost of State police forces chargeable to civil and administrative activities and to various types of criminal law enforcement activities are estimates only. They are, however, estimates which represent the best judgment of the responsible head of each State police force as to the work of his own force, and may, it is believed, be regarded as giving a fair indication of the relative importance of the different activities of the forces considered.

⁶ See Table 1, infra, for references to these reports.

⁷ Through the courtesy of Dr. W. M. Stewart, director, Dr. Starke M. Grogan, chief statistician for statistics of States and cities, and Dr. Lemuel A. Carruthers, expert chief of division, of the Bureau of the Census, the writer was furnished with copies of the work sheets used in preparing Financial Statistics of States, 1928, which contain much valuable information. All State police reports have been checked against these census figures.

⁸ Acknowledgment is also made to Mr. Bruce Smith, of the National Institute of Public Administration, New York, N. Y., for advice and assistance.

CHAPTER II

STATE POLICE FORCES

1. *Introductory.*—State police forces may be of three general types: (a) highway police, concerned primarily with enforcement of the motor vehicle laws, although occasionally exercising general police functions; (b) semimilitary forces, created primarily for frontier duty and for the suppression of riots and civil commotion, although having and exercising the ordinary functions of police; and (c) forces primarily concerned with ordinary police duties, particularly in rural areas. Some consideration of the character and functions of each of these types of State police force is a necessary preliminary to defining the scope of this study.

2. *Highway police forces.*—State highway police forces exist in a number of States, including California, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, Oregon, Utah, Virginia and Washington. In Pennsylvania such a force exists side-by-side with a regular State police force concerned with general police duties. These forces are concerned primarily with the patrol of improved State highways, and with the enforcement of the motor vehicle laws. While some of them have been given general police powers, those powers in most cases are seldom exercised. One reason for this is the fact that most such forces are subordinate to the State department of motor vehicles or some analogous department, and hence administrative supervision has been principally directed toward the enforcement of the motor vehicle and highway laws, rather than the criminal law proper.⁹ The functions of such forces, like those of the traffic squads of municipal police forces, are primarily administrative and only incidentally criminal; and the cost of such forces can not, in general, be regarded as part of the cost of administration of criminal justice.¹⁰

In the case of a few of these forces, however, a considerable amount of criminal law enforcement work proper is carried on. Thus, while the Maryland State police force is under

⁹ See Smith, *The State Police: An American Experiment in Rural Protection*, Police Journal, vol. 3, p. 22 (London, 1930). See also Annual Report of the State Highway Department of Delaware, 1930, pp. 19-23; Twelfth Annual Report of the Division of Highways, State of Illinois, p. 110 (1930). In some cases, such forces are limited by law to traffic duty.

¹⁰ This matter of the exclusion from the cost of criminal justice of expenditures for traffic regulation has been referred to in pt. 3 (pp. 157-158, supra).

the jurisdiction of the State department of motor vehicles and is restricted by law to motor vehicle regulation, its members have been deputized by the sheriffs of most of the counties in Maryland, and function, in the capacity of deputy sheriffs, in carrying out a considerable amount of general law enforcement work.¹¹ So also, the State police of Maine, while primarily a highway force, has some general criminal duties.¹²

3. *Semimilitary forces.*—The only example of the semimilitary type of State police which still exists is the Texas Rangers.¹³ This force was originally largely concerned with frontier duty and with the suppression of riots and civil commotion, but has now come to be primarily occupied with exercising general law enforcement duties. It differs from other State forces exercising general police jurisdiction principally in its semimilitary organization and character.¹⁴

4. *State police forces proper.*—The class of State police forces proper includes those State forces which comprise "a numerous and permanent body of police officers who are clothed with general police authority, state-wide in its extent, and regularly exercised,"¹⁵ and which are concerned primarily with general police duties. Such forces exist in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and West Virginia.

The State police forces proper are primarily agencies for rural police and protection, although used occasionally for other special duties in times of public emergency.¹⁶ As the superintendent of the Pennsylvania State Police puts it, such forces have been organized "with the primary purpose of giving police protection to areas lying outside of municipal jurisdiction, and with the secondary function of cooperating with the various police authorities of the State, giving aid

¹¹ See Smith, *The State Police*, p. 48 (New York, 1925).

¹² See Annual Report of the Superintendent, Maine State Highway Police, 1930 (mimeograph), pp. 2-3, 5.

¹³ Similar forces at one time existed in Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico, but have been disbanded. See Smith, *The State Police*, p. 45, and *The State Police: An American Experiment in Rural Protection*, Police Journal, vol. 3, p. 22.

¹⁴ The Texas Rangers date back to the time when Texas was an independent Republic, and were originally organized for military service on the Mexican border. This duty has persisted, and the rangers "still retain much of their frontier flavor" (Smith, *The State Police*, p. 57). The rangers are under the command of the State adjutant general, a military officer.

¹⁵ See Smith, *The State Police*, p. 48.

¹⁶ See Smith, *The State Police: An American Experiment in Rural Protection*, Police Journal, vol. 3, p. 20.

where more than normal police power is required, as frequently occurs during disasters by flood, fire or explosion, during threatened lynchings, or where the local authority is not sufficiently strong to maintain peace and enforce the law.¹⁷ In general, such forces function only outside of the municipal limits of the cities of the State, except where called on for riot or other emergency duty.¹⁸ In their ordinary duties they supplement the police work of county sheriffs and village constables.¹⁹

5. *Other State police agencies.*—There may be other State agencies having some police duties or functions. California, for example, has a State division of criminal identification and investigation which serves as a clearing-house for fingerprint and other identification records and for police statistics for all the municipalities of the State, and which also has certain limited investigational duties.²⁰ It is, however, rather an adjunct to the municipal forces of the State, than a separate State force. There may also be police agencies in State executive departments analogous to those in the Federal departments,²¹ but these are neither numerous nor important in most States. Finally, the National Guard may be called out for police duty in emergencies, and in that sense is a State police force.²²

6. *Scope of this study.*—This study includes all State police forces, whether denominated as highway police, rangers or otherwise, which have and regularly exercise important police duties in matters relating to violations of the criminal law generally. It does not include forces having no general police powers, nor those which, although having such powers,

¹⁷ See Adams, *The State Police*, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, pp. 34-35 (1929).

¹⁸ See Smith, *The State Police*, pp. 73-80. In a few instances, State police have been used within municipal limits in the absence of an emergency, but this practice is unusual and has not been very successful. See Smith, *The State Police: An American Experiment in Rural Protection*, Police Journal, vol. 3, p. 28.

¹⁹ See Adams, *The State Police*, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 34.

²⁰ See Report of the California State Division of Identification and Investigation for the Biennial Period ending June 30, 1930, pp. 3-4, 6-10. State bureaus of criminal identification have been organized in some other States, such as Indiana and Utah. Special bureaus for dealing with automobile thefts exist in Indiana and North Carolina. The Nevada "State police force," composed of 3 permanently employed men, functions principally as a bureau of identification. See Biennial Report of the Superintendent Nevada State Police and Warden State Penitentiary, 1927-28, p. 13.

²¹ Cf. p. 72-77, supra.

²² Cf. p. 40, supra.

do not regularly exercise them,²³ for the reason that the cost of these forces is an expense of general State administration rather than of criminal justice.²⁴ Nor does it include central State bureaus of identification and information like that existing in California, or other specialized State bureaus, since the cost of such bureaus, while a part of the State cost of criminal justice, is primarily related to municipal police activity rather than to independent State police work. Finally, this study does not include the police work of the National Guard, for reasons which have been indicated in an earlier part of this report.²⁵

This study as thus defined and limited deals with the cost of the State police forces of 11 States—Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas and West Virginia. These are the only States which have State forces regularly exercising general police powers; in the other 37 States, the task of rural protection against crime is still left to the sheriffs of the counties and the constables and similar peace officers of the villages. The study may thus be regarded as a comparative analysis of the cost of rural police protection in those States which have adopted the State police system for this purpose.²⁶

CHAPTER III

STATE POLICE COSTS

1. *Special problems involved.*—The principal problem in working out comparative figures as to State police costs arises from the inclusion in the study of certain forces whose duties are not confined to general police protection in rural areas, but which have that function as a part of their regular work.²⁷ It is obvious that a direct comparison of the costs of such forces with the costs of other forces charged only with the duty of rural protection against crime would be

²³ This excludes the State highway police of all of the States except Maine and Maryland.

²⁴ See p. 104, supra.

²⁵ See p. 40, supra.

²⁶ The 11 States which have adopted this system have 20.3 per cent of the rural population of the United States. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 15. The 7 of these 11 States located in the New England and Middle Atlantic States have 94.4 per cent of the aggregate rural population of these regions.

²⁷ Such, for example, are the Connecticut, Maine and Maryland forces, which have extensive duties in connection with traffic.

wholly without significance. In order to make any useful comparison, an allocation of cost must be made in the case of forces of the former sort. Moreover, allocation is necessary if the cost of State police chargeable to the administration of criminal justice is to be ascertained, even in the case of forces having only general police duties, since most of these discharge some administrative functions.²⁸ Certain of the tables in the following sections will attempt such allocation.²⁹

No particularly complicated problem other than that of allocation of costs arises in connection with studies of State police expenditures. The published reports permit a reasonable degree of classification of expenditures, although not on an entirely comparable basis except in the case of salaries and wages. Accordingly, a classification into "pay roll" and "other expenses" has been used, no attempt being made to segregate repair and supply expenditures from general overhead.³⁰ Capital expenditures are either eliminated from operating expense or stated separately in the published reports, so that no difficulty arises on this point. Some data are available as to capital outlays,³¹ but none as to total investment or carrying charges thereon.

2. *Basic operating costs.*—Table 1 gives basic figures for the cost of State police forces for the census year 1928, classified into expenditures for pay roll and other expenditures. It also gives the number of men on each force and indicates the cost per police officer.

²⁸ See Smith, *The State Police*, pp. 51-53.

²⁹ As to basis on which the allocations have been made, see p. 103, *supra*.

³⁰ Total operating expenses as shown by State reports have in all cases been checked against the figures as to State police costs compiled by the Bureau of the Census as shown on the original work sheets used in preparing *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*. Fair agreement was found except for Michigan and Texas, where large discrepancies appeared. In the case of Michigan this was apparently due to the failure of the census agent to include in total cost other expenses than salaries. In the case of Texas the discrepancy appears to have been due to the inclusion by the census agent of the entire cost of the State adjutant general's department as a police cost. In both these cases, as in all other cases, the State figures were used in preference to the census figures.

³¹ Such outlays, as shown by the original work sheets of the Census, aggregated \$120,765.67 for the 11 States here considered during the census year 1928.

TABLE 1.—*Operating costs of State police forces, 1928*

State	End of fiscal year	Number on force	Pay roll	Other expenditures	Total operating cost	Cost per police officer
Connecticut.....	June 30, 1928	1 100	\$194,040.53	\$184,899.30	\$379,839.83	\$3,798.40
Maine.....	do.....	3 62	70,236.05	63,763.95	140,000.00	2,258.06
Maryland.....	Sept. 30, 1928	5 48	68,172.24	60,880.30	128,052.54	2,834.44
Massachusetts.....	Nov. 30, 1928	7 170	315,403.14	330,741.62	646,234.60	3,801.38
Michigan.....	Dec. 31, 1928	9 139	219,000.00	177,057.12	396,057.12	2,853.60
New Jersey.....	June 30, 1928	10 131	234,350.03	282,498.13	516,848.16	3,945.40
New York.....	do.....	12 503	755,232.78	1,090,328.08	1,845,560.86	3,670.30
Pennsylvania.....	May 31, 1928	14 308	542,292.70	268,360.05	810,652.75	2,634.83
Rhode Island.....	Dec. 31, 1928	16 33	87,000.00	28,850.01	115,850.01	3,207.60
Texas.....	Aug. 31, 1928	19 30	39,902.46	29,612.73	69,515.19	2,313.84
West Virginia.....	June 30, 1928	21 167	225,129.02	187,370.08	412,500.00	2,627.30

¹ Authorized. See Reports of the Connecticut State Police Department for the Fiscal Periods July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927, and July 1, 1927, to June 30, 1928, p. 91.

² *Ibid.*, p. 180.

³ Average for year. Information from Chief, Maine State Highway Police, Augusta, Me.

⁴ Information from Chief, Maine State Highway Police, Augusta, Me.

⁵ Average for year. Information from Commissioner of Motor Vehicles of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.

⁶ See Twelfth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles of Maryland, p. 15 (1928). Obvious capital outlays amounting to \$20,318.39 have been deducted in arriving at total cost.

⁷ Information from Commissioner of Public Safety, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.

⁸ See Annual Report of the Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Safety for the Year ending November 30, 1928, p. 30.

⁹ Information from the Commissioner of Public Safety, State of Michigan, Lansing, Mich.

¹⁰ Average for year. See Seventh Annual Report of the Department of State Police of New Jersey, p. 33 (1928).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹² Average for 1928. See Annual Report of the New York State Troopers for the Year 1928, p. 15.

¹³ Information from Superintendent, New York State Troopers, Albany, N. Y.

¹⁴ Average for the period June 1, 1926 to May 31, 1928. See Biennial Report of the Pennsylvania State Police for the Fiscal Years 1926-1928, p. 5.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁶ As of Dec. 31, 1928. See Fourth Annual Report of the Rhode Island Department of State Police, p. 9 (1929).

¹⁷ Information from Superintendent, Department of State Police, State of Rhode Island, Providence, R. I.

¹⁸ See Fourth Annual Report of the Rhode Island Department of State Police, p. 12 (1929).

¹⁹ As of Aug. 31, 1928. See Reports of the Adjutant General of the State of Texas for the Years Ending Aug. 31, 1927 and Aug. 31, 1928, p. 34.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

²¹ Average for the period July 1, 1926 to June 30, 1928. See Fifth Biennial Report of the West Virginia Department of Public Safety, p. 15 (1928).

²² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²³ Amount of appropriation for fiscal year ending June 30, 1928.

The foregoing table indicates that the largest factor in the cost of State police forces is salaries and wages, which average 50.03 per cent of the total cost for all the forces considered. The annual expenditure per police officer varies from a minimum of \$2,258.06 in the case of the Maine State Highway Police to a maximum of \$3,945.40 per annum in the case of the New Jersey State Troopers. Average pay-roll expenditures are much less variant, the minimum being \$1,229.51 per annum for the Maine force, and the

maximum of \$1,949.41 per annum for the Connecticut force.³²

3. *Cost of criminal work.*—Table 2 shows the cost of the criminal work of the various State police forces for 1928, arrived at on the basis of estimates by the head of each force as to the relative amount of the time of that force devoted, respectively, to criminal and to administrative and other noncriminal matters.

TABLE 2.—*Cost of criminal work of State police forces, 1928*

State	Operating cost ¹	Per cent of criminal work ²	Cost of criminal work
Connecticut.....	\$370,830.33	32	\$121,540
Maine.....	140,000.00	(*)
Maryland.....	138,053.04	10	13,805
Massachusetts.....	646,234.66	68	374,810
Michigan.....	306,637.12	(*)
New Jersey.....	516,848.16	75	387,636
New York.....	1,851,561.70	35	648,047
Pennsylvania.....	810,610.81	49	737,056
Rhode Island.....	115,850.91	40	46,340
Texas.....	69,415.10	100	69,415
West Virginia.....	412,500.00	65	262,125
Total.....	5,477,571.48	\$ 2,001,380

¹ From Table 1, supra.

² Estimated by head of each force.

³ No estimate obtained.

⁴ The Superintendent of the Pennsylvania State Police estimates that 53 per cent of the time of the force during the fiscal year 1927-28 was spent on ordinary criminal work, 38 per cent on riot duty (a very unusual circumstance), and 9 per cent on administrative duties. Time spent on riot duty has been included in the above table as time spent on criminal work.

⁵ Incomplete.

The foregoing table indicates that, except in the case of the Maryland highway force and the Connecticut, New York and Rhode Island forces, the major part of the duties of State police forces are in connection with criminal work. The average estimated proportion of criminal work for all the forces for which data are available is 53.9 per cent.

It must be borne in mind that the figures given in Table 2 for costs of criminal work are based on estimates only, and are not anywhere nearly as exact as the form in which they are presented might be taken to indicate. This basic infirmity of the data must be borne in mind in considering what conclusions, if any, may safely be drawn therefrom.

³² It must be borne in mind that pay-roll expenditures are not an accurate index of relative real wages, since the practice as to subsistence allowances, commutation of quarters, etc., varies in the different States. See Adams, *The State Police*, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 38.

Figures as to the per capita cost of the criminal work of State police forces, computed on the basis of the total rural population of each State,³³ are of interest, since they show how much each State is spending directly for the police protection of its citizens who live in rural sections. Table 3 shows such per capita costs for the census year 1928.

TABLE 3.—*Relation of cost of criminal work of State police to rural population*

State	Rural population ¹	Cost of criminal work of police ²	Per capita cost per annum
Connecticut.....	475,133	\$121,540	\$0.256
Maine.....	475,917	(*)
Maryland.....	666,657	13,805	.022
Massachusetts.....	418,188	374,810	.890
Michigan.....	1,540,250	(*)
New Jersey.....	702,090	387,636	.552
New York.....	2,066,114	648,047	.314
Pennsylvania.....	3,097,839	737,056	.238
Rhode Island.....	52,068	46,340	.887
Texas.....	3,435,367	69,415	.020
West Virginia.....	1,237,701	262,125	.212

¹ From Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 15.

² From Table 2, supra.

³ Data not available.

Table 3 shows wide variations in the expenditures of the various States for the protection of their rural residents by State police.³⁴ The extent to which these variations in per capita cost is due to differences in the sizes of the various forces is shown in Table 4.

³³ Per capita figures based on total population, urban and rural, while they might be of significance in a general study of State expenditures, would indicate nothing as to the amount spent for rural police protection in relation to the need for spending it.

³⁴ The total governmental expenditures for the police protection of each rural resident, as distinguished from the expenditures for protection by State police, would include the cost of the criminal work of sheriffs and constables, as to which no data are available. See pp. 106, 107, supra.

TABLE 4.—Relation of size of State police forces and cost of criminal work to rural population

State	Theoretical size of criminal force ¹	Police-men (criminal) per 100,000 rural population ²	Per capita criminal cost ³
Connecticut.....	32	6.7	\$0.250
Maine ⁴
Maryland.....	5	8	0.021
Massachusetts.....	97	23.2	.806
Michigan ⁵
New Jersey.....	98	14.0	.552
New York.....	208	10.1	.314
Pennsylvania.....	300	9.7	.238
Rhode Island.....	13	25.0	.887
Texas.....	30	9	.020
West Virginia.....	72	5.8	.212

¹ Arrived at by applying percentage of criminal work of force (from Table 2, supra) to actual size of force (from Table 1, supra), thus giving the theoretical number of men on each force doing criminal work only.

² Population data from Table 3, supra.

³ From Table 3, supra.

⁴ No data available.

Table 4 indicates that Massachusetts and Rhode Island are spending proportionately the most money and providing the largest amount of State police protection for their rural population, and that Maryland and Texas are spending the proportionately smallest amount of money and providing the least rural State police protection of any of the States which have adopted the State police system.³⁶ New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and West Virginia occupy an intermediate position.

4. *Cost of prohibition enforcement.*—Some State police forces are largely concerned with the enforcement of the prohibition laws; other forces do little or nothing in this connection. Table 5, which is based on estimates by the head of each force, shows the relative cost of prohibition enforcement and other criminal work for each force for the census year 1928.

³⁶ By "amount of State police protection" is meant numerical amount. It is impossible on the basis of the data here presented to reach any conclusions as to relative efficiency of State police forces, and so as to the actual amount of protection afforded.

TABLE 5.—Relative cost of prohibition and other criminal work of State police forces, 1928

State	Total cost of criminal work ¹	Cost of prohibition-enforcement work ²	Per cent	Cost of other criminal work ³	Per cent
Connecticut.....	\$121,540	\$30,387	25.0	\$91,161	75.0
Maine ⁴
Maryland.....	13,805	(⁵)	13,805	100.0
Massachusetts.....	374,810	45,230	12.1	329,580	87.9
Michigan ⁵
New Jersey.....	337,030	(⁶)	(⁶)	(⁶)	(⁶)
New York.....	648,047	148,125	22.0	499,922	77.1
Pennsylvania.....	737,650	202,453	27.4	535,203	72.0
Rhode Island.....	40,340	5,793	12.5	40,547	87.5
Texas.....	69,415	24,295	35.0	45,120	65.0
West Virginia.....	262,125	123,750	47.2	138,375	52.8
Total.....	⁸ 2,273,742	580,030	⁶ 25.5	1,693,713	⁶ 74.5

¹ From Table 2, supra.

² Based on estimates by the head of each force.

³ No estimate secured.

⁴ None.

⁵ Exclusive of Maine, Michigan, and New Jersey.

⁶ Weighted average.

The foregoing table indicates that the majority of State police forces devote a substantial amount of time and expense to the attempt to enforce the prohibition laws. This is particularly marked in the case of the West Virginia force.

5. *Conclusion.*—The cost figures presented in the preceding sections indicate certain facts as to expenditures for State police forces by those States which have adopted this method of protecting their rural areas from crime. Those figures do not, however, indicate the total cost of rural police protection in such States, nor do they afford any basis for comparisons of the cost of rural police protection in the States having State police forces and in the States which have adhered to the sheriff-constable system. Nor do the figures afford a basis for judgment as to the comparative efficiency of the various State forces. The fact that the cost per State policeman is high in a certain State may be due to the fact that that particular State is seeking, by paying adequate salaries, providing first-class equipment, and in general following a liberal policy, to secure the most efficient possible State police force; it may be due to the fact that money is being wastefully spent; or it may be due to still other causes. The fact that the cost per State policeman is low in another State may be due to a praiseworthy economy; it may be due to a niggardly financial policy which results in an inefficient force

which is not worth even the limited amount expended on it; or it may be due to wholly extraneous factors. The figures presented here do not and can not indicate which of these situations may exist in any particular case. Moreover, there are no satisfactory figures as to the volume of crime in the rural areas of the several States available to afford a basis for comparing the efficiency of State police forces as reflected by relative costs and crime rates.³⁶ Consequently, the figures here presented have only a limited field of usefulness. Subject to these limitations, however, the data here presented as to the cost of State police forces are believed to be reasonably comprehensive and comparable.

³⁶ Such a comparative study would require much data in addition to figures as to volume of crime and costs of police, and, even with this other data, might yield only tentative and suggestive results. See pp. 330-348, *infra*. Figures as to volume of crime are, however, essential to any results at all. See pp. 343-346, *infra*. Hence, in any comparative study of the efficiency of State police forces, comprehensive figures as to known offenses in the rural sections of each State having such forces would be essential. These figures do not exist. While the State police forces of Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island report offenses known to them (cf. Uniform Crime Reports, vol. 2, No. 3, March, 1931), no county in any one of those States regularly reports offenses known to the county law enforcement officers. In the absence of such figures, the data as to rural crime conditions are entirely too incomplete to be useful. The figure as to known Part I offenses (for an explanation of the term "Part I offenses," see pp. 344-345, *infra*) reported by the State police of Massachusetts for March, 1931, was 20.8 per 100,000 rural population. The corresponding figure for New Jersey was 20.1 per 100,000; for New York, 14.4 per 100,000; and for Rhode Island, 42.2 per 100,000. (Uniform Crime Reports, vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 23-26.) But these figures can not fairly be taken as indicating that the rural crime rate in Rhode Island last March was twice that for Massachusetts and New Jersey and three times that for New York. There may have been many offenses in Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York which were reported to county officers which never came to the knowledge of the State police. Moreover, the Rhode Island State police may police urban areas, so that some of the offenses known to it may not be rural offenses. For these reasons, quite apart from the question of the reliability of police statistics of known offenses (cf. pp. 345-346, *infra*), no useful conclusions of any sort can be predicated on existing statistics as to the amount of rural crime.

PART 5

THE COST OF STATE PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND PAROLE AGENCIES

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—The purpose of this part of the report is to present comprehensive figures as to the cost of State penal and correctional institutions and State parole agencies.¹

2. *Scope of study.*—The study deals with State institutions and agencies only. It does not cover county or municipal institutions for either adults or minors even where such institutions are used to confine State prisoners,² nor does it cover locally-administered parole.³

There were several reasons for excluding county jails and workhouses, city houses of detention, and other municipal institutions from the study. In the first place, it would have been impossible, as a practical matter, to obtain any comprehensive cost figures. Most of the 3,073 counties of the United States, and many of the 1,833 cities of the country over 5,000 in population, have some sort of a jail.⁴ Practically no published financial figures exist for any of these institutions.⁵ To obtain accurate and comparable cost data from some 3,000 to 4,000 independent governmental units would have been impossible without an enormous expendi-

¹ Data as to the cost of Federal penal and corrective institutions and agencies have been presented in part 2 of this report (pp. 120-138, *supra*).

² As in the case of Delaware. There is no Delaware State prison, State prisoners being confined in the New Castle County workhouse. See National Society of Penal Information, *Handbook of American Prisons and Reformatories*, 1920, pp. 215-224.

³ While parole is normally a State function, locally-administered parole for certain types of offenders exists in a few States—for example, California and Pennsylvania.

⁴ In 1923 there were some 3,460 county and municipal penal and correctional institutions for adults in the continental United States. See *Prisoners, 1923*, p. 3 (U. S. Census, 1926). The number of such institutions in 1923 was probably greater.

⁵ See pp. 170-180, *supra*.

ture of time and money. In the second place, figures as to the cost of the penal institutions operated by approximately 75 per cent of the cities of the country over 25,000 in population and by the counties in which such cities are located, obtained in the course of a nation-wide field study of municipal costs of administering criminal justice, are presented elsewhere in this report.⁶ Third, a large majority of the adult offenders in prison are confined in State institutions,⁷ so that the failure to include county and municipal institutions in the study is not as serious as it might otherwise be.

Institutions for incompetent offenders, such as asylums for the criminal insane and hospitals for defective delinquents, have been excluded because the cost of such institutions is not regarded as a part of the cost of criminal justice.⁸

The study covers in detail 95 institutions for adults in 47 States,⁹ having a total prison population on January 1, 1928, of 91,192 persons, made up of 87,170 men and 4,022 women.¹⁰ Total figures by States for State adult penal and correctional expenditures are also presented.

Total figures by States are given for the cost of State institutions for delinquent minors,¹¹ and as to the cost of State parole agencies. Detailed figures by institutions are also given for 51 State institutions for minors.

3. *Period covered.*—The period covered by the figures presented here as to total State costs and as to the costs of individual penal institutions for adults is the census year 1928—i. e., the last fiscal period of each institution or each State, as the case may be, ending on or before December 31,

⁶ See pp. 307-314, *infra*.

⁷ The last Federal census of prisoners, taken as of Jan. 1, 1923, showed that 75.1 per cent of all adult prisoners were in State institutions, 10.6 per cent in county jails or other institutions, and 8.3 per cent in municipal jails or institutions. See *Prisoners, 1923*, pp. 190-193. There is no reason to believe that these percentages have changed radically in subsequent years.

⁸ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities*, reprinted as Appendix C to this report (p. 544, *infra*). See also *Prisoners, 1923*, p. 3.

⁹ Omitting Delaware, which has no State penal institutions for adults. See note 2, *supra*.

¹⁰ See *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927*, p. 112 (U. S. Census, 1931). These institutions include 59 State prisons and penitentiaries, 24 for men, 4 for women, and 31 for both sexes; 32 reformatories and similar institutions, 17 for men, 12 for women, and 3 for both sexes; and 4 prison farms, 1 for men and 3 for women.

¹¹ In 1923, the last year for which detailed Census figures are available, there were 90 such institutions, with a total delinquent population of 20,708 minors. See *Children Under Institutional Care, 1923*, pp. 288, 346-355 (U. S. Census, 1926).

1928.¹² It is not believed that the comparability of the figures is seriously affected by the resulting variations in fiscal periods as between different institutions and States.¹³ The period covered by the figures as to the costs of individual institutions for minors is the fiscal year 1926-1927.

4. *Material used.*—The basic material used in the study has been the financial data as to State penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies collected by the Bureau of the Census. The last published figures as to individual institutions are for the census year 1927;¹⁴ but figures have been collected, although not yet published, for 1928, and these have formed part of the data for this study.¹⁵ Use has also been made of the Census figures as to total State expenditures for penal and correctional institutions for adults and minors and for parole agencies.¹⁶

The published reports of State penal institutions for adults have been utilized, so far as available, to supplement and check the census data.¹⁷

No financial figures for 1928 were reported by 10 of the State institutions for adults from which reports were requested by the census.¹⁸ Figures for these institutions on the

¹² The use of the census year has been discussed in pt. 4 of this report (p. 192, *supra*). The census institutional figures cover the year ending June 30, 1928, in the case of 52 institutions; the calendar year 1928 in the case of 13 institutions; the year ending Nov. 30, 1928, in the case of 8 institutions; the year ending Sept. 30, 1928, in the case of 7 institutions; the year ending May 31, 1928, in the case of 2 institutions; and the years ending Mar. 31, Apr. 1, and July 1, 1928, in the case of 1 institution each. See *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927*, pp. 124-127. As to State fiscal periods, see pp. 163-164, *supra*.

¹³ This question has been discussed in an earlier part of the report. See p. 164, *supra*.

¹⁴ See *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927*, pp. 124-127.

¹⁵ Acknowledgment is made to Dr. W. M. Stewart, director, Bureau of the Census; to Dr. Starke M. Grogan, chief statistician for statistics of States and cities; to Dr. Lemuel A. Caruthers, expert chief of division; and to Miss Harriet M. Cheney, in charge of statistics of penal institutions, for making available these unpublished figures, as well as the original work sheets used in compiling *Financial Statistics of States, 1928* (U. S. Census, 1931).

¹⁶ See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 86, 87, 100, 101. The original work sheets of the Census were examined for each State. See note 15, *supra*. Detailed figures as to State institutions for minors were obtained from the published bulletin of the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior entitled *Industrial Schools for Delinquents, 1926-27* (Bulletin No. 10, 1928).

¹⁷ For a discussion of the extent and character of the available reports, see pp. 178-179, 181-182, *infra*. Reports were examined for 57 out of the 95 State institutions for adults included in the detailed study.

¹⁸ Alabama State penitentiary; Louisiana State penitentiary; Maryland penitentiary; Mississippi State penitentiary; Clinton State prison (New York); South Carolina State penitentiary; Brushy Mountain penitentiary (Tennessee); Nashville State prison (Tennessee); Texas State prison; Vermont State prison and house of correction for women. There are also certain State penal institutions not on the official list of the census from which no reports were sought. No attempt was made to secure detailed figures as to these latter institutions in the present investigation, although they have been taken account of in compiling total costs by States.

census basis were obtained from published reports of the institutions or by correspondence in the case of all but 2 institutions.¹⁰ In some instances, moreover, the figures reported to the Bureau of the Census required explanation and amplification. Here also the published reports of the institutions involved and correspondence with the heads of those institutions were resorted to.²⁰

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS OF INSTITUTIONAL COSTS

1. *Introductory.*—Some consideration has already been given in the earlier parts of this report²¹ to the special problems which arise in any study of penal institutional costs; but a somewhat more detailed consideration of these problems as they arise in the case of State institutions, with particular reference to the extent to which the available figures make possible their solution, is desirable here. Consideration will therefore next be given to the problems of (a) classification of operating expenses, (b) treatment of capital outlays, (c) treatment of receipts, and (d) treatment of expenditures in connection with prison industries. After discussing these problems, consideration will be given to the question of the extent to which the figures presented in the following chapters may, in the light of that discussion, be regarded as accurate and reliable.

2. *Classification of operating expenses.*—The classification of operating expenses²² adopted by the Bureau of the Census for its detailed financial statistics of penal institutions for adults includes four classes of expenditures—viz, (a) salaries and wages; (b) provisions; (c) fuel, light and water; and (d)

¹⁰ Louisiana State penitentiary and Texas State prison. In these instances, the cost of each institution was estimated on the basis of data contained in the original work sheets used in preparing the census financial statistics of States.

²⁰ Acknowledgment is made to the wardens of the various institutions for their cooperation in answering inquiries. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. Lewis E. Lawes, warden of Sing Sing State prison, Ossining, N. Y., and to Dr. Leo J. Palmer, superintendent of the New York State reformatory for women, Bedford Hills, N. Y., for valuable suggestions as to the form and contents of this part of this report.

²¹ See pp. 44-47, 160-161, 178, supra.

²² Described as "expenditures for maintenance." See *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories*, 1927, p. 124.

"all other expenditures for maintenance."²³ The Department of Justice adopts a more detailed classification in its financial statistics of Federal penal institutions.²⁴ It distinguishes between (a) administrative expenses, including as separate subclasses (1) salaries, and (2) other administrative expenses; (b) support of inmates, including as separate subclasses (1) subsistence, (2) clothing, (3) medical attention, and (4) other allowances; (c) maintenance of institution, including as subclasses (1) power, heat, light, and water, and (2) "institutional buildings and improvements";²⁵ and (d) commitment and release expenditures.²⁶ The classifications used in reports of the various State institutions differ greatly. Practically all of the reports give substantially more detail than the census statistics, and many of them more detail than the Department of Justice publishes for Federal institutions. If the figures of the institutions themselves were comparable, they would in many cases furnish the most satisfactory data for study, but lack of uniformity of accounting methods is such as preclude the use of these figures otherwise than to check and supplement the census figures.

One highly unsatisfactory feature of the census classification of operating expense is the catch-all class of "other expenditures for maintenance." This includes such widely diverse items as expenditures for power, which might better be classed with heat, light and water;²⁷ repairs to institutional buildings and equipment, which should either be classified separately or with expenditures for supplies; clothing and medical care for inmates, both of which might well be separately classified;²⁸ and other miscellaneous operating expenses. From an accounting standpoint, this classification

²³ See *Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics*, p. 15 (U. S. Census, 1927). The census figures as to the cost of State penal institutions given in *Financial Statistics of States*, 1928, pp. 86-87, do not give any classification except as between institutions for adults and institutions for minors. See p. 181, supra.

²⁴ These statistics have already been presented (although with a different classification) in an earlier part of this report (pp. 120-134, supra); they are referred to here for purposes of comparison only.

²⁵ This subclass represents expenditures for repairs, and does not, in spite of its misleading name, include capital outlays.

²⁶ This classification includes "transportation, clothing, and gratuities allowed to released prisoners, and other expenses incidental to commitment and discharge of prisoners." See *Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions*, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, p. 81, note 2.

²⁷ As in the Federal institutional statistics. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

²⁸ As in the case of the Federal statistics. *Ibid.*, p. 81. At least, all expenditures for the support of inmates other than subsistence should be segregated and classed together.

is not satisfactory. Moreover, the instructions as to classification issued by the census²⁹ are not sufficiently detailed to insure uniformity in the items included under the heading "other expenditures for maintenance," as distinguished from "expenditures for other purposes" (i. e., other purposes than maintenance or improvements). For example, so far as the published forms and instructions of the census go, gratuities to discharged prisoners might be placed in either classification with considerable show of reason.³⁰

Nevertheless, the census figures, although open to some criticism on the score of classification of operating charges, do separate the two principal classes of such charges—viz, salaries and wages, and expenditures for subsistence; their failure to go into further detail is important principally because inadequate forms and instructions have resulted in failure to secure a uniform classification of what in most cases are relatively minor expenditures.³¹

In this report, the census classification will, of necessity, be followed, except that the relatively minor class of expenditures for heat, light and water, which has no very great significance, will not be used, but only the classes of pay roll, subsistence and other operating expenses.

3. *Treatment of capital outlays.*—The census figures for maintenance expenses exclude capital outlays. This point is specifically covered in the instructions for compiling the figures,³² and in the form used in collecting the data from the individual institutions.³³ Annual capital outlays for each institution for adults are reported by the Census,³⁴ but no figures are given for capital investment by institutions.³⁵ Practically all of the State reports eliminate capital outlays from operating expenses, and many of them give consider-

²⁹ See Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics, p. 15. The unsatisfactory character of these instructions has already been pointed out. See p. 183, supra, note 36.

³⁰ The correct procedure is, of course, to classify such expenditures separately, as is done by the Department of Justice in the case of Federal institutions. See note 26, supra.

³¹ The other defects in the detailed census figures hereafter referred to (pp. 211-213, 227-232, infra) are with regard to other matters than the classification of operating charges.

³² See Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics, p. 15.

³³ Both the census figures and the Department of Justice statistics on Federal institutions are satisfactory in this respect. See note 25, supra.

³⁴ See Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927, p. 124. Cf. Financial Statistics of States, 1923, pp. 100, 101.

³⁵ Lump-sum figures for the total value of the properties used by all the correctional institutions of each State, including those for minors, are published by the Census. See Financial Statistics of States, 1923, pp. 108-109.

able detail as to such outlays. A few give data as to aggregate capital investment, but not a sufficient number to make possible a comparative analysis. No institution regularly accrues and reports depreciation on its prison plant; but a few institutions do accrue depreciation on the equipment and machinery used by prison industries.³⁶

Both census and institutional figures may thus be relied on so far as the elimination of capital outlays from operating expenses is concerned. The absence of data as to capital investment does not introduce any error into the figures here presented; although it must be remembered that, since no account is taken in the figures of such investment and the resultant carrying charges, they represent annual operating costs only, and not total annual costs.

4. *Treatment of receipts.*—The Census publishes no figures as to receipts by individual penal institutions, although some figures are collected.³⁷ Data is also collected by the Census as to receipts by penal institutions in compiling the data as to financial statistics of States,³⁸ but no separate figures are published.³⁹ The reports of individual institutions, on the other hand, give a considerable amount of information on this subject, although it is not always in satisfactory form.

Two classes of receipts by State penal institutions must be distinguished: (a) operating income from prison industries, amounts received for hire of labor of prisoners, and the like; and (b) compensation received for use of the institution itself or the services of its staff. The type of the former class is receipts from the sale of prison-made goods; the type of the latter class is per diem compensation for confining Federal prisoners, paid to the institution (or to the State direct) by the Federal Government. No inaccuracy will be introduced if receipts of the former class are not taken account of in determining operating costs;⁴⁰ but failure to make appro-

³⁶ This is true, for example, of the New York State institutions.

³⁷ See Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics, p. 15. The only classification of receipts is "received from appropriations" and "received from other sources," which is wholly inadequate for accounting purposes.

³⁸ See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, p. 34 (U. S. Census, 1923).

³⁹ See Financial Statistics of States, 1923, pp. 70, 71. Receipts from penal institutions are lumped with receipts from charities and hospitals. (Cf. p. 181, supra, note 27.)

⁴⁰ Provided, of course, that institutional expenses incurred in connection with the earning of such receipts are not included in operating expenses. See p. 161, infra. Receipts of this class reduce the net burden on the taxpaying public which supports the institution, but are not properly to be considered as credits against operating cost. See p. 160, supra.

appropriate allowance for receipts of the latter class may introduce such inaccuracy.⁴¹ The census figures do not deduct either type of receipts from operating cost, so that inaccuracies may result so far as the latter class of receipts are concerned. The State reports supply some data on receipts which make it possible to correct the census figures in a few instances.

The figures presented in the following chapter may thus be relied upon not to involve the deduction from operating costs of profits from prison industries or other receipts of similar character. They can not be relied upon to make appropriate deductions of compensation received for confining Federal prisoners and other similar receipts in all cases. Fortunately, receipts of this latter class are relatively small;⁴² and hence no great error resulting from this source will be found in the figures.⁴³

5. *Treatment of expenditures for prison industries.*—The principal weakness of the detailed institutional cost figures of the Bureau of the Census results from failure to give adequate instructions to the institutions sending in returns to the bureau as to how to deal with expenditures in connection with prison industries.⁴⁴ The census figures as to aggregate State costs of penal institutions are not, in general, subject to this infirmity, since reasonably detailed instructions on the point are issued to the clerks and special agents who collect the data.⁴⁵ It is unfortunate that this policy of providing adequate instructions was not also followed in securing the detailed institutional figures.

To secure accurate figures as to institutional administrative costs, there must be excluded from such costs; (a) the

⁴¹ If Federal prisoners are included in reporting the population of the institution, the accuracy of figures as to cost per inmate will not be affected if no deduction is made for receipts from the Federal Government in determining operating cost. The accuracy of the data as to the net State cost will, however, be affected.

⁴² The total operating expenses of all State penal institutions for adults during the census year 1928 was \$32,057,862 as against a total of only \$351,250 paid State institutions during that year for confining Federal prisoners. The aggregate amount received from this source, which is the principal source of receipts of this character, was thus only 1.1 per cent of total operating expenses.

⁴³ Since Federal prisoners are habitually included in reporting total prison population, the figures as to cost per inmate will in any event be correct in most cases. See note 41, supra.

⁴⁴ Neither the form circulated nor the manual of instructions available (Instructions for Compiling Criminal Statistics, p. 16) cover the point at all, except by vague inference.

⁴⁵ See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, p. 34. In a few instances, mistakes appear to have been made even in these figures. See Table 7, infra.

cost of raw material used in the manufacture of prison-made goods; (b) expenditures for repairs of machinery and equipment used for such manufacture; and (c) wages paid prisoners for work in connection with prison industries.⁴⁶ It is impossible to be certain, on the basis of the existing figures, whether these three items of expenditures have been excluded in all cases.⁴⁷ In some instances, it was possible to check the census figures by the reports of the institutions themselves, but there still remain in the figures potential errors due to this cause.

6. *Accuracy of figures.*—The figures as to the cost of State penal and correctional institutions for adults presented in the next chapter have been developed, as already stated,⁴⁸ primarily on the basis of the figures as to individual institutions collected by the Bureau of the Census, supplemented by data obtained from the published reports of the institutions and by correspondence. They are subject to the minor defect that there is no assurance that compensation received for confining Federal prisoners and other analogous receipts have been deducted in all cases, and to the somewhat more serious defect that there is no assurance that expenditures in connection with prison industries have in all cases been eliminated from institutional operating costs. Even with these defects, however, they are the best comprehensive institutional figures available.

It is believed, for reasons more fully explained below,⁴⁹ that in most cases the figures as to total State costs of penal and correctional institutions for adults, collected by the Census in connection with compiling financial statistics of States, are more comprehensive and accurate than those obtainable by adding the cost of individual State institutions. Hence, the figures as to total State costs of penal treatment of adults presented in the last chapter of this part have in most cases been taken from the former source.

The figures as to total State costs of correctional institutions for minors presented in Chapter IV, and the figures as

⁴⁶ Allowance for depreciation on manufacturing machinery and equipment, while necessary to arrive correctly at the profit realized on prison industries, is not essential to the correct determination of institutional operating costs.

⁴⁷ In one case (North Dakota State prison) it affirmatively appears that amounts disbursed as wages to inmates have been included in operating cost. See Table 2, infra, note 10.

⁴⁸ See pp. 207-208, supra.

⁴⁹ See pp. 227-232, infra.

to total State parole costs appearing in Chapter V, are those collected by the Census in compiling financial statistics of States, and are believed to be reliable. The figures as to the institutional costs of State institutions for minors, presented in Chapter IV, are based on unchecked reports from the institutions themselves, and may well contain some errors.

CHAPTER III

COST OF STATE PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR ADULTS

1. *Institutional cost figures.*—Table 1 shows the location, date of end of fiscal year, total operating expenses, outlays during the year for additions and improvements, and other expenditures for each of 95 State penal institutions for adults in the United States for the census year 1928.⁶⁰

TABLE 1.—Expenditures of State penal institutions for adults, 1928

State and institution	Location	End of fiscal year	Operating expenses	Outlays for improvements	Other expenditures
Alabama State penitentiary. ¹	Montgomery	Sept. 30	\$268,635	-----	\$ 50,436
Arizona State prison	Florence	June 30	145,760	\$8,250	-----
Arkansas:					
State farm for women.	Jacksonville	do	12,968	4,245	-----
State penitentiary	Little Rock	do	231,870	-----	\$ 114,780
California:					
Folsom State prison.	Represa	do	485,672	51,492	54
San Quentin State prison.	San Quentin	do	760,764	210,220	-----
Colorado:					
State penitentiary	Canon City	Nov. 30	333,230	10,077	\$ 170,103
State reformatory	Buena Vista	do	125,266	-----	-----
Connecticut:					
Connecticut reformatory.	Cheshire	June 30	200,673	10,970	-----
State farm for women.	Niantic	July 1	110,344	105,432	-----
State prison	Wethersfield	June 30	222,718	57,511	-----
Florida State prison	Ralford	Dec. 30	453,127	132,070	17,257
Georgia State penitentiary.	Atlanta	Dec. 31	83,480	2,341	12,547
Idaho State penitentiary. ¹	Boise	Nov. 20	113,911	-----	-----
Illinois:					
Illinois State penitentiary.	Joliet	June 30	880,281	46,846	\$ 231,951
Southern Illinois penitentiary.	Monard	do	622,303	4,643	9,677
State reformatory	Pontiac	do	460,671	-----	-----
Women's prison	Joliet	do	38,042	-----	-----
Indiana:					
Indiana reformatory.	Pendleton	Sept. 30	418,029	75,491	-----
Indiana women's prison.	Indianapolis	do	40,807	3,500	215
State prison	Michigan City	do	\$ 420,086	\$ 80,042	\$ 378,402

See footnotes at end of table.

⁶⁰ These 95 institutions are all the penal institutions for adults officially listed by the Bureau of the Census. The list is not a complete one. See Table 1, footnotes 1 and 12.

TABLE 1.—Expenditures of State penal institutions for adults, 1928—Continued

State and institution	Location	End of fiscal year	Operating expenses	Outlays for improvements	Other expenditures
Iowa:					
Men's reformatory ¹⁰	Anamosa	June 30	\$362,508	\$28,506	-----
Women's reformatory.	Rockwell City	do	33,848	-----	\$ 520,038
State penitentiary	Fort Madison	do	445,408	557	\$ 532,206
Kansas:					
State industrial reformatory.	Hutchinson	do	330,587	110,359	16,875
State penitentiary	Lansing	do	570,531	119,047	-----
Women's industrial farm.	do	do	77,140	17,568	-----
Kentucky:					
Kentucky State reformatory.	Frankfort	do	372,606	37,182	7,559
Kentucky State penitentiary.	Eddyville	do	100,891	12,121	4,481
Louisiana State penitentiary.	Baton Rouge	Dec. 31	¹¹ 459,758	-----	-----
Maine:					
Maine State prison.	Thomaston	June 30	198,880	2,000	10,023
Reformatory for men.	South Windham	do	48,000	42,167	10,000
Reformatory for women.	Skowhegan	do	45,318	26,420	12,589
Maryland:					
Maryland house of correction.	Jessups	Sept. 30	257,002	-----	-----
Maryland penitentiary.	Baltimore	do	372,172	-----	-----
Massachusetts: ¹⁴					
Massachusetts reformatory.	Concord Junction	Nov. 30	371,282	800	-----
Massachusetts State prison.	Charleston	do	362,575	-----	-----
Reformatory for women.	Frammingham	do	160,304	9,366	\$ 121,515
Michigan:					
Michigan reformatory.	Ionia	June 30	583,872	-----	-----
State prison	Jackson	do	1,450,778	1,260,108	-----
State house of correction and branch prison.	Marquette	do	475,559	684	16,034
Minnesota:					
State reformatory	St. Cloud	do	360,954	165,327	45,547
State reformatory for women.	Shakopee	do	40,334	1,030	10,985
State prison	Stillwater	do	550,511	305,569	9,044
Mississippi State penitentiary.	Jackson	do	500,000	-----	-----
Missouri State penitentiary.	Jefferson City	Dec. 31	1,177,581	86,804	-----
Montana State penitentiary.	Deer Lodge	June 30	156,013	5,007	5,955
Nebraska:					
Nebraska State penitentiary.	Lincoln	do	288,565	-----	-----
State reformatory for men.	do	do	108,612	-----	-----
State reformatory for women.	York	do	30,633	1,157	-----
Nevada State prison	Carson City	Dec. 31	83,482	1,726	3,200
New Hampshire State prison.	Concord	June 30	83,388	-----	-----
New Jersey:					
New Jersey State prison.	Tronton	do	720,987	71,764	20,369
New Jersey State reformatory.	Rahway	do	367,574	20,248	-----
New Jersey reformatory for women.	Cilnton	do	115,109	8,217	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Expenditures of State penal institutions for adults, 1928—
Continued

State and institution	Location	End of fiscal year	Operating expenses	Outlays for improvements	Other expenditures
New Mexico State penitentiary.	Santa Fe.....	June 30	\$151,092	\$15,064	\$0,000
New York:					
Albion training school.	Albion.....	do.....	123,159	2,037	-----
Auburn State prison	Auburn.....	do.....	552,848	50,166	15,916
Auburn State prison for women.	do.....	do.....	60,383	-----	-----
Bedford reformatory. ¹	Bedford Hills.....	do.....	186,757	-----	-----
Clinton State prison	Dannemora.....	do.....	637,292	30,000	-----
Great Meadow State prison.	Comstock.....	do.....	425,752	83,694	-----
Sing Sing State prison.	Ossining.....	do.....	706,474	25,030	¹⁶ 537,438
State reformatory...	Elmira.....	do.....	496,160	44,140	-----
North Carolina State prison.	Raleigh.....	do.....	553,312	-----	-----
North Dakota State prison.	Bismark.....	do.....	180,437	0,277	670
Ohio:					
London prison farm	London.....	Dec. 31	186,502	616	-----
Reformatory for women.	Marysville.....	June 30	154,329	188,873	-----
State penitentiary...	Columbus.....	Dec. 31	881,610	72,062	-----
State reformatory...	Mansfield.....	do.....	597,810	172,261	23,860
Oklahoma:					
State penitentiary...	MoAlester.....	June 30	618,188	314,047	¹⁸ 226,206
State reformatory...	Granite.....	do.....	199,652	10,501	¹⁷ 53,523
Oregon State penitentiary.	Salem.....	Dec. 31	185,148	-----	-----
Pennsylvania:					
Eastern State penitentiary.	Philadelphia....	May 31	604,129	-----	¹⁸ 131,007
Pennsylvania industrial reformatory.	Huntingdon....	Dec. 31	496,370	71,256	-----
State industrial home for women.	Muncy.....	do.....	110,345	-----	-----
Western State penitentiary.	Pittsburgh....	May 31	1,118,547	-----	-----
Rhode Island:					
Reformatory for women.	Howard.....	Nov. 30	40,587	350	-----
State prison.....	do.....	do.....	173,357	620	-----
South Carolina State prison.	Columbia.....	Dec. 31	152,091	-----	-----
South Dakota State penitentiary.	Sioux Falls....	June 30	168,608	2,479	-----
Tennessee:					
Brushy Mountain penitentiary.	Petros.....	Dec. 31	326,087	-----	-----
Nashville State prison.	Nashville.....	do.....	476,240	-----	-----
Texas State prison.....	Huntsville....	Aug. 31	¹¹ 1,364,104	-----	-----
Utah State prison.....	Salt Lake City..	June 30	110,403	5,765	4,032
Vermont:					
State prison and house of correction for men.	Windsor.....	Dec. 31	159,028	-----	-----
State prison and house of correction for women.	Rutland.....	June 30	¹⁹ 19,150	⁵ 1,663	-----
Virginia State penitentiary.	Richmond.....	do.....	177,299	37,639	²⁰ 92,819
Washington:					
State penitentiary...	Walla Walla....	Mar. 31	299,760	29,092	¹⁶ 139,245
State reformatory...	Monroe.....	do.....	143,317	250,598	-----
West Virginia penitentiary. ¹	Moundsville....	June 30	196,284	-----	12,500

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Expenditures of State penal institutions for adults, 1928—
Continued

State and institution	Location	End of fiscal year	Operating expenses	Outlays for improvements	Other expenditures
Wisconsin:					
Industrial home for women.	Faycheedah....	June 30	\$51,823	\$3,418	[*] \$2,302
State prison.....	Waupun.....	do.....	304,028	54,630	¹⁸ 599,178
State reformatory...	Green Bay.....	do.....	206,508	-----	-----
Wyoming State penitentiary.	Rawlins.....	Sept. 30	107,975	-----	-----
Total ²¹	-----	-----	\$2,057,802	4,704,611	3,642,542

¹ This institution (Kilby State Penitentiary) is the largest State penal institution in Alabama, having a capacity of 1,000 prisoners. There are 4 other State penal institutions for adults in the State, having an aggregate capacity of 2,150 prisoners. See Quadrennial Report of the Alabama State Board of Administration, October 1, 1926, to September 30, 1930, pp. 27-32. The cost of these other prisons is included in the total State cost of penal institutions for adults, as shown by a later table (Table 12, infra), but is not included in this table. No attempt was made by the Bureau of the Census to secure data from these other institutions.

² Includes purchases for prison store, farm, and industries; gratuities paid discharged convicts; and rewards paid for the recapture of escaped convicts.

³ Inquiry failed to disclose the character of these expenditures.

⁴ This amount does not check with the financial figures given in the Twenty-sixth Biennial Report of the Colorado Board of Corrections and Warden of the Colorado State Penitentiary, pp. 15-21. Inquiry failed to disclose the character of these expenditures.

⁵ Figures estimated from data for biennial period.

⁶ It has been impossible to check this figure from the records of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare, or to ascertain the character of the expenditures represented. The figure for total operating expenses, however, while it does not check exactly, appears to be very nearly accurate.

⁷ Figures estimated on a proportional basis from consolidated data for the prison and the hospital for insane criminals.

⁸ Corrected figures furnished by the institution, differing from those reported to the Bureau of the Census.

⁹ Expenditures for the operation of prison farms and industries.

¹⁰ Figures estimated on a proportional basis for the entire reformatory, including the insane department.

¹¹ It has been impossible to check this figure exactly, but it appears to represent in part expenditures for the prison farm and in part expenditures which should have been classified as maintenance. See Sixth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of the Iowa Women's Reformatory, p. 21. The figure given for operating expenses is hence probably too low.

¹² While it has been impossible to check this figure exactly, it appears to represent expenditures for prison industries. See Forty-third Biennial Report of the Warden of the Iowa State Penitentiary, pp. 28-33.

¹³ Figure from original work sheets of the Bureau of the Census used in compiling Financial Statistics of States, 1928. No figures were reported by this institution to the Bureau of the Census, and no institutional report was made available to the commission.

¹⁴ There are 3 other State penal institutions for adults in Massachusetts in addition to those here enumerated. See Annual Report of the Massachusetts Commissioner of Correction for the Year Ending November 30, 1928, p. 2. The cost of these institutions is included in the total State cost of penal institutions for adults as shown by a later table (Table 12, infra), but is not included in this table. No attempt was made by the Bureau of the Census to secure data from these other institutions.

¹⁵ Figures estimated on a proportional basis from data for the entire reformatory, including the department for defective delinquents.

¹⁶ Expenditures for the operation of prison industries.

¹⁷ Expenditures for livestock, equipment and new cell house. Partly capital outlays.

¹⁸ Purchases made for prisoners through the prison commissary.

¹⁹ Figure estimated from data for biennial period after deduction from operating expenses of receipts on account of Federal prisoners. See Biennial Report of the Vermont Department of Public Welfare, July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1928, p. 83.

²⁰ Purchases of supplies sold to other State institutions.

²¹ These are not complete totals, since not all State penal institutions are included in this table. Compare Table 12, infra.

Table 2 shows the division of the operating expenses of the 95 State penal institutions included in Table 1 between pay roll, subsistence, and other operating expenses.

TABLE 2.—Operating expenses of State penal institutions for adults, 1928

State and institution	Pay roll	Subsistence	Other expenses	Total
Alabama State penitentiary.....	\$62,804	\$33,970	\$111,861	\$208,635
Arizona State prison.....	57,560	57,252	30,948	145,760
Arkansas:				
State farm for women.....	5,500	2,105	5,303	12,908
State penitentiary.....	28,540	(¹)	(¹)	231,870
California:				
Folsom State prison.....	152,843	135,736	197,093	485,672
San Quentin State prison.....	224,151	291,925	234,698	750,774
Colorado:				
State penitentiary.....	123,000	103,224	100,100	333,230
State reformatory.....	41,460	15,069	70,731	125,266
Connecticut:				
Connecticut reformatory.....	111,184	24,114	71,375	206,673
State farm for women.....	30,302	5,961	70,081	110,344
State prison.....	120,248	48,450	48,020	222,718
Florida State prison.....	90,972	147,539	210,616	468,127
Georgia State penitentiary.....	25,978	18,259	38,243	83,480
Idaho State penitentiary.....	27,221	(²)	(²)	113,911
Illinois:				
Illinois State penitentiary.....	380,838	232,085	270,368	880,281
Southern Illinois penitentiary.....	203,040	141,433	277,254	622,303
State reformatory.....	150,753	131,749	181,469	460,971
Women's prison.....	10,420	10,546	11,076	32,042
Indiana:				
Indiana reformatory.....	138,181	123,200	167,542	418,929
Indiana women's prison.....	17,857	10,190	21,814	49,867
State prison.....	140,553	149,540	132,693	422,786
Iowa:				
Men's reformatory.....	150,435	160,530	105,543	362,508
Women's reformatory.....	15,393	0,700	11,725	33,848
State penitentiary.....	204,808	99,610	140,984	445,408
Kansas:				
State industrial reformatory.....	90,013	47,213	202,361	339,587
State penitentiary.....	150,993	168,793	231,735	570,531
Women's industrial farm.....	21,775	24,353	31,012	77,140
Kentucky:				
Kentucky State reformatory.....	92,725	113,645	106,230	372,600
Kentucky State penitentiary.....	65,038	61,472	64,381	190,891
Louisiana State penitentiary.....				459,758
Maine:				
Maine State prison.....	53,753	117,091	20,036	190,880
Reformatory for men.....	20,000	9,360	18,040	48,000
Reformatory for women.....	18,458	0,175	20,085	45,318
Maryland:				
Maryland house of correction.....	91,487	72,001	93,574	257,062
Maryland penitentiary.....	164,545	95,291	112,306	372,172
Massachusetts:				
Massachusetts reformatory.....	210,533	40,098	111,651	371,282
Massachusetts State prison.....	176,152	88,563	97,860	362,575
Reformatory for women.....	87,192	14,953	58,159	160,304
Michigan:				
Michigan reformatory.....	197,852	162,034	223,086	583,872
State house of correction and branch prison.....	202,832	140,070	132,657	475,569
State prison.....	530,970	466,378	483,421	1,480,778
Minnesota:				
State reformatory.....	139,750	51,075	170,120	360,954
State reformatory for women.....	21,615	3,817	14,902	40,334
State prison.....	305,368	109,366	138,777	550,511
Mississippi State penitentiary.....	118,147	97,189	284,064	500,000
Missouri State penitentiary.....	385,923	296,939	514,609	1,177,581
Montana State penitentiary.....	50,447	36,879	63,587	150,913
Nebraska:				
Nebraska State penitentiary.....	97,341	104,139	87,085	288,565
State reformatory for men.....	42,216	26,383	40,613	109,612
State reformatory for women.....	8,917	4,975	10,741	30,633
Nevada State prison.....	31,927	17,800	33,695	83,482
New Hampshire State prison.....	35,538	18,937	28,913	83,388
New Jersey:				
New Jersey State prison.....	377,019	147,867	204,511	729,397
New Jersey State reformatory.....	183,718	67,205	116,591	367,574
New Jersey reformatory for women.....	40,486	12,030	66,593	119,109
New Mexico State penitentiary.....	45,664	35,867	69,561	151,092

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—Operating expenses of State penal institutions for adults, 1928—Continued

State and institution	Pay roll	Subsistence	Other expenses	Total
New York:				
Albion training school.....	\$62,330	\$15,278	\$45,545	\$123,159
Auburn State prison.....	201,184	120,156	165,508	562,848
Auburn State prison for women.....	25,939	11,700	22,738	60,383
Bedford reformatory.....	85,510	25,598	75,043	186,157
Clinton State prison.....	289,977	153,247	194,041	637,265
Great Meadow State prison.....	210,150	96,384	119,212	425,746
Sing Sing State prison.....	346,631	121,085	238,768	706,474
State reformatory.....	230,509	87,485	189,464	496,100
North Carolina State prison.....	205,644	274,050	73,079	553,312
North Dakota State prison.....	¹⁰ 57,555	38,181	84,701	180,431
Ohio:				
London prison farm.....	72,241	22,262	91,999	186,501
Reformatory for women.....	43,315	50,821	60,193	154,329
State penitentiary.....	332,558	294,721	254,331	881,610
State reformatory.....	194,106	131,441	272,263	597,810
Oklahoma:				
State penitentiary.....	182,877	174,608	260,703	618,188
State reformatory.....	50,239	58,312	85,101	190,652
Oregon State penitentiary.....	72,359	41,008	71,781	185,148
Pennsylvania:				
Eastern State penitentiary.....	295,711	152,560	217,889	666,160
Pennsylvania industrial reformatory.....	220,822	76,995	198,553	496,370
State industrial home for women.....	49,810	3,154	57,581	110,345
Western State penitentiary.....	414,208	525,538	178,711	1,118,547
Rhode Island:				
Reformatory for women.....	11,994	9,605	18,938	40,587
State prison.....	54,311	47,863	71,183	173,357
South Carolina State penitentiary.....	54,300	28,064	69,037	152,061
South Dakota State penitentiary.....	68,834	36,492	63,282	168,608
Tennessee:				
Brushy Mountain penitentiary.....	82,230	63,139	181,312	326,680
Nashville State prison.....	121,518	114,333	240,398	476,247
Texas State prison.....				1,364,104
Utah State prison.....	44,359	10,873	55,175	110,403
Vermont:				
State prison and house of correction for men.....	52,571	32,382	74,075	159,028
State prison and house of correction for women.....	4,887	3,011	11,252	19,150
Virginia State penitentiary.....	80,443	43,387	53,469	177,299
Washington:				
State penitentiary.....	60,172	119,057	120,540	299,769
State reformatory.....	48,466	47,674	47,177	143,317
West Virginia penitentiary.....	60,084	57,901	72,299	190,284
Wisconsin:				
Industrial home for women.....	22,098	15,395	14,335	51,828
State prison.....	139,026	55,329	169,773	364,028
State reformatory.....	80,895	17,000	108,613	206,508
Wyoming State penitentiary.....	29,712	30,273	47,990	107,975

¹ Inquiry failed to disclose the proper classification of \$203,330 disbursed for maintenance expenses other than salaries and wages.² Figures estimated from data for biennial period.³ Inquiry failed to disclose the proper classification of \$80,600 disbursed for maintenance expenses other than salaries and wages.⁴ Figures estimated on a proportional basis from consolidated data for the prison and the hospital for insane criminals.⁵ Corrected figures furnished by the institution, differing from those reported to the Bureau of the Census.⁶ Figures estimated on a proportional basis from data for the entire reformatory, including the insane department.⁷ These figures are probably too low. See Table 1, supra, note 11.⁸ No data as to the proper classification of this total expenditure could be secured. See Table 1, supra, note 13.⁹ Figures estimated on a proportional basis from data for the entire reformatory, including the department for defective delinquents.¹⁰ Includes wages of inmates.¹¹ Figures estimated from data for biennial period after allowance for receipts on account of Federal prisoners. See Table 1, supra, note 10.

2. *Cost per inmate.*—Table 3 gives the average daily number of inmates and annual operating cost per inmate, divided between pay roll, subsistence and other operating expenses, for the 95 State penal institutions included in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 3.—Operating cost per inmate of State penal institutions for adults, 1928

State and institution	Average daily prison population	Annual cost per inmate ¹			
		Pay roll	Subsistence	Other expenses	Total
Alabama State penitentiary	1,022	\$61.45	\$91.95	\$100.45	\$262.85
Arizona State prison	535	103.70	107.01	67.84	272.45
Arkansas:					
State farm for women	33	166.67	63.79	162.51	392.97
State penitentiary	1,151	24.80	(²)	(²)	201.45
California:					
Folsom State prison	2,185	69.05	62.12	90.21	222.28
San Quentin State prison	4,362	61.39	66.02	53.80	172.11
Colorado:					
State penitentiary	1,050	117.05	98.31	102.00	317.36
State reformatory	179	231.65	73.01	305.15	609.81
Connecticut:					
Connecticut reformatory	260	413.33	89.64	205.33	708.30
State farm for women	185	163.79	32.22	432.38	628.39
State prison	576	210.01	84.11	83.51	386.66
Florida State prison	1,667	54.67	88.51	131.74	274.82
Georgia State penitentiary	470	56.47	41.37	83.14	181.48
Idaho State penitentiary	403	67.60	(²)	(²)	232.08
Illinois:					
Illinois State penitentiary	3,191	110.35	72.73	86.00	278.08
Southern Illinois penitentiary	1,956	104.11	72.31	141.73	318.15
State reformatory	1,451	105.03	90.80	125.05	323.89
Women's prison	86	190.93	122.63	128.79	442.35
Indiana:					
Indiana reformatory	1,964	70.36	62.22	80.72	213.30
Indiana women's prison	82	217.77	124.24	201.12	603.13
State prison	1,822	71.57	72.33	65.21	209.11
Iowa:					
Men's reformatory	1,009	155.04	99.63	104.00	359.27
Women's reformatory	98	168.81	68.98	117.00	345.30
State penitentiary	1,113	134.01	89.50	126.68	400.19
Kansas:					
State industrial reformatory	926	97.21	50.99	218.52	366.72
State penitentiary	1,730	86.70	97.52	145.51	329.79
Women's industrial farm	164	132.77	148.50	189.10	470.37
Kentucky:					
Kentucky State reformatory	1,831	50.64	62.07	90.79	203.50
Kentucky State penitentiary	740	88.43	83.61	85.02	257.06
Louisiana State penitentiary	1,855	(²)	(²)	(²)	243.54
Maine:					
Maine State prison	194	277.08	603.56	134.19	1,014.85
Reformatory for men	88	227.27	100.36	211.82	545.45
Reformatory for women	92	200.00	66.64	225.25	492.59
Maryland:					
Maryland house of correction	1,034	88.48	99.63	90.50	248.61
Maryland penitentiary	1,146	143.58	83.12	98.05	324.75
Massachusetts:					
Massachusetts reformatory	771	284.74	52.01	144.81	481.56
Massachusetts State prison	928	189.82	95.43	105.46	390.71
Reformatory for women	262	332.70	54.78	224.28	611.85
Michigan:					
Michigan reformatory	1,970	100.43	82.25	115.70	298.38
State house of correction and branch prison	921	220.23	152.08	144.04	516.35
State prison	3,751	141.56	124.34	128.87	394.77

¹ Basic data from Table 2, supra.

² Data not available. See Table 2, supra, note 1.

³ Data not available. See Table 2, supra, note 3.

⁴ Average of prison population on first and last days of year.

⁵ Data not available. See Table 1, note 13, and Table 2, note 8, supra.

TABLE 3.—Operating cost per inmate of State penal institutions for adults, 1928—Continued

State and institution	Average daily prison population	Annual cost per inmate ¹			
		Pay roll	Subsistence	Other expenses	Total
Minnesota:					
State reformatory	838	\$107.30	\$61.17	\$214.53	\$443.06
State reformatory for women	80	270.10	47.71	186.28	504.18
State prison	1,232	247.80	86.34	112.44	446.64
Mississippi State penitentiary	1,508	73.93	60.82	178.14	312.89
Missouri State penitentiary	3,795	101.69	72.86	135.76	310.30
Montana State penitentiary	470	118.54	77.69	133.40	329.65
Nebraska:					
Nebraska State penitentiary	689	141.28	151.15	120.39	418.82
State reformatory for men	281	150.77	93.89	121.80	366.52
State reformatory for women	63	168.02	93.87	315.49	577.95
Nevada State prison	231	138.21	76.88	146.30	361.39
New Hampshire State prison	123	288.03	163.96	235.00	677.95
New Jersey:					
New Jersey State prison	1,707	221.22	86.61	110.81	427.64
New Jersey State reformatory	762	244.31	89.45	155.04	488.80
New Jersey State reformatory for women	166	297.99	77.12	302.77	737.88
New Mexico State penitentiary	410	111.36	87.48	169.69	368.52
New York:					
Albion training school	212	294.04	72.07	214.83	580.94
Auburn State prison	1,528	170.93	82.56	103.32	361.81
Auburn State prison for women	111	233.68	105.46	204.85	543.99
Bedford reformatory	322	265.63	79.50	234.91	579.09
Clinton State prison	1,581	183.41	96.95	122.73	403.09
Great Meadow State prison	1,108	180.67	89.99	107.59	384.25
Sing Sing State prison	1,083	204.74	71.52	141.03	417.29
State reformatory	1,197	199.83	48.02	106.05	353.90
North Carolina State prison	1,922	106.65	142.01	98.72	287.88
North Dakota State prison	305	189.39	125.18	277.00	591.60
Ohio:					
London prison farm	586	123.28	37.99	167.99	318.26
Reformatory for women	461	93.68	110.24	130.55	334.77
State penitentiary	4,237	78.54	69.56	59.97	208.07
State reformatory	2,778	69.87	47.71	97.61	215.19
Oklahoma:					
State penitentiary	2,017	69.88	66.72	96.62	233.22
State reformatory	793	70.62	73.53	107.32	251.47
Oregon State penitentiary	689	105.02	69.52	164.18	288.72
Pennsylvania:					
Eastern State penitentiary	1,762	167.93	86.59	122.40	376.92
Pennsylvania industrial reformatory	1,069	200.50	72.03	135.74	408.27
State industrial home for women	123	404.06	25.04	468.14	898.74
Western State penitentiary	1,881	220.25	279.39	95.01	594.66
Rhode Island:					
Reformatory for women	70	151.82	121.58	240.36	513.76
State prison	307	176.01	155.01	231.86	562.88
South Carolina State penitentiary	551	98.66	62.02	125.29	285.97
South Dakota State penitentiary	418	164.67	87.30	151.40	403.37
Tennessee:					
Brushy Mountain penitentiary	4760	109.63	84.19	241.75	435.57
Nashville State prison	1,250	97.21	91.47	192.32	381.00
Texas State prison	4,138	(²)	(²)	(²)	329.65
Utah State prison	220	103.84	47.48	240.70	482.11
Vermont:					
State prison and house of correction for men	340	154.62	95.24	217.87	467.73
State prison and house of correction for women	82	187.96	115.81	432.77	736.54
Virginia State penitentiary	2,268	35.01	19.31	22.83	77.15
Washington:					
State penitentiary	1,055	57.04	112.85	114.25	284.14
State reformatory	550	88.12	86.68	55.68	260.58
West Virginia penitentiary	1,000	34.78	30.47	38.10	103.31
Wisconsin:					
Industrial home for women	82	293.85	187.74	150.43	632.05
State prison	997	130.44	56.00	170.20	356.73
State reformatory	550	147.08	30.91	197.48	375.47
Wyoming State penitentiary	302	98.38	100.24	158.91	357.53

⁶ Estimate by prison authorities.

⁷ Average of prison population on Dec. 31, 1927, and Dec. 31, 1928.

⁸ Average daily prison population for the calendar year 1928, exclusive of Federal prisoners.

The operating cost per inmate, as will be noted from the foregoing table, varies considerably as between different institutions. Table 4 gives detailed comparative figures by States as to cost per inmate for three types of penal institutions: (a) penitentiaries for men;⁵¹ (b) reformatories for men;⁵² and (c) institutions for women.

TABLE 4.—Operating cost per inmate by States and types of penal institutions for adults, 1928

Region and State	Penitentiaries for men	Reformatories for men	Institutions for women	Average for State
New England:				
Maine.....	\$1,014.85	\$545.45	\$402.60	\$775.03
New Hampshire.....	607.95			677.95
Vermont.....	467.73		736.54	480.80
Massachusetts.....	300.71	481.56	611.85	455.07
Rhode Island.....	564.68		513.70	554.26
Connecticut.....	386.60	768.30	628.80	520.84
Average.....	475.88	554.03	586.65	520.10
Middle Atlantic:				
New York.....	392.80	414.50	574.09	461.04
New Jersey.....	427.64	488.80	737.88	463.74
Pennsylvania.....	480.80	464.33	898.74	464.23
Average.....	420.37	450.66	644.07	440.98
East North Central:				
Ohio.....	208.07	233.15	334.77	225.78
Indiana.....	209.11	213.30	608.13	210.70
Illinois.....	293.68	323.80	442.35	302.15
Michigan.....	418.70	206.88		382.46
Wisconsin.....	365.73	375.47	632.05	382.42
Average.....	288.50	264.48	371.76	292.34
West North Central:				
Minnesota.....	446.84	443.06	504.18	447.51
Iowa.....	400.19	350.27	345.39	379.17
Missouri.....	310.30			310.30
North Dakota.....	591.60			591.60
South Dakota.....	403.37			403.37
Nebraska.....	418.82	386.52	577.98	418.19
Kansas.....	329.70	366.72	470.37	350.09
Average.....	364.32	386.97	460.65	372.74
South Atlantic:				
Maryland.....	324.75	248.01		288.62
Virginia.....	77.15			77.15
West Virginia.....	103.31			103.31
North Carolina.....	287.88			287.88
South Carolina.....	275.97			275.97
Georgia.....	181.48			181.48
Florida.....	274.82			274.82
Average.....	200.30	248.61		204.94

⁵¹ In this group are included institutions receiving both men and women, since the female population of such institutions is negligible. See Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927, pp. 112-117.

⁵² In this group are included prison farms for men except those in the Southern States.

TABLE 4.—Operating cost per inmate by States and types of penal institutions for adults, 1928—Continued

Region and State	Penitentiaries for men	Reformatories for men	Institutions for women	Average for State
East South Central:				
Kentucky.....	\$267.90	\$203.50		\$219.17
Tennessee.....	401.47			401.47
Alabama.....	262.85			262.85
Mississippi.....	312.80			312.80
Average.....	328.81	203.50		266.01
West South Central:				
Arkansas.....	201.45		\$302.07	200.70
Louisiana.....	243.54			243.54
Oklahoma.....	236.22	251.77		236.84
Texas.....	320.65			320.65
Average.....	273.04	251.77	302.07	272.65
Mountain:				
Montana.....	320.65			320.65
Idaho.....	282.66			282.66
Wyoming.....	357.53			357.53
Colorado.....	317.36	690.81		373.06
New Mexico.....	368.52			368.52
Arizona.....	272.45			272.45
Utah.....	482.11			482.11
Nevada.....	361.30			361.30
Average.....	330.79	690.81		348.11
Pacific:				
Washington.....	284.14	260.58		276.07
Oregon.....	268.72			268.72
California.....	188.80			188.80
Average.....	267.62	260.58		210.55
General average.....	311.50	321.13	543.73	320.04

3. *Per capita cost.*—Table 5 shows the annual per capita cost to the inhabitants of each State of the penal institutions for adults of that State for which detailed figures have been given in the preceding tables. It also shows the number of persons confined in such penal institutions per 100,000 population, by States.^{52a}

^{52a} The per capita cost figures are computed on the basis of the total cost of the State institutions for which data as to number of prisoners are available (i. e., those institutions for which detailed figures have been given in Tables 1 to 4, inclusive, supra), in order to permit a comparison between per capita cost and number of prisoners per 100,000 population. Complete figures as to State penal costs, including all State penal expenditures, are given in Table 12, infra.

TABLE 5.—Per capita cost of State penal institutions for adults, 1928

Region and State	Population ¹	Prisoners in state penal institutions	Prisoners per 100,000 population	Penal Institution cost per capita
New England:				
Maine.....	797,423	374	46.9	\$0.363
New Hampshire.....	465,293	123	26.5	.180
Vermont.....	369,611	366	101.8	.495
Massachusetts.....	4,249,614	1,991	46.1	.210
Rhode Island.....	687,497	386	56.1	.311
Connecticut.....	1,696,993	1,030	64.1	.340
Total.....	8,166,341	4,240	60.2	.270
Middle Atlantic:				
New York.....	12,588,060	7,752	61.6	.253
New Jersey.....	4,041,334	2,615	64.7	.300
Pennsylvania.....	9,631,350	4,835	60.2	.248
Total.....	26,260,750	15,192	67.9	.258
East North Central:				
Ohio.....	9,049,607	8,002	121.3	.274
Indiana.....	3,238,503	3,808	119.4	.262
Illinois.....	7,030,654	6,084	87.0	.205
Michigan.....	4,842,325	6,642	137.2	.625
Wisconsin.....	2,939,000	1,620	65.4	.212
Total.....	26,207,185	26,885	109.2	.309
West North Central:				
Minnesota.....	2,563,953	2,147	83.7	.375
Iowa.....	2,740,939	2,220	80.9	.335
Missouri.....	3,626,367	3,795	104.5	.324
North Dakota.....	680,845	305	44.8	.265
South Dakota.....	692,846	418	60.3	.243
Nebraska.....	1,377,963	1,023	74.2	.310
Kansas.....	1,880,909	2,820	160.0	.625
Total.....	13,296,915	12,728	95.7	.357
South Atlantic:				
Delaware.....	233,380			
Maryland.....	1,631,526	2,180	133.7	.386
Virginia.....	2,421,851	2,298	94.9	.073
West Virginia.....	1,729,295	1,900	109.8	.113
North Carolina.....	3,170,276	1,922	60.6	.174
South Carolina.....	1,738,765	551	31.6	.087
Georgia.....	2,908,506	460	15.8	.020
Florida.....	1,468,211	1,607	113.0	.312
Total.....	15,306,720	10,078	71.8	.147
East South Central:				
Kentucky.....	2,614,580	2,571	98.3	.212
Tennessee.....	2,616,556	2,000	76.4	.307
Alabama.....	2,040,248	1,022	50.0	.102
Mississippi.....	2,009,821	1,595	79.5	.204
Total.....	9,887,214	7,191	72.7	.216
West South Central:				
Arkansas.....	1,854,482	1,184	63.9	.132
Louisiana.....	2,101,503	1,565	74.5	.210
Oklahoma.....	2,396,040	3,410	142.3	.341
Texas.....	5,824,715	4,198	71.0	.234
Total.....	12,176,830	10,587	86.0	.237

¹Population figures from the 1930 Census. It has been deemed preferable to use these exact figures rather than estimated 1928 figures.

TABLE 5.—Per capita cost of State penal institutions for adults, 1928—Continued

Region and State	Population	Prisoners in state penal institutions	Prisoners per 100,000 population	Penal Institution cost per capita
Mountain:				
Montana.....	537,606	476	88.5	\$0.202
Idaho.....	445,032	403	90.6	.256
Wyoming.....	225,565	302	133.6	.378
Colorado.....	1,035,791	1,229	118.6	.442
New Mexico.....	423,317	410	96.8	.367
Arizona.....	435,673	535	122.8	.335
Utah.....	507,847	229	45.1	.217
Nevada.....	91,058	231	253.4	.917
Total.....	3,701,789	3,815	103.1	.350
Pacific:				
Washington.....	1,563,306	1,605	102.8	.289
Oregon.....	953,789	689	72.1	.194
California.....	6,077,251	6,547	115.3	.218
Total.....	8,194,433	8,841	107.9	.227
Grand total.....	122,288,177	100,167	81.9	.202

4. *Comparative costs of State and Federal institutions.*—The following table shows the average costs by geographical divisions for different classes of State institutions compared with the cost of Federal institutions of the same types. The State figures are for the census year 1928; the Federal figures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.⁵³

TABLE 6.—Comparative cost of Federal and State penal institutions for adults

State institutions ¹	Annual cost per inmate			
	Penitentiaries	Reformatories	Institutions for women	Average
New England.....	\$475.88	\$554.93	\$586.65	\$520.19
Middle Atlantic.....	429.37	450.00	614.97	446.08
East North Central.....	283.56	204.48	371.70	292.14
West North Central.....	304.32	386.07	400.65	372.74
South Atlantic.....	200.39	248.01	204.94
East South Central.....	328.81	203.60	296.91
West South Central.....	273.94	251.77	302.97	272.55
Mountain.....	330.79	699.81	348.11
Pacific.....	207.02	260.55	210.55
All State institutions.....	311.86	321.13	543.73	320.94
Federal institutions ²	344.97	444.00	738.56	374.19

¹Weighted averages for geographic divisions.
²Average for 3 Federal institutions in the case of penitentiaries; figures for a single institution in the case of reformatories and of institutions for women. Figures from the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice. See pp. 120-130, supra, for details.

³Federal figures for 1929-30 have been used for the reason that the costs of the Federal reformatory for men at Chillicothe and the Federal institution for women at Alderson were wholly out of line in 1927-28, due to the fact that those institutions had only recently begun to operate. It is not believed that the 2-year difference in fiscal period in the figures presented in Table 6 greatly affects the validity of the comparison.

5. *Significance of institutional cost figures.*—The figures in the preceding 4 sections of this chapter indicate how the costs of State penal institutions differ. They do not show, except to a very limited extent, why such differences occur, nor do they indicate whether any particular institution is or is not being economically or efficiently run. This must be particularly borne in mind when considering figures as to cost per inmate. *Other things being equal*, the institution having the lowest cost per inmate is the most economical and efficient institution; but other things are seldom if ever equal. A low cost per inmate may mean an efficient and economical institution; or it may mean a parsimoniously run, inefficient institution, which makes rather than rehabilitates criminals, and which in reality costs the tax-paying public more money in the long run than an efficient, well-run institution operated at a greater immediate cost. Moreover, operating costs per inmate are very largely affected by such elements as climatic conditions, the type of housing, the degree of security regarded as desirable,⁵⁴ and other factors which are wholly independent of the efficiency of prison administration. It will therefore be apparent that the figures here presented must be used with caution. They serve rather to direct inquiry than to provide answers as to questions of economy and financial efficiency in State prison administration.

6. *Total State costs.*—The figures used in the tables presented in the prior sections of this chapter have been either detailed institutional costs, or, in one instance,⁵⁵ State totals of such institutional costs. It was pointed out, however, in the preceding chapter⁵⁶ that these figures were not as satisfactory in certain respects as the State total figures collected by the Bureau of the Census in connection with the compilation of its financial statistics of States. These two sets of State totals—those arrived at by adding the costs of the penal institutions of each State as collected by the Bureau of the Census from those institutions, and those compiled by the

⁵⁴ These factors also very largely affect the capital investment required. As to special factors affecting operating costs in prisons in the Southern States, see National Society for Penal Information, *Handbook of American Prisons and Reformatories*, 1929, pp. xxii-xxviii.

⁵⁵ Table 5. See p. 223, supra.

⁵⁶ See p. 213, supra.

bureau as part of its financial statistics of States—are not the same. In so far as the latter total figures exceed the former, this should not cause surprise, since the total expenditures of a State for penal treatment of adult offenders might well include other items in addition to the cost of State penal institutions, as, for example, the cost of State prison departments having supervision over several institutions, the expense of transporting prisoners from one institution to another,⁵⁷ etc. The more inclusive figure would more accurately represent the actual total cost of State penal treatment than would the mere sum of State institutional costs.

The difference between the two sets of total figures is not, however, limited to this natural and proper one. An examination of the work sheets used by the Bureau of the Census in compiling its financial statistics of States and a comparison of the data there available with the figures as to institutional costs collected by the bureau indicates that in most cases the figures for institutional costs included in the State totals in the census financial statistics of States can not be reconciled with the figures for the costs of the same institutions collected for publication by the Census in its penal institutional statistics. Table 7 shows the amount of these discrepancies in the 1928 figures by States, and suggests possible explanations of some of them.

⁵⁷ This is properly to be regarded as a part of the cost of penal and corrective treatment. Cf. p. 40, supra, note 10.

TABLE 7.—State costs of penal treatment of adults, 1928

State and agency	Cost, institutional basis ¹		Cost, State basis ²	
	Agency	Total	Agency	Total
Alabama:				
Board of administration.....			\$82, 850	
Convict department.....			1, 610, 267	
Miscellaneous.....			9, 052	
				\$1, 702, 178
Arizona:				
State prison ¹	\$145, 700		172, 850	
Highway camps.....			50, 090	
		\$145, 700		232, 840
Arkansas:				
Farm for women ¹	12, 908		10, 740	
Penitentiary ¹	231, 870		230, 917	
		240, 838		250, 673
California:				
Folsom prison ¹	495, 072		500, 985	
San Quentin prison ²	750, 764		932, 058	
Transporting prisoners.....			211, 940	
		1, 230, 430		1, 613, 771
Colorado:				
State penitentiary ¹	333, 230		374, 858	
State reformatory ¹	125, 206		6 (134, 602)	
		455, 406		374, 858
Connecticut:				
State prison ¹	222, 718		214, 728	
Farm for women.....	116, 344		117, 493	
Prisoners in county jails.....			114, 032	
		330, 062		447, 153
Florida: State prison ¹	458, 127	458, 127	452, 536	452, 530
Georgia:				
Prison commission.....			34, 627	
Penitentiary ¹	83, 450		87, 612	
		83, 450		122, 239
Idaho: Penitentiary ¹	113, 911	113, 911	100, 840	100, 840
Illinois:				
State penitentiary.....	889, 281		1, 751, 200	
Southern Illinois penitentiary.....	622, 303			
Women's prison.....	35, 042			
Reformatory ¹	409, 971		6 (455, 378)	
		2, 019, 597		1, 761, 200
Indiana:				
Reformatory ¹	418, 929		408, 708	
Women's prison ¹⁰	49, 807		50, 051	
State prison.....	380, 991		428, 991	
State farm.....			159, 100	
Industries ¹¹			239, 653	
Escaped prisoners.....			1, 857	
		849, 787		1, 318, 482
Iowa:				
Men's reformatory ¹²	302, 508		482, 004	
Women's reformatory ¹	33, 848		63, 546	
Penitentiary ¹	445, 408		457, 014	
Road maintenance.....			14, 199	
Institutional service expense.....			503, 754	
		841, 764		1, 520, 777
Kansas:				
Industrial reformatory ¹	339, 587		6 (353, 602)	
Penitentiary ¹	570, 531		647, 331	
Women's industrial farm ¹	77, 140		72, 738	
Transporting prisoners.....			7, 755	
		987, 258		11 724, 506
Kentucky:				
Reformatory ¹	372, 609		357, 307	
Penitentiary ¹	190, 891		195, 788	
Gratuities to discharged prisoners.....			21, 421	
		563, 497		607, 516
Louisiana: Penitentiary.....			450, 758	450, 758
Maine:				
State prison ¹	196, 880		203, 774	
Reformatory for men ¹	48, 000		61, 711	
Reformatory for women ¹	45, 318		58, 169	
Board of prison commissioners.....			2, 000	
Auditing prison accounts.....			362	
		200, 198		14 258, 825

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—State costs of penal treatment of adults, 1928—Continued

State and agency	Cost, institutional basis ¹		Cost, State basis ¹	
	Agency	Total	Agency	Total
Maryland:				
Board of welfare.....			\$16, 178	
House of correction ¹	\$257, 062		220, 923	
Penitentiary.....			471, 951	
		(14)		\$709, 047
Massachusetts:				
State prison.....	362, 575		362, 575	
Reformatory.....	371, 282		371, 282	
Reformatory for women.....	100, 304		159, 132	
Prison camp.....			72, 218	
Prison colony.....			65, 736	
State farm.....			605, 700	
Department of correction.....			16 114, 764	
Industries.....			17 152, 299	
Department of mental diseases.....			18 60, 048	
		\$804, 161		1, 970, 251
Michigan:				
Reformatory ¹	583, 872		540, 203	
State prison ¹⁰	1, 480, 778		1, 095, 310	
House of correction and branch prison ¹⁰	475, 559		440, 146	
Transporting prisoners.....			84, 138	
Miscellaneous.....			3, 275	
		2, 540, 209		3 3, 073, 518
Minnesota:				
Reformatory ¹	369, 954		424, 080	
Reformatory for women ¹	40, 334		40, 842	
State prison.....	550, 511		550, 511	
Transporting prisoners.....			12, 080	
Miscellaneous.....			12, 696	
		900, 799		11 1, 014, 503
Mississippi: Penitentiary.....			440, 003	440, 003
Missouri:				
Penitentiary ¹	1, 177, 681		1, 130, 184	
Industries.....			12 1, 606, 072	
Transporting prisoners.....			8, 008	
Miscellaneous.....			315	
		1, 177, 681		2, 814, 470
Montana:				
Penitentiary.....	156, 913		155, 695	
Transporting prisoners.....			7, 970	
		156, 913		163, 571
Nebraska:				
Penitentiary ¹	288, 505		245, 344	
Reformatory for men ¹	108, 012		114, 401	
Reformatory for women ¹	30, 633		31, 700	
		427, 210		
Nevada:				
State prison.....	83, 482		13 32, 349	
Transporting prisoners.....			3, 400	
		83, 482		85, 758
New Hampshire:				
State prison.....	83, 388		84, 094	
Miscellaneous.....			200	
		83, 388		84, 894
New Jersey:				
State prison ¹¹	720, 087		736, 307	
Reformatory ¹	367, 674		360, 797	
Reformatory for women ¹	115, 169		124, 703	
Industries ¹¹			857, 118	
		1, 212, 070		2, 078, 015
New Mexico: Penitentiary ¹	151, 092	151, 092	10 114, 422	114, 422
New York:				
Albion training school.....	123, 159		123, 159	
Bedford reformatory ¹⁷	186, 767		217, 334	
Auburn prison.....	552, 848			
Auburn women's prison.....	60, 353			
Clinton prison.....			13 2, 273, 014	
Great Meadow prison.....	425, 752			
Sing Sing prison.....	706, 474			
Reformatory ¹	496, 160		502, 144	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—State costs of penal treatment of adults, 1928—Continued

State and agency	Cost, institutional basis ¹		Cost, State basis ²	
	Agency	Total	Agency	Total
New York—Continued.				
Transporting prisoners.....			\$18,221	
Department of correction.....			124,271	
Not cost of industries.....			441,020	
Miscellaneous.....			137	
		(10)		¹⁰ \$3,080,883
North Carolina: State prison ³	\$653,312	\$653,312	610,073	610,073
North Dakota:				
State prison ³	180,437		107,527	
Transporting prisoners.....			2,030	
Twine plant.....			42,064	
		180,437		242,621
Ohio:				
Reformatory for women ³	154,320		110,070	
Penitentiary ³	881,610		685,412	
Reformatory ³	597,810		447,100	
London prison farm ³	180,502		178,093	
Grafton farm.....			14,522	
Industries.....			758,050	
Miscellaneous.....			30,400	
		1,820,251		¹⁰ 2,230,125
Oklahoma:				
Penitentiary ³	018,188		730,518	
Reformatory ³	100,052		238,365	
Twine plant.....			317,804	
		817,840		1,286,687
Oregon: Penitentiary ³	185,143	205,780	208,780	208,780
Pennsylvania:				
Eastern penitentiary ³¹	064,120		705,135	
Industrial reformatory ³	490,370		⁶ (401,007)	
Industrial home for women.....	110,545		103,955	
Western penitentiary ³	1,118,547		537,097	
Penal law commission.....			1,025	
		2,380,501		1,438,112
Rhode Island:				
Reformatory for women ³	40,587		30,560	
State prison ³	173,357		197,673	
Jail expenses.....			5,530	
Miscellaneous.....			2,000	
		213,044		244,603
South Carolina: Penitentiary.....			150,014	150,014
South Dakota:				
Penitentiary ³	108,008		165,013	
Transporting prisoners.....			10,052	
		108,008		175,065
Tennessee:				
Brushy Mountain penitentiary.....			311,493	
Nashville prison.....			405,035	
Transporting prisoners.....			10,051	
				¹⁰ 788,078
Texas:				
State prison.....				
Board of prison commissioners.....			1,364,104	
				1,364,104
Utah:				
State prison ³	110,403		¹¹ 80,023	
Transporting prisoners.....			1,207	
		110,403		81,330
Vermont:				
State prison and house of correction for men ³	150,028		150,000	
State prison and house of correction for women.....			28,696	
County jails.....			35,146	
Miscellaneous.....			225	
		150,028		¹⁴ 223,820
Virginia:				
Penitentiary ³	177,200		200,020	
Road force.....			530,753	
Penitentiary farm.....			137,810	
Maintenance of prisoners.....			411,271	
Transporting prisoners.....			40,150	
lime grinding plant.....			137,810	
		177,200		1,424,852
Washington:				
Penitentiary ³	200,709		344,683	
Reformatory.....	143,317		⁶ (143,317)	
		443,080		344,683

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—State costs of penal treatment of adults, 1928—Continued

State and agency	Cost, institutional basis ¹		Cost, State basis ²	
	Agency	Total	Agency	Total
West Virginia: Penitentiary ³	\$100,284	\$100,284	\$407,165	\$407,165
Wisconsin:				
Industrial home for women.....	51,328			
Prison.....	364,023		¹⁰ 600,820	
Reformatory.....	200,508			
Industries.....			112,272	
		622,004		710,101
Wyoming: Penitentiary ³	107,075	107,075	90,582	90,582
		¹⁰ 27,481,764		¹⁷ 40,508,202

¹ Unpublished figures collected by the Bureau of the Census for inclusion in Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1928 (not yet published). Supplementary figures secured by the commission in this investigation are not included, but will be found in Tables 1 and 2, supra.

² Figures from work sheets used in preparing Financial Statistics of States, 1928 (U. S. Census, 1931).

³ No explanation of the discrepancy between the two figures for the cost of this institution is available.

⁴ After deduction of \$31,212 representing unallocated credits.

⁵ This discrepancy of \$11,628 appears to be the result of differences in handling purchases for prison industries.

⁶ This institution is classed as an institution for adults for purposes of institutional statistics and as an institution for minors for purposes of State statistics.

⁷ This discrepancy of \$13,071 appears to be the result of failure to exclude capital outlays from operating expense in the case of the institutional figure.

⁸ The corresponding total of the institutional figures is \$1,540,626. The discrepancy appears to be due principally to differences in accounting for expenditures for prison industries and for transporting prisoners.

⁹ The discrepancy here is due to the inclusion in operating cost as reported on an institutional basis of an item of \$10,131 representing capital outlay for equipment.

¹⁰ The discrepancy here is due to the inclusion in cost on a State basis of an item of \$215 representing fixed charges which was not included in the cost on an institutional basis.

¹¹ This item is, according to the original work sheets of the census, made up of "farm expense and sales to other departments." It probably represents farm expenses plus a net loss on prison industries, since the institutional figures (Table 1, supra, note 9) show an expenditure of \$378,402 representing expenditures for the operation of prison farms and industries.

¹² This discrepancy may be due to the elimination of the cost of the insane department from reported expenditures on an institutional basis.

¹³ After deduction of \$2,023 representing unallocated credits.

¹⁴ After deduction of \$68,101 representing unallocated credits.

¹⁵ Incomplete.

¹⁶ Including transportation of prisoners, aid to discharged prisoners, and taxes on State penal institutions.

¹⁷ After deduction of \$944,316 representing proceeds of industries.

¹⁸ Psychiatric examination of prisoners.

¹⁹ The discrepancy here appears to result principally from differences in methods of accounting for capital outlays.

²⁰ After deduction of \$21,581 representing unallocated credits.

²¹ After deduction of \$32,511 representing unallocated credits.

²² After deduction of \$774,400 representing proceeds of industries.

²³ Including item of \$25,860 for maintenance of Federal prisoners.

²⁴ Including State prison farm at Leesburg, N. J.

²⁵ Materials for manufacturing purchased.

²⁶ After deduction of item of \$40,000 representing value of prison-made goods used by other State departments. Includes items of \$42,211 for wages of prisoners, and \$8,743 for transporting prisoners.

²⁷ This discrepancy may be due to the elimination of the cost of the department for defective delinquents from reported expenditures on the institutional basis.

²⁸ The total cost on the institutional basis for 4 of these 5 institutions is \$1,745,467.

²⁹ After deduction of \$10,327 representing unallocated refunds.

³⁰ After deduction of \$272 representing unallocated refunds.

³¹ The discrepancy here is apparently due to the erroneous inclusion of an item of \$131,007 representing capital outlays in the figures on a State basis.

³² After deduction of \$2,095 representing unallocated credits.

³³ After deduction of \$30,338 representing sales to other State departments.

³⁴ After deduction of \$237 representing unallocated refunds.

³⁵ The corresponding total of the institutional figures is \$622,004. No explanation of the discrepancy between the two totals is available.

³⁶ As computed by the Bureau of the Census for inclusion in Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1928 (not yet published).

³⁷ From Financial Statistics of States, 1928, p. 86.

It will be apparent from Table 7 that the cost figures collected for inclusion in the penal institutional statistics of the Census and those collected for inclusion in the census financial statistics of States do not check except in comparatively few instances. The reasons for the individual discrepancies in the case of particular institutions are no doubt various; some possible ones are pointed out in the notes to Table 7, but in most cases the available figures do not make possible any explanation of the failure of the figures to check. While, on the whole, the figures forming a part of the census financial statistics of States are the more comprehensive and apparently the more accurate, in a few instances the institutional figures seem obviously the more correct. Accordingly, in giving State totals for the cost of penal treatment of adults, the former figures will be given in most cases; where the institutional figures appear to be more accurate, appropriate corrections will be made and the nature thereof indicated.⁶³

It is unfortunate that the Bureau of the Census should issue two irreconcilable sets of financial statistics as to State penal institutions for adults,⁶⁰ and it is to be hoped that this condition will be corrected by the bureau.⁶⁰

CHAPTER IV

COST OF STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR MINORS

1. *Introductory.*⁶¹—The only comprehensive and comparable annual statistics as to the cost of State correctional institutions for minors are those published by the Bureau of the Census as part of its annual financial statistics of States. These give State totals only, and do not permit the analysis of the figures to show institutional costs per inmate nor the division of expenditures as between salaries, subsistence, etc., although figures as to annual capital outlays (but not aggregate capital investment) are available.⁶² The total figures

⁶³ See the notes to Table 12, *infra*.

⁶⁰ The latest published reports of the Census containing these discordant figures are *Financial Statistics of States, 1927* (pp. 90, 91) and *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927* (pp. 124-127). These published reports show discrepancies similar to those analyzed in detail in Table 7 for the 1928 figures.

⁶¹ It is also to be hoped that the quality of the institutional financial statistics published by the Census will be substantially improved. See pp., 208-213, *supra*.

⁶² Compare the discussion of the available published statistics as to institutions for juvenile delinquents in pt. 3 (pp. 179, 181-182, *supra*.)

⁶³ See *Financial Statistics of States, 1928*, pp. 86, 87, 100, 101.

include "all payments by the State for the custody, board and education of truant and incorrigible school children where the children are committed by a court order to an institution, and for the support of State institutions to which children under 18 years of age are committed by the court for criminal offenses."⁶³

The only comprehensive financial statistics as to individual institutions for juvenile delinquents are those published by the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior.⁶⁴ The most recent figures available are for the last fiscal years of the reporting institutions ending on or before June 30, 1927.⁶⁵ These statistics are collected every four years,⁶⁶ so that the next figures available will be for the year 1930-31.⁶⁷ The statistics of the Office of Education do not separate State institutions from county, municipal and private institutions, nor identify State institutions as such.

2. *Institutional cost figures.*—Table 8 shows the average number of inmates, total operating cost, and cost per inmate for the year 1926-27 for 51 State correctional institutions for minors.⁶⁸

⁶³ Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, pp. 34, 35.

⁶⁴ See *Industrial Schools for Delinquents: 1926-27*, pp. 18-21 (Bulletin No. 10, 1928, U. S. Office of Education).

⁶⁵ Except in a few instances where particular institutions sent in reports for later periods. It is impossible to identify these institutions from the published figures.

⁶⁶ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. L. A. Kalbach, chief clerk, Office of Education, Department of the Interior, for assistance in securing information as to these statistics.

⁶⁷ Some unofficial data are also available. An unpublished survey made by the Russell Sage Foundation for 1920-21, covering 94 institutions for juvenile delinquents, including 79 institutions for boys and 15 for both sexes, showed an average operating cost per inmate of \$411. Not all of these, however, were State institutions. A contemporaneous study of 67 institutions for delinquent girls showed an operating cost per inmate of \$481. See Reeves, *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls*, p. 420 (New York, 1929). In this case also, not all of the institutions studied were State institutions. The report of the Committee on Delinquency of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, shortly to be published, will contain a section dealing with the cost of care of delinquent children. Acknowledgment is made to Miss Katherine F. Lenroot, assistant chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, for making this material available to the writer in manuscript form.

⁶⁸ Figures from *Industrial Schools for Delinquents: 1926-27*, pp. 12-21. This publication gives figures for 152 institutions, of which 81 are State institutions. Cost figures for 1926-27 are not available for 18 of these State institutions, and 12 of them (having a mixed population of adults and minors) have already been considered in dealing with penal and correctional institutions for adults—Illinois State reformatory, Indiana reformatory, Iowa reformatory for women, Kansas State industrial reformatory, Maine State reformatory for women, Minnesota State reformatory, New Jersey State reformatory for women, Albion State training school (New York), Bedford reformatory (New York State reformatory for women), Pennsylvania industrial reformatory, and Washington State reformatory.

TABLE 8.—Operating cost per inmate of State institutions for juvenile delinquents, 1926-27

State and institution	Location	Average enrollment for year	Operating cost	Cost per inmate
Arizona: State industrial school.....	Fort Grant.....	105	\$60, 118	\$572. 55
Arkansas: Boys' industrial school.....	Pine Bluff.....	175	95, 300	544. 57
California:				
California school for girls.....	Ventura.....	163	118, 531	727. 17
Preston school of industry.....	Waterman.....	560	238, 767	426. 35
Whittier State school.....	Whittier.....	310	214, 724	692. 06
Colorado:				
State industrial school.....	Golden.....	251	132, 626	608. 07
State industrial school for girls.....	Mount Morrison.....	138	54, 378	394. 04
Connecticut: School for boys.....	Meriden.....	430	200, 389	456. 46
Delaware: Ferris industrial school.....	Marshallton.....	156	62, 000	391. 02
Florida: Industrial school for boys.....	Marlanna.....	411	115, 787	281. 72
Georgia: Training school for girls.....	Atlanta.....	112	35, 000	312. 50
Idaho: Industrial training school.....	St. Anthony.....	296	102, 000	344. 59
Illinois:				
State training school for girls.....	Geneva.....	475	194, 009	406. 44
St. Charles school for boys.....	St. Charles.....	774	378, 274	490. 02
Indiana:				
Indiana girls' school.....	Indianapolis.....	326	116, 179	356. 38
Indiana boys' school.....	Plainfield.....	502	161, 167	321. 03
Iowa:				
Training school for boys.....	Eldora.....	460	183, 232	398. 33
Training school for girls.....	Mitchellville.....	185	90, 305	488. 46
Kansas: State industrial school for girls.....	Beloit.....	159	76, 000	477. 98
Louisiana: Training institute.....	Louisville.....	105	87, 892	445. 60
Maine: State school for girls.....	Hallowell.....	158	76, 067	481. 44
Maryland: Training school for boys.....	Lock Raven.....	213	138, 318	649. 38
Massachusetts:				
State industrial school for girls.....	Lancaster.....	296	138, 000	466. 22
Industrial school for boys.....	Shirley.....	307	159, 195	518. 55
Michigan: State public school.....	Coldwater.....	374	243, 124	650. 06
Minnesota:				
State training school for boys.....	Red Wing.....	328	172, 720	520. 59
Minnesota home school for girls.....	Sauk Center.....	289	166, 444	575. 03
Mississippi: Industrial and training school.....	Columbia.....	300	95, 500	318. 33
Montana:				
State vocational school for girls.....	Helena.....	76	41, 975	552. 30
Montana State industrial school.....	Miles City.....	140	61, 000	435. 71
Nebraska: State industrial school.....	Kearney.....	217	82, 860	381. 80
New Jersey:				
State home for boys.....	Jamesburg.....	628	294, 348	468. 71
State home for girls.....	Tronton.....	270	188, 041	698. 67
New York:				
New York State training school for girls.....	Hudson.....	421	249, 023	591. 50
State agricultural and industrial school.....	Industry.....	731	381, 431	521. 79
North Carolina: Stonewall Jackson manual training and industrial school.....	Concord.....	415	133, 208	320. 98
North Dakota: State training school.....	Mandan.....	185	88, 790	479. 95
Ohio:				
Girls' industrial school.....	Delaware.....	506	186, 414	368. 41
Boys' industrial school.....	Lancaster.....	1, 100	319, 781	290. 71
Oregon: State industrial school for girls.....	Salem.....	73	61, 094	830. 90
Pennsylvania: Training school.....	Morgantown.....	704	308, 952	519. 07
Rhode Island: Sockanosset school for boys.....	Howard.....	177	113, 000	638. 41
Texas:				
Girls' training school.....	Gainesville.....	100	75, 655	472. 84
State juvenile training school.....	Gatesville.....	891	229, 460	257. 61
Virginia: Industrial school for boys.....	Maldens.....	219	72, 460	330. 90
Washington: State training school.....	Chehalis.....	202	108, 183	535. 41
West Virginia:				
West Virginia industrial school for boys.....	Grafton.....	420	102, 000	242. 85
West Virginia industrial home for girls.....	Industrial.....	127	30, 076	312. 40
Wisconsin:				
Wisconsin industrial school for girls.....	Milwaukee.....	238	105, 880	444. 57
Wisconsin industrial school for boys.....	Waukesha.....	361	148, 002	412. 72
Wyoming: Industrial institute.....	Worland.....	81	51, 000	629. 62

Table 9 shows comparative costs per inmate by geographical regions for institutions for boys, institutions for girls, and institutions for both sexes, and also gives average costs per inmate for all three types of institutions. Figures as to the cost per inmate of the one Federal institution for delinquent boys⁶⁹ and of the District of Columbia institution for delinquent girls⁷⁰ are given for purposes of comparison. All figures are derived from those published by the Office of Education for 1926-27.

TABLE 9.—Comparative costs per inmate of State and Federal institutions for juvenile delinquents, 1926-27

Region	Institutions			
	For boys	For girls	For both sexes	Average
New England.....			(1)	\$498. 73
Middle Atlantic.....	\$512. 01	\$471. 51	(1)	530. 45
East North Central.....	497. 35	633. 37	2 \$516. 97	530. 45
West North Central.....	380. 36	389. 90	2 650. 00	398. 16
South Atlantic.....	480. 62	525. 70	2 474. 54	474. 18
West Atlantic.....	340. 12	312. 43	(1)	333. 07
East South Central.....	(1)	(1)	2 318. 33	318. 33
West South Central.....	327. 23	2 472. 84	(1)	343. 03
Mountain.....	518. 28	450. 25	404. 28	462. 83
Pacific.....	623. 91	761. 12	(1)	566. 71
All State institutions.....	416. 21	482. 68	485. 48	440. 79
Federal institutions ⁷¹	2 308. 31	2 615. 70	(1)	307. 11

¹ No institutions reporting for 1926-27.

² 1 institution only.

³ 1 District of Columbia institution only.

⁴ None.

⁵ Average for 1 Federal and 1 District of Columbia institution.

The average annual operating cost of \$440.79 per inmate for all reporting State institutions may be compared with the average of \$424.93 per inmate for all institutions (including State, county, municipal, and private institutions) reporting costs to the Office of Education for 1926-27.⁷¹

It has not been possible in this study to check the figures published by the Office of Education as to individual institutional costs with the basic data used by the Bureau of the Census in preparing its State totals, nor with the reports of the individual institutions. It would seem desirable that the first of these checks, at least, be made with respect to the 1930-31 figures before they are published by the Office of

⁶⁹ The National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.

⁷⁰ The National Training School for Girls, Washington, D. C.

⁷¹ See Industrial Schools for Delinquents, p. 11.

Education. Indeed, there seems considerable reason to doubt whether it is desirable to have financial statistics as to institutions for juvenile delinquents published by two separate bureaus of the Federal Government;⁷² and, as between the Office of Education and the Bureau of the Census, the latter seems clearly the preferable agency to have the matter in charge,⁷³ especially as this would facilitate coordination of financial statistics as to correctional institutions for juveniles with those as to penal institutions for adults which the census now publishes, as well as checking against the State totals published as part of the census financial statistics of States.

3. *Comparative State totals.*—Table 10 shows aggregate expenditures, by States, for the operation of correctional institutions, and other correctional expenditures for minors, for the census year 1928, gives the per capita expenditure of each State, and indicates the amount of capital outlays for such institutions during that period.

TABLE 10.—*Cost of State correctional treatment of juvenile delinquents, 1928*

Region and State	Expenditure ¹	Per capita expenditure ²	Capital outlay ³
New England:			
Maine.....	\$145,879	\$0.182	\$3,156
New Hampshire.....	67,061	.124	04,000
Vermont.....	130,472	.379	-----
Massachusetts.....	506,937	.140	23,306
Rhode Island.....	141,781	.206	16,100
Connecticut.....	516,043	.322	130,120
Total.....	1,505,723	.105	240,417
Middle Atlantic:			
New York.....	925,541	.074	29,074
New Jersey.....	440,202	.109	418,163
Pennsylvania.....	1,102,802	.124	85,805
Total.....	2,568,545	.007	533,732
East North Central:			
Ohio.....	561,527	.084	112,007
Indiana.....	282,037	.087	48,518
Illinois.....	1,262,094	.106	130,480
Michigan.....	542,672	.312	59,610
Wisconsin.....	280,113	.098	16,392
Total.....	2,930,243	.116	367,907

See footnotes at end of table.

⁷² Compare National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 11, 47.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 15, 47-49.

TABLE 10.—*Cost of State correctional treatment of juvenile delinquents, 1928—Continued*

Region and State	Expenditure ¹	Per capita expenditure ²	Capital outlay ³
West North Central:			
Minnesota.....	\$373,224	\$0.140	\$21,072
Iowa.....	204,142	.110	12,620
Missouri.....	340,671	.090	001
North Dakota.....	171,841	.253	59,443
South Dakota.....	459,501	.088	1,553
Nebraska.....	101,162	.117	6,070
Kansas.....	063,205	.353	122,576
Total.....	2,072,800	.156	221,840
South Atlantic:			
Delaware.....	120,425	.505	146,538
Maryland.....	300,358	.184	158,046
Virginia.....	294,933	.084	69,955
West Virginia.....	250,145	.148	193,544
North Carolina.....	281,703	.087	207,274
South Carolina.....	114,758	.066	-----
Georgia.....	84,470	.020	6,282
Florida.....	200,827	.137	63,172
Total.....	1,593,028	.102	675,810
East South Central:			
Kentucky.....	205,837	.070	40,415
Tennessee.....	395,000	.152	156,044
Alabama.....	208,580	.070	62,460
Mississippi.....	113,566	.057	-----
Total.....	923,082	.093	259,810
West South Central:			
Arkansas.....	123,105	.060	2,337
Louisiana.....	114,412	.054	100,119
Oklahoma.....	216,105	.090	140,315
Texas.....	313,010	.054	98,873
Total.....	766,632	.063	341,644
Mountain:			
Montana.....	108,514	.203	8,014
Idaho.....	140,050	.316	4,414
Wyoming.....	73,935	.328	15,110
Colorado.....	303,181	.351	-----
New Mexico.....	45,104	.107	-----
Arizona.....	64,755	.149	3,132
Utah.....	74,751	.147	5,202
Nevada.....	20,751	.204	-----
Total.....	897,647	.243	35,872
Pacific:			
Washington.....	310,988	.203	272,730
Oregon.....	120,167	.126	18,467
California.....	793,480	.140	43,903
Total.....	1,230,635	.150	335,100
Grand total.....	14,547,341	.110	3,018,240

¹ From Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 86-87.

² Computed on the basis of the population of each State in 1930.

³ From Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 100-101.

⁴ Corrected figure furnished by the Bureau of the Census. The figures of \$9,501 appearing in Financial Statistics of States, 1928, p. 86, is incorrect.

⁵ The total of \$2,072,800 for this region appearing in Financial Statistics of States, 1928, p. 86, is correct.

⁶ Weighted average.

CHAPTER V

COST OF STATE PAROLE AGENCIES

1. *Introductory.*—In the case of State parole agencies, as in the case of State correctional institutions for minors, the only comprehensive and comparable annual cost statistics are the State totals published by the Bureau of the Census.⁷⁴ These totals do not permit analysis of the figures to show costs per parolee nor do they make possible any classification of parole expenditures. The total figures include "all payments for boards and officers whose duties are to recommend prisoners for pardon or parole, and to keep in touch with those who have been released from custody subject to the supervision of such boards and officers."⁷⁵

2. *Comparative State figures.*—Table 11 gives aggregate expenditures, by States, for pardon and parole boards and officers for the census year 1928, and also shows the per capita cost of parole to the inhabitants of each State, and the expenditure per inmate of State penal institutions for adults in each State.⁷⁶

TABLE 11.—Cost of State parole agencies, 1928

Region and State	Expenditure for parole ¹	Cost per capita to public ²	Expenditure per adult State prisoner ³
New England:			
Maine.....	\$2,223.00	\$0.0028	\$5.00
New Hampshire.....			
Vermont.....	6,380.00	.0177	17.43
Massachusetts.....	162,858.00	.0383	83.05
Rhode Island.....	36,210.00	.0527	93.82
Connecticut.....	7,591.00	.0047	7.37
Total.....	215,268.00	.0264	50.08
Middle Atlantic:			
New York.....	30,683.00	.0024	3.91
New Jersey.....	73,692.00	.0182	28.18
Pennsylvania.....	201.00	.00002	.04
Total.....	104,576.00	.004	6.88

See footnotes at end of table.

⁷⁴ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928 pp. 86-87. For a discussion of the available State figures, see p. 185, supra.

⁷⁵ Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of States, p. 35. The figures also include State probation costs. As to the propriety of classing pardon and parole costs together, see pp. 83, 137, supra.

⁷⁶ This figure is believed to be significant as an index of what each State is spending on post-institutional treatment of released prisoners.

TABLE 11.—Cost of State parole agencies, 1928—Continued

Region and State	Expenditure for parole ¹	Cost per capita to public ²	Expenditure per adult State prisoner ³
East North Central:			
Ohio.....	\$14,057.00	\$0.0021	\$1.74
Indiana.....	9,725.00	.0030	2.52
Illinois.....	103,321.00	.0135	15.41
Michigan.....	105,374.00	.0218	15.80
Wisconsin.....			
Total.....	232,480.00	.0092	8.05
West North Central:			
Minnesota.....	348.00	.00014	.10
Iowa.....	32,826.00	.0133	14.70
Missouri.....	4,258.00	.0012	1.12
North Dakota.....	362.00	.00053	1.19
South Dakota.....	3,033.00	.0052	8.00
Nebraska.....	9,030.00	.0060	8.84
Kansas.....	3,500.00	.0010	1.24
Total.....	53,906.00	.0033	4.24
South Atlantic:			
Delaware.....	3,101.00	.0134	(⁴)
Maryland.....	17,189.00	.0105	7.00
Virginia.....			
West Virginia.....	5,504.00	.0032	2.05
North Carolina.....	6,036.00	.0022	3.61
South Carolina.....	1,043.00	.00005	2.08
Georgia.....			
Florida.....			
Total.....	34,553.00	.0023	3.15
East South Central:			
Kentucky.....	5,644.00	.0022	2.20
Tennessee.....			
Alabama.....			
Mississippi.....			
Total.....	5,644.00	.00057	.78
West South Central:			
Arkansas.....			
Louisiana.....	3,104.00	.0039	4.42
Oklahoma.....	4,970.00	.0021	1.40
Texas.....	8,507.00	.0015	2.15
Total.....	21,971.00	.0018	2.03
Mountain:			
Montana.....			
Idaho.....			
Wyoming.....			
Colorado.....			
New Mexico.....	934.00	.0022	2.28
Arizona.....	760.00	.0017	1.40
Utah.....	182.00	.00030	.80
Nevada.....			
Total.....	1,866.00	.00054	.40
Pacific:			
Washington.....	14,134.00	.0090	9.04
Oregon.....			
California.....	24,886.00	.0044	3.80
Total.....	39,020.00	.0048	4.12
Grand total.....	700,344.00	.0050	7.25

¹ From Financial Statistics of States, 1928, pp. 86-87. Includes pardon and State probation costs.

² Computed on the basis of the population of each State in 1930.

³ Computed from data given in Table 5, supra.

⁴ Includes State probation.

⁵ Omitted for the reason that Delaware has no State penal institution for adults.

⁶ Weighted average.

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

1. *Summary of State costs of penal and corrective treatment.*—Table 12 summarizes the cost of State penal and corrective treatment for each of the States for the census year 1928, giving the total cost, by States, for penal and correctional institutions for adults, correctional institutions for minors, and parole agencies, and also giving the total cost per capita of the State penal and corrective institutions and agencies of each State.

TABLE 12.—*Cost of State penal and corrective treatment, 1928*

Region and State	Annual expenditures, 1928				Annual per capita expenditure ¹
	Institutions for adults ¹	Institutions for minors ²	Parole agencies ³	Total	
New England:					
Maine.....	\$258,825	\$145,870	\$2,223	\$406,927	\$0.510
New Hampshire.....	84,804	57,601	—	142,555	.306
Vermont.....	223,926	136,442	—	360,368	1.020
Massachusetts.....	\$1,817,052	500,037	162,563	2,479,652	.600
Rhode Island.....	244,603	141,781	36,210	422,600	.616
Connecticut.....	447,163	516,043	7,501	970,707	.606
Total.....	3,077,313	1,505,603	215,268	4,888,274	.590
Middle Atlantic:					
New York.....	\$3,248,854	925,541	30,653	4,205,078	.334
New Jersey.....	\$1,221,803	440,202	73,092	1,735,097	.429
Pennsylvania.....	\$2,019,562	1,192,802	201	3,212,565	.334
Total.....	6,490,309	2,558,545	104,676	9,153,430	.340
East North Central:					
Ohio.....	1,478,075	561,527	14,057	2,053,659	.309
Indiana.....	\$1,078,819	282,937	9,728	1,371,484	.423
Illinois.....	1,761,200	1,202,604	103,321	3,117,516	.409
Michigan.....	3,073,618	542,672	105,374	3,721,664	.770
Wisconsin.....	\$606,820	298,113	—	904,933	.308
Total.....	7,968,441	2,948,243	232,480	11,160,164	.462
West North Central:					
Minnesota.....	1,014,508	373,224	348	1,388,080	.541
Iowa.....	1,520,777	204,142	32,820	1,847,745	.748
Missouri.....	\$1,147,707	340,671	4,258	1,501,636	.434
North Dakota.....	\$200,467	171,841	362	372,670	.548
South Dakota.....	175,065	50,561	3,633	229,259	.345
Nebraska.....	301,535	161,162	9,030	471,727	.408
Kansas.....	724,500	603,205	3,500	1,331,205	.740
Total.....	5,175,155	2,072,806	53,000	7,301,027	.540
South Atlantic:					
Delaware.....	—	120,425	3,101	123,616	.502
Maryland.....	709,047	300,358	17,180	1,026,585	.630
Virginia.....	\$1,287,035	204,333	—	1,491,368	.610
West Virginia.....	407,155	256,145	5,504	668,804	.387
North Carolina.....	546,973	281,703	0,036	828,712	.263
South Carolina.....	159,614	114,768	1,643	276,025	.158
Georgia.....	122,230	84,470	—	206,718	.071
Florida.....	452,530	200,827	—	653,357	.445
Total.....	3,654,509	1,563,028	34,563	5,252,100	.334

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—*Cost of State penal and corrective treatment, 1928—Contd.*

Region and State	Annual expenditures, 1928				Annual per capita expenditure
	Institutions for adults	Institutions for minors	Parole agencies	Total	
East South Central:					
Kentucky.....	\$607,510	\$205,837	\$5,044	\$818,397	\$0.313
Tennessee.....	788,078	305,000	—	1,133,177	.452
Alabama.....	1,702,178	208,530	—	1,910,708	.722
Mississippi.....	440,003	113,550	—	553,553	.226
Total.....	3,538,775	623,922	5,044	4,167,741	.452
West South Central:					
Arkansas.....	250,073	123,105	—	373,178	.205
Louisiana.....	459,758	114,412	8,104	582,274	.377
Oklahoma.....	\$908,583	216,105	4,070	1,128,758	.497
Texas.....	1,361,104	513,010	8,807	1,882,921	.280
Total.....	3,040,418	760,632	21,071	3,822,121	.315
Mountain:					
Montana.....	103,571	108,514	—	212,085	.500
Idaho.....	100,840	140,050	—	240,890	.513
Wyoming.....	90,582	78,035	—	168,617	.780
Colorado.....	374,858	363,181	—	738,039	.712
New Mexico.....	114,422	45,104	934	160,460	.370
Arizona.....	232,840	64,755	750	298,345	.085
Utah.....	7112,610	74,751	182	7,187,543	.369
Nevada.....	65,577	26,751	—	92,328	1.236
Total.....	1,284,450	807,047	1,866	2,193,363	.500
Pacific:					
Washington.....	344,583	316,088	14,134	674,805	.432
Oregon.....	208,786	120,107	—	328,893	.344
California.....	1,613,771	793,408	24,550	2,431,729	.428
Total.....	2,167,140	1,230,603	38,020	3,435,763	.410
Grand total.....	36,455,530	14,556,230	709,344	51,721,122	.423

¹ From Financial Statistics of States, 1923, pp. 36-37, unless otherwise indicated. For details, see Table 7, supra, and discussion following that table.

² From Table 10, supra.

³ From Table 11, supra. Includes pardon boards and State probation agencies.

⁴ Computed on the basis of the 1930 census figures as to population.

⁵ Expenditures for prison industries excluded.

⁶ Figure arrived at by using the institutional figure for the operating cost of the Western State Penitentiary instead of the figure used in compiling the census financial statistics of States.

⁷ Figure arrived at by adding operating cost of State prison on institutional basis, amounting to \$110,403, and \$2,000 for transporting prisoners. See Table 7, supra, note 33.

2. *Conclusions to be drawn from the figures.*—Attention has already been directed to the fact that the figures as to the cost of State penal institutions for adults presented in Chapter III of this part are not in themselves sufficient to afford any basis for judging the comparative economy and efficiency of those institutions.⁷⁷ Similarly, any attempt to use the other figures given in this part as the basis for judging the relative efficiency and economy of the penal and corrective systems of the several States is bound to be

⁷⁷ See pp. 226-227, infra.

unsuccessful. This is particularly true of the figures as to total State expenditures for penal and correctional activities presented in the preceding section, since those figures show merely what each State as such spends, directly and independently of its municipal subdivisions, for the penal and correctional treatment of criminals, not the total amount spent in the State for that purpose. The practices of the several States with regard to the administration of penal and correctional activities differ greatly. In some States, practically all such activities (except the confinement of short-term minor offenders, which is almost universally a county or municipal function) are carried on by the State directly; in others a large part of these activities are carried on by the counties; while at least one State⁷⁸ has no State penal institutions for adults at all.⁷⁹ Consequently State totals and figures as to per capita State expenditures are even less indicative of relative efficiency and economy of administration than are figures as to costs per inmate in the case of individual institutions. Unless these facts are borne in mind in considering the figures presented in the preceding sections, misinterpretation of the data is likely.

No attempt will be made here to draw any detailed conclusions from the data which have been presented. Such conclusions would require much more elaborate information than is contained in this report, and would more properly form part of a report on the penal and corrective treatment of criminals than part of a report on the cost of criminal justice. This part of the present report merely presents basic cost data, and does not attempt the task of relating those data to the other aspects of the subject of penal and corrective agencies and treatment.

However, one important fact, which is clearly apparent on the face of the figures, may be emphasized here—viz, that the cost to the individual taxpayer of State penal and corrective treatment is comparatively small. The total expenditures of all the States during the census year 1928 for penal and correctional institutions and agencies was \$51,721,122, out of a total of \$1,208,286,155 expended for all general State gov-

ernmental purposes during that year.⁸⁰ Even if annual expenditures for State penal and correctional activities were doubled, this would increase the aggregate cost of State government by only 4.28 per cent, and would increase the annual cost of such activities for the United States as a whole by less than 43 cents per capita.⁸¹ This fact may be relevant in considering proposals for increasing the efficiency of the penal and correctional machinery of the States which involve possible increases in cost.

⁸⁰ See Financial Statistics of States, 1928, p. 72.

⁸¹ See Table 12, supra.

⁷⁸ Delaware. See p. 205, supra, note 2.

⁷⁹ For a detailed description of the penal organization of the several States, see National Society for Penal Information, Handbook of American Prisons and Reformatories, 1929, pp. xxii-xxiii, 108-1018.

PART 6

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL
JUSTICE IN AMERICAN CITIES

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, RAYMOND H. FRANZEN and
WILLIAM B. HUBBELL

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—The purpose of the investigation which has resulted in obtaining the data presented in this part of the report has been the securing of reliable and comparable figures as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in American municipalities.¹ The need for such an investigation had become obvious as a result of an examination of the published statistical material relating to municipal costs of administering criminal justice,² which disclosed the fact that the available material of this character was neither sufficiently extensive nor sufficiently reliable to make possible a study of such costs on the basis of published figures alone,³ and clearly indicated the necessity for detailed field investigation. The results of this investigation, as presented in Chapter V of this part,⁴ represent the first attempt to secure detailed and reliable figures as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in a substantial number of American cities.

This part of the report, however, has a further purpose than that of merely presenting basic statistical data as to costs of criminal justice in American cities. To obtain the maximum value from these data, as from any statistical

¹ A secondary object of the investigation was the obtaining of social data with regard to the communities studied for use in making a comparative analysis of the cost figures. See pp. 341-343, *infra*.

² For a list of such material, see Appendix A (pp. 470-483, *infra*).

³ See the full discussion of this matter in pt. 3 (pp. 153-161, *supra*).

⁴ See pp. 281-330, *infra*. Chs. II, III, and IV (pp. 253-281, *infra*) are preliminary to Ch. V, and discuss, respectively, how the investigation was made, what accounting problems were met with and how they were solved, and to what extent the figures obtained may be regarded as representative.

data, analysis and interpretation are necessary. Moreover, the possibility of relating these data to community conditions in the cities studied calls for careful investigation, since the establishment of relationships of this character, if such exist, would add greatly to the significance and usefulness of the cost figures. The project for the investigation originally contemplated such analysis and interpretation of the data obtained by field study, and the entire investigation was planned on that basis. As explained in detail later,⁵ limitations of time have made it impossible to complete this part of the project prior to the termination of the commission's existence on June 30, 1931, so that this part of the report will not present any definitive analysis or interpretation of the basic cost figures. However, even though definitive analysis has been impossible, the lines which it is believed such analysis should take have been worked out and a definite plan for the completion of the investigation prepared. Chapter VI of this part⁶ will set forth this plan, and will make recommendations as to the continuation and completion of the study.

This part, therefore, while complete as regards the basic cost data presented,⁷ is not a final report of the investigation in the course of which those data were secured, but is to be considered as a progress report.⁸

2. *Relation to other studies.*—Before outlining the precise scope of the investigation reported upon in this part, it will be desirable briefly to consider the relationship of the cost of municipal criminal justice to the other types of costs considered in the prior parts of this report.

⁵ See p. 340, *infra*.

⁶ See pp. 339-343, *infra*.

⁷ In the sense that all the basic data which it has been possible to secure are presented. The extent to which those data are complete in the sense of covering the entire field of potential investigation is discussed in Chapter IV (pp. 271-277, *infra*).

⁸ Compare National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Progress Report on the Study of the Business of the Federal Courts. This part of the present report is more complete than the progress report of the Federal court study in that it presents in final form representative basic data for analysis; while, in the case of the Federal court study, representative basic data will not be available until June 30, 1931.

Part 2 of the report⁹ has dealt with the cost of Federal criminal justice in the continental United States.¹⁰ Part 3,¹¹ inventorying and appraising the published material on State and municipal costs of criminal justice, has served as a general introduction to parts 4¹² and 5¹³ dealing with certain aspects of State costs, and to this part, dealing with municipal costs. The discussion of State costs in parts 4 and 5 is not as complete as that of Federal costs contained in part 2, since those parts are limited to the consideration, respectively, of State police forces and State penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies. These, while representing by far the most important centralized criminal justice functions exercised by the States directly, do not include all State criminal justice activities.

One of the important functions of criminal law administration undertaken directly by the State in a considerable number of jurisdictions is that of the trial and sentence of persons accused of serious crimes. However, governmental practice varies—this function, while undertaken by the State directly in some jurisdictions, is in others committed to counties, cities, or other municipal subdivisions, either wholly or in part. The same thing is true of prosecution—in some States it is State-administered, in others it is administered by counties and municipalities. This fact has important consequences affecting any attempt to work out comparative studies of State and municipal court or prosecution costs. In order to permit comparison, either State studies must be worked out which will include county and municipal court or prosecution costs, or else municipal studies must be made in such a way as to include appropriate allowances for State and county costs allocable to each municipality. The first method would give comparable studies of State costs; the second, comparable studies of municipal costs.

It is obvious, of course, that the most desirable procedure would be to make both kinds of studies—comparative studies by States and comparative studies by municipalities. The reasons for not doing so are purely practical. Complete

⁹ See pp. 71-152, *supra*.

¹⁰ Exclusive of the District of Columbia. See p. 71, *supra*.

¹¹ See pp. 153-191, *supra*.

¹² See pp. 192-204, *supra*.

¹³ See pp. 205-243, *supra*.

State studies are very difficult to make,¹⁴ and while attempts were made to secure such studies for all the States,¹⁵ only one was secured,¹⁶ and that can not be regarded as representative.¹⁷ In addition to the practical difficulties involved in State studies, comparative studies on a municipal basis have greater possibilities of analysis and interpretation in the light of community likenesses and differences than do State studies, since the municipal unit is on the average much more homogeneous than the State unit. Consequently, in view of the fact that the time and funds necessary for making both classes of studies were not available, it seemed best to work out comparative municipal studies only, but to include in those studies appropriate allowances for State prosecution and court expenditures.

This part of the report presents comparative data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice based on municipal units after allowance has been made for State expenditures for prosecution and courts, which are not elsewhere considered in this report,¹⁸ and thus, to that extent, supplements the material as to State costs presented in parts 4 and 5. The major portions of the costs dealt with in this part are,

¹⁴ The State of Pennsylvania, for example, contains 67 counties; 25 cities and 2 urban townships having over 25,000 population; 67 cities and 8 urban townships having a population of between 10,000 and 25,000; 252 incorporated places having a population of between 2,500 and 10,000; and 641 incorporated places under 2,500 population. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, pp. 935-936, 958-966. A complete State study for Pennsylvania would thus require investigation of the expenditures of some 1,063 different governmental units.

¹⁵ Since funds were not available for such studies, it was necessary to attempt to secure voluntary cooperation in making them. Educational institutions (in most cases the State universities) in all 48 States were approached with regard to the matter, but only in one case (see note 16, *infra*) was a State study arranged for. This was not due to a lack of willingness to cooperate, which was universally present, but to lack of funds and to the inherent difficulty of the problems presented by such studies.

¹⁶ Rhode Island. The study was directed by Prof. H. A. Phelps, of Brown University, Providence, R. I. Even this study, moreover, is not entirely complete, since it does not include the cost of town administration of criminal justice. See Appendix II (pp. 655-656, *infra*), for a presentation of the data obtained for Rhode Island.

¹⁷ Rhode Island has an urban population of 92.4 per cent, as compared with an average of 56.2 per cent for the country as a whole; a population density of 604.3 persons per square mile, as against an average of 41.3 for the country as a whole; and only 5 counties and 19 other incorporated places, as against an average of 64 counties and 130 incorporated places per State for the country as a whole. See Population Bulletin, First Series: United States Summary, 1930, pp. 7, 26, 80-81 (U. S. Census, 1931).

¹⁸ Allowance is not made for State expenditures for penal and corrective treatment, which are elsewhere dealt with. See pp. 306-307, *infra*.

however, direct municipal expenditures and county expenditures, which are not elsewhere considered in this report.¹⁹

3. *Scope of study.*—In order to obtain complete data as to the cost of criminal justice in the United States, it would be necessary, in addition to developing figures as to direct State costs and either dealing with them separately²⁰ or allocating them to the municipal subdivisions of the States,²¹ to secure figures covering all municipal corporations having and exercising functions in connection with criminal justice. This would include all of the 3,073 counties and substantially all of the 16,598 incorporated places in the United States.²² As has already been indicated,²³ the practical difficulties of making an investigation covering almost 20,000 separate governmental units were recognized to be insuperable. On the other hand, some reasonably comprehensive investigation of municipal costs of criminal justice was essential, since these costs make up much the largest portion of the total cost of criminal justice to the country.²⁴ The question has been where to draw the line.

The classification made by the Bureau of the Census between urban and rural population might perhaps have been made use of to limit the scope of the investigation. The definition of urban population of the 1930 census includes "all cities and other incorporated places having 2,500 population or more" and "townships and other political subdivisions (not incorporated as municipalities) which had a total population of 10,000 or more and a population density of 1,000 or more per square mile," but excludes incorporated towns in New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, although having over 2,500 population, except "those towns in which there is a village or thickly settled area having more than 2,500 inhabitants and comprising, either by itself or when combined with other villages within the same town,

¹⁹ Except in a very general way in pts. 1 and 3 (pp. 37-49, 153-191, *supra*).

²⁰ As has been done in the case of State police forces and State penal institutions. See pts. 4 and 5 (pp. 192-243, *supra*).

²¹ As has been done in the case of State expenditures for prosecution and criminal courts. See § 2, *supra*.

²² See Population Bulletin, First Series: United States Summary, 1930, pp. 8-33, 80-81. The population of these 16,598 incorporated places totals 78,137,858 persons, or 63.6 per cent of the total population. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 14.

²³ See pp. 47-48, *supra*.

²⁴ See the discussion of this point in pt. 10 (pp. 438-439, *infra*).

more than 50 per cent of the total population of the town."²⁵ Under this definition there were in 1930 a total of 3,165 urban places, having an aggregate population of 68,954,823 persons, or 56.2 per cent of the entire population of the United States.²⁶ Here again, however, the practical difficulties of a complete investigation were serious, since if the attempt had been made to cover the cost of criminal justice in all urban places it would have required not only studies for all of these 3,165 places but also, in most cases, for the counties in which they are located. This would have meant that some 4,000 to 5,000 governmental units would have had to be studied, which was an impracticably large undertaking in view of limitations on available time and funds.

The final decision was to limit the study to cities over 25,000 in population.²⁷ There are 365 such cities, located in 44 States,²⁸ with an aggregate population of 48,860,416 persons,²⁹ amounting to 70.9 per cent of the urban population of the United States, and to 38.2 per cent of the total population. The reasons for this decision were as follows: First, purely practical considerations made it impossible to work out any plan for securing adequate studies for more than 365 municipalities in view of the limited time and funds available.³⁰ Second, the Bureau of the Census, in classifying cities for purposes of the 1930 census, has placed an important division at 25,000 population.³¹ Third, there was precedent for adopting a dividing line in the neighborhood of that selected, since the Bureau of the Census, in its financial statistics of cities, has for years adopted 30,000 population as the criterion for inclusion.³² The population

²⁵ See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 7.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁷ Exclusive of urban places not incorporated cities. As to the reason for excluding these places, see p. 250, *infra*.

²⁸ Including 1 in the District of Columbia. The States of Idaho, Nevada, Vermont and Wyoming have no cities over 25,000 in population.

²⁹ See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, pp. 22-29.

³⁰ Some of the difficulties met in carrying out even this limited project are referred to in Chapter II (pp. 253-258, *infra*). The original project contemplated studies for the 100 largest cities of the country only, but was expanded to include smaller cities so as to give a more fully representative set of studies.

³¹ See, for example, Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, pp. 14, 22-29.

³² See Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000, 1928, p. 7 (U. S. Census, 1931).

limit for the present investigation was placed 5,000 below this figure in order to get a more adequate representation of smaller communities. Fourth, it was believed that, even though the dividing line was placed at 25,000, a reasonably comprehensive picture of urban conditions would be obtained. The cities over 25,000 in population include, as has been stated,³³ over 70 per cent of the population of the United States classified as "urban" by the Census Bureau. Moreover, from many standpoints—and one of these, we believe, is the standpoint of the student of crime—the "small town" of 3,000 to 10,000 population, although classified as "urban" by the census, has more points of resemblance to smaller rural villages than to larger cities. So far as the administration of criminal justice is concerned, the problems of the small town are rural rather than urban.³⁴ On the other hand, the problems of the city of 25,000 and over tend to become more and more assimilated, with increasing size, to those of the larger urban centers. For these reasons it was felt that to draw the line at 25,000 population would result in a practical project which would yield reasonably comprehensive and homogeneous data as to urban communities.

Urban places over 25,000 in population other than incorporated cities³⁵ were omitted from the study because of their relative unimportance³⁶ and because some practical difficulties might have been expected as a result of the fact that the methods of investigation used were developed for incorporated places. One city over 25,000 in population located in two States, but classified as a single city by the Census Bureau, was omitted because of its small size and because of the difficulties involved in the study of a com-

³³ See p. 249, *supra*.

³⁴ For example, reliance is usually on the sheriff-constable system for policing, on justices of the peace, and on the other normal devices of rural criminal justice. Compare Jefferson, *Distribution of the World's City Folks*, *Geographical Review*, vol. 21, p. 448 (1931).

³⁵ There are 10 such places: Belvedere township, Calif.; West Haven town, Conn.; Arlington, Brookline and Watertown towns, Mass.; North Bergen and Woodbridge townships, N. J.; Lower Merion and Upper Darby townships, Pa.; and East Providence town, R. I. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, pp. 22-29.

³⁶ The average population of these places is only 35,510, and none of them has a population of over 50,000. Their total population is 355,005, or less than 0.75 per cent of the total population of incorporated places over 25,000 in population. Hence their omission is of small consequence.

munity which was physically one, but legally and governmentally two.³⁷

The project for the study thus included 365 cities of the United States over 25,000 in population,³⁸ and the effort was made to arrange for field studies of as many as possible of these cities which would develop figures as to the cost of administration of criminal justice therein³⁹—including not merely amounts spent by each city itself, but the total spent in and for the benefit of the citizens of the city. This required the allocation to a number of the cities studied of part of the cost of criminal justice borne directly by the State, a matter which has already been discussed.⁴⁰ Moreover, in substantially all cases,⁴¹ an allocation to the city of part of the cost of criminal justice borne by the county in which the city is located was necessary. The reasons making such an allocation of county costs necessary are substantially similar to those already given for making allowance for State expenditures. There is a great variation in practice in various States, and in some instances even in the same State, with regard to what criminal justice functions are county-administered and what are municipal, particularly in the case of prosecution, courts, and penal and corrective activities. Unless appropriate allowance is made for county expenditures in the case of cities where these functions are largely county-administered, the resulting figures for these cities will not be comparable with the figures for other cities where such functions are exercised directly by the city. In some jurisdictions the extent to which criminal justice functions are county-administered is so great that the resulting lack of comparability would be very serious.⁴² Accordingly, the city studies have been worked out in such a way so as to

³⁷ Texarkana, Ark.-Tex. This city (population 27,300) is in reality two separate cities, Texarkana, Ark. (population 10,764), and Texarkana, Tex. (population 16,532).

³⁸ For a list of these cities, see Appendix G (pp. 644-654, *infra*).

³⁹ As to the comprehensiveness of the figures actually obtained, see pp. 271-277, *infra*; as to their accuracy, see pp. 277-281, *infra*.

⁴⁰ See pp. 246-247, *supra*.

⁴¹ Except in a few instances where it was found that city and county were coextensive and city and county governments had been merged.

⁴² This has been recognized in another situation by the Bureau of the Census, which, in its financial statistics for cities over 300,000, includes in city expenditures an allowance for the city's share of county expenditures. See *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of over 30,000: 1928*, pp. 14, 15.

include in each case appropriate allowances for the city's share of State and county expenditures for the administration of criminal justice in and for the city.

This, then, has been the objective of the investigation here reported upon: To secure accurate data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice, including appropriate allowances for State and county expenditures, for the 365 cities of the United States over 25,000 in population in 1930. The extent to which this objective has been attained will be indicated, and the data secured will be presented and discussed, in the following chapters of this part.

4. *Order of discussion.*—The purpose of this part of the report is, as has been stated,⁴³ the presentation of data as to the cost of criminal justice in American cities; but, before these data can profitably be presented, three preliminary topics must be discussed. First, the methods used in obtaining the data must be outlined, so as to make possible an intelligent judgment as to the value of those data. This topic will be dealt with in Chapter II.⁴⁴ Second, the accounting problems encountered must be stated, and the solutions adopted for them indicated. This will show exactly how the figures later presented were arrived at, and will permit a critical judgment as to whether they have been developed along right lines. These matters will be discussed in Chapter III.⁴⁵ Third, the extent and character of the data obtained must be indicated, and the question of the extent to which those data may be relied upon as representative must be considered. These matters will be dealt with in Chapter IV.⁴⁶

After this preliminary discussion, the basic cost data developed will be presented in Chapter V.⁴⁷ This chapter is the heart of this part of the report, and will form the starting point for the further analysis of the data which we recommend, if later made. Our plan and recommendations for such further analysis will appear in the concluding chapter of this part.⁴⁸

⁴³ See p. 244, supra.

⁴⁴ See pp. 253-263, infra.

⁴⁵ See pp. 263-271, infra.

⁴⁶ See pp. 271-281, infra.

⁴⁷ See pp. 281-339, infra.

⁴⁸ See Ch. VI (pp. 339-348, infra).

CHAPTER II

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

1. *Necessity for cooperative investigation.*—Even with the projected study limited to 365 cities, the problem of arranging to have detailed studies made for each city was a difficult one in view of limitations on available time and funds. The ideal method of procedure, if the money had been available, would have been to employ a small group of trained and paid investigators to make all the studies. While it would have been a physical impossibility for a single investigator or team of investigators to make all the studies within the limitations of time imposed by the necessary cessation of the commission's work on June 30, 1931,⁴⁹ it would have been possible to arrange for some 12 or 15 regional investigations under centralized direction and control.⁵⁰ In this way a considerable degree of uniformity of results would have been assured and the problem of supervision and coordination would have been greatly simplified. If funds had been available, this plan would have been adopted. The difficulty was that it would have required an estimated expenditure of at least \$70,000, which was more than three times the amount made available by the commission for the entire cost of crime investigation. Hence the plan was necessarily abandoned.

The only alternative which presented itself as offering a feasible way of arranging for the studies lay in the possibility of securing voluntary cooperation by local agencies in or near the cities included in the project. It was believed that if these agencies could be induced to cooperate on a nation-wide scale, the necessary field work might be arranged for within the limits of budget restrictions. The investigation as actually developed has attested the soundness of this belief.

⁴⁹ Experience with the studies as actually made showed that the completion of a study for a single city required at least 1 week and in some cases longer, depending on the state of the available records. Some studies took from 5 to 6 weeks of full-time work. Assuming an average of 2 weeks for studies by a single investigator, the complete project would have required 730 weeks of study, which, making allowance for time consumed in travel, would have meant some 20 years of work by 1 investigator.

⁵⁰ A team of 2 investigators could in all probability have covered the average city in 1 week or a little less. This would have permitted the completion of some 30 cities by each team in the 30 weeks available for field work.

2. *Possible agencies of local cooperation.*—A canvass of the possibilities of local cooperation indicated that there were, in general, four classes of local agencies⁶¹ which might be appealed to. These were, first, municipal research bureaus; second, colleges and universities; third, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations; and fourth, the city administrations themselves.⁶²

Bureaus of municipal research exist in many of the larger cities of the United States.⁶³ Moreover, in some States⁶⁴ there are municipal leagues having research functions and including in their membership a number of cities. These bureaus and leagues are continually engaged in research work, have trained personnel for such work, and are thoroughly familiar with the organization and personnel of local government in their respective localities. It was, therefore, determined to make the attempt to enlist the cooperation of these organizations wherever possible.

The studies to be made had an obvious relationship to research in the fields of political science, municipal government, public finance, sociology and law as carried on by the colleges and universities of the country. Such institutions are located in or near many of the cities which were included in the project.⁶⁵ In so far as it was possible to secure the active conduct of studies by faculty members, the personnel available might be expected to equal in training and ability that of the research bureaus and municipal leagues,⁶⁶ while the conduct of such studies by graduate students or advanced undergraduates under faculty supervision would, it was believed, result in satisfactory studies in most cases. It was therefore decided to attempt to enlist the cooperation of institutions of higher learning wherever possible.

⁶¹ The term "local" is used as referring to agencies located in or near the cities in question. Some of these—e. g., the State universities—were not local to any single city, and in many cases assumed the responsibility of studies for several cities. See pp. 484-500, *infra*.

⁶² As to other agencies employed in special cases, see p. 257, *infra*.

⁶³ Such bureaus exist in 87 of the 93 cities of the United States over 100,000 in population.

⁶⁴ For example, in Kansas, Kentucky, New Jersey and several other States.

⁶⁵ Accredited colleges and universities are located in 120 of the 305 cities included in the project.

⁶⁶ In a number of cases, such bureaus and leagues are adjuncts of the political science departments of educational institutions.

In a considerable number of cities, chambers of commerce, merchant's associations and similar organizations maintain permanent research bureaus.⁶⁷ In other cases, where no permanent research organizations existed, it was believed that studies might be worked out either by the permanent executive personnel of civic organizations⁶⁸ or by special committees created by such organizations for the purpose.⁶⁹ Moreover, special civic organizations concerned primarily with criminal justice were found to exist in some of the cities embraced in the project.⁷⁰ It was decided to ask such organizations as these for assistance in carrying out the project.

While it was realized that city administrations themselves could hardly be expected to do more than cooperate with research agencies,⁷¹ it was, nevertheless, believed that, where no other agencies could be induced to carry out the studies, mayors or city managers might be willing to compile the data for their cities. It was therefore decided to approach city administrations direct in cases where studies could not be otherwise arranged.

These four classes of agencies—research bureaus, educational institutions, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations, and city administrations—thus formed the potential agencies of local cooperation whose assistance it was hoped to enlist.⁷² We will next outline the methods employed in enlisting such assistance and indicate the extent of the cooperation secured.

3. *Securing cooperation.*—The work of securing cooperation began on October 6, 1930, when the project and the proposed instructions to investigators were finally approved by the commission.⁷³ Immediately upon such approval, let-

⁶⁷ As, for example, the Merchants' Association of New York, New York, N. Y., and the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Ind.

⁶⁸ As was done, for example, by the permanent executive personnel of the Chamber of Commerce of the Oranges and Maplewood, East Orange, N. J.

⁶⁹ As was done, for example, by the Michigan City Chamber of Commerce, Michigan City, Ind.

⁷⁰ Such as, for example, the Cincinnati Regional Crime Committee, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁷¹ Not only was the time required to make the studies considerable, but a considerable amount of the data to be obtained was to be found only in county records. See p. 251, *supra*.

⁷² As to other agencies actually enlisted, see p. 257, *infra*.

⁷³ As to the necessity for and character of these instructions, see pp. 258-261, *infra*.

ters were written to research bureaus, municipal leagues, research departments of chambers of commerce, and educational institutions throughout the country soliciting their cooperation.⁶⁴

These letters were supplemented by personal visits made by the director of the study to cities and States where it proved difficult to secure adequate cooperation by correspondence.⁶⁵ A round-table discussion of the project was arranged as part of the program of the annual convention of the Government Research Association⁶⁶ held at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 12, 1930.⁶⁷ This round-table session was addressed by the director of the study and by representatives of cooperating research bureaus,⁶⁸ and the project was thus brought to the attention of other research organizations.⁶⁹ After the amount of assistance obtainable from research organizations and educational institutions had been definitely ascertained, letters were written to city administrations and to chambers of commerce in those cities where studies had not yet been arranged.⁷⁰ The Chamber of Commerce of the United States cooperated by sending out letters to member chambers of commerce urging them to cooperate.⁷¹ Special

⁶⁴ A total of 256 such letters (including follow-ups) were sent out during the 5-month period from October 6, 1930, to March 6, 1931.

⁶⁵ Such trips were made to Boston, Mass.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Trenton, N. J.; Harrisburg and Philadelphia, Pa.; Cincinnati and Cleveland, Ohio; Chicago, Ill.; Ann Arbor and Detroit, Mich.; Madison, Wis.; Washington, D. C.; New Orleans, La.; and Dallas, Tex. In addition, numerous personal conferences were held in New York with representatives of research bureaus and educational institutions in other States, such as Rhode Island, Illinois, Delaware, North Carolina and California.

⁶⁶ The national organization of municipal research bureaus and similar organizations.

⁶⁷ Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Russell Ramsey, chairman of the committee on financial statistics of cities and States of the Government Research Association, and to Dr. Russell Forbes and Dr. Luther Gulick of that association, for cooperation in arranging for this.

⁶⁸ Mr. Hazen C. Pratt, of the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research, and Dr. Luther Gulick, of the National Institute of Public Administration. These addresses are reprinted in Appendix B to this report (pp. 615-633, *infra*).

⁶⁹ This meeting also afforded the opportunity for personal conference by the director of the study with representatives of research bureaus and educational institutions in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Kentucky, Colorado, and California.

⁷⁰ A total of 57 such letters, including follow-ups, were sent out.

⁷¹ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. William Butterworth, at that time president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, to Messrs. John J. O'Connor, manager of the finance department, and Welles A. Gray, of that department, and to Dr. John M. Redpath, manager of the research department, for arranging for such cooperation.

assistance was given by individual members of the advisory group organized to assist in working out the project⁷² in their own localities⁷³ and by members of the commission and other advisors.⁷⁴

As a result of these activities, which extended over some six months beginning October 6, 1930, cooperative studies were arranged for which covered completely or in part 300 of the 365 cities included in the project, including all the cities in the United States over 200,000 in population⁷⁵ and 92.7 per cent of those over 50,000 in population.⁷⁶ Of these 300 studies, 53 were made by research bureaus, 204 by or under the auspices of educational institutions, 18 by chambers of commerce or other civic organizations, 3 by city administrations, and 22 by other agencies.⁷⁷

The field work of the project was thus accomplished entirely through the cooperative endeavor of local research agencies, and to them belongs the major share of the credit for this part of the report. Detailed acknowledgment to the agencies which organized these studies and to the individuals who made them is reserved for a special appendix to this report,⁷⁸ but it must be emphasized here that it was only

⁷² For an account of the organization and a list of the personnel of the advisory group, see p. 259, *infra*.

⁷³ Special assistance in securing studies in individual cities was given by Prof. William Anderson in Minnesota; by Dr. Russell Forbes, Dr. Luther Gulick, and Dr. W. E. Mosher in New York and New Jersey; by Prof. Samuel C. May and Dr. Lewis A. Maverick in California; by Prof. Howard W. Odum in North Carolina; by Prof. Frederic A. Ogg in Wisconsin; by Dr. Lent D. Upson in Michigan; and by Dr. W. F. Willoughby in the District of Columbia.

⁷⁴ Acknowledgment is made to Chairman Wickersham for assistance in Delaware and New York; to Commissioner Grubb for assistance in Alabama; to Commissioner Lemann for assistance in Louisiana and Texas; to Commissioner Loesch for assistance in Chicago, Ill.; to Commissioner Mackintosh for assistance in the State of Washington; to Commissioner McCormick for assistance in California; and to Commissioner Pound for assistance in Massachusetts. Special acknowledgment for advice as to arranging for the studies in Texas is made to Hon. Joseph C. Hutcheson, jr., United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit, New Orleans, La., formerly United States district judge for the southern district of Texas. Special acknowledgment for assistance in organizing studies for Chicago and neighboring cities in Illinois and Indiana is made to Mr. Elbridge Bancroft Pierce, of the Chicago bar.

⁷⁵ There are 41 such cities.

⁷⁶ Details as to the extent of the completed studies are given in a later chapter of this part. See pp. 271-277, *infra*.

⁷⁷ These included members of the bar, educators, municipal officials and other public-spirited citizens.

⁷⁸ See Appendix B (pp. 484-509, *infra*).

because of their enthusiastic and effective cooperation that this most important part of this report is possible.

4. *Coordinating the studies.*—From the time that the project for cooperative studies was first conceived it was obvious that such studies would be of substantial value only if made in a way which would insure comparable results. Hence the preparation of careful detailed instructions to be followed by all investigators was an essential prerequisite to the actual making of any studies in individual cities, and, for that matter, to any attempt to arrange effectively to have such studies made. Only by issuing such detailed instructions could any reasonable degree of uniformity be expected to be secured in 300 separate studies carried out by or under the auspices of 115 different and independent agencies.⁷⁹

On the other hand, it was regarded as both impracticable and undesirable to go extremely far in the direction of detailed requirements and directions for the individual studies. The organization of the machinery for administering criminal justice differs widely in various parts of the United States.⁸⁰ Methods of public accounting, also, are widely variant.⁸¹ If instructions were too detailed, they could not be made of general application. It was therefore determined to provide the investigators with two basic instruction documents: (a) a manual setting forth the minimum requirements for the studies and laying down the general principles to be followed in working out the data called for by those requirements; and (b) a model report of an actual study for a typical city which would serve as a guide in preparing the reports of the other investigations. It was believed that providing such a manual and model report, while it would leave the investigators free to deal with local peculiarities of governmental organization or

⁷⁹ It was doubted by some of the persons consulted in developing the project whether the requisite degree of uniformity could be secured even if such instructions were issued. The reasons for believing that reasonably uniform results have been obtained in fact are discussed in a later chapter. See pp. 280-281, *infra*.

⁸⁰ The variation as regards the distribution of criminal justice activities between State, county and city has been referred to in the preceding chapter. See pp. 246-251, *supra*.

⁸¹ See the discussion of published material on municipal costs of criminal justice in pt. 3 of this report (pp. 153-191, *supra*).

accounting on their merits, would insure an adequate degree of uniformity in the completed reports.⁸²

The general scheme of the project was developed by the writers of this part of the report early in 1930, and preparation of a manual of instructions to investigators was then begun. Since the subject matter of the investigation lay in the general field of public administration and finance, it was deemed desirable to secure the advisory assistance of experts in that field, and, to that end, a representative group of such experts, drawn in part from government research organizations and in part from the political science departments of educational institutions, was asked to serve as an advisory committee or group.⁸³ The preparation of the manual and the working out of the details of the project were thus assured the benefit of expert assistance and criticism.

Since many of the most important problems involved in the investigation arose in connection with matters of accounting, it was regarded as advisable to secure the advice and

⁸² The question was repeatedly asked by those approached in arranging the studies—Why have you not prepared a uniform form or data sheet? The reason this was not done is that referred to above—*viz.*, the variation of governmental machinery and accounting methods in various cities and States. No single form could have been devised which would have fitted such widely different communities as New York, N. Y.; New Orleans, La.; Tampa, Fla.; Portland, Me.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Montclair, N. J.; Peoria, Ill.; Butte, Mont.; Laredo, Tex.; and Bellingham, Wash., to cite random examples. The only possible procedure was to lay down the general requirements to be met and principles to be followed in the manual, provide a model report of an actual study as a guide, and leave the application of those principles and the meeting of those requirements to local investigators familiar with local conditions.

⁸³ This group was originally made up of Dr. Edith Abbott, dean of the School of Social Service, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. William Anderson, professor of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Dr. Russell Forbes, director, Municipal Administration Service, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Luther Gulick, director, National Institute of Public Administration, New York, N. Y. (and now professor of municipal science and administration, Columbia University); Dr. A. N. Holcombe, professor of political economy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Mr. Robert Lynd, secretary, Social Science Research Council, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Samuel C. May, professor of political science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., and director of the Bureau of Public Administration of the university; Dr. W. E. Mosher, director, School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; Dr. Howard W. Odum, director, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Dr. Frederic A. Ogg, chairman of the department of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Dr. Lent D. Upson, director, Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Detroit, Mich.; and Dr. W. F. Willoughby, director, Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. Dr. Lewis A. Maverick, lecturer in economics, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., later became a member of this group.

assistance of a recognized expert in that field, and, through the courtesy of the accounting firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co., it was possible to obtain the advisory services of Mr. W. W. Law, C. A., whose expert judgment was relied upon in all accounting matters. Advice as to particular matters was also sought from recognized experts in the special fields of municipal administration and finance⁸⁴ and from the consultants of the commission in the fields of police, prosecution, courts, penal and corrective treatment, juvenile delinquency, and criminal statistics. The proposed manual in draft form was submitted to these experts and their suggestions and criticisms were taken into account in preparing the final edition for use by the local investigators.

It was regarded as highly important that the proposed manual be submitted to practical test before being circulated to the investigators, and, partly in order to make such a test and partly to provide a model study to be used as a guide by investigators in other cities, a study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Rochester, N. Y., on the basis contemplated by the original draft of the manual, was arranged.⁸⁵ This study, covering the calendar year 1929, was made by Mr. Hazen C. Pratt, of the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research, under the supervision of Mr. W. Earl Weller, director of the bureau, during the summer of 1930. The manual was thoroughly revised as a result of this test study, and many unnecessary requirements eliminated. It was then again circulated, this time in tentative revised form, to the members of the advisory group and to the consultants

⁸⁴ For example, Mr. Bruce Smith, director, committee on uniform crime records, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and a recognized authority on police matters, advised as to problems of police costs; and Mr. Welles A. Gray, sometime assistant director of the Municipal Administration Service (now expert on State and local taxation of the finance department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States), advised as to various matters relating to municipal organization and finance.

⁸⁵ Rochester was chosen for the test study: First, because it was a city of fairly large size, so that the problems there encountered might be regarded as reasonably typical of those in the larger urban communities of the country, but still was not so large (like New York and Chicago) as to be definitely atypical in relation to smaller cities; second, because it was reasonably near New York, permitting close liaison between the persons making the test study and the director of the general investigation; and, third, because it was possible to secure the services of the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research to carry out the study. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. George Eastman, chairman, and to the members of the board of trustees of that bureau, for their assistance in this regard.

of the commission in other fields. The suggestions and criticisms made with regard to this revised draft were considered at a meeting of the advisory group in New York on September 29, 1930, and the manual in tentative final form was submitted to and approved by the commission on October 6, 1930, after which the final edition was printed.⁸⁶

The next step was to prepare a model report embodying the requirements laid down in the final edition of the manual on the basis of the data obtained for Rochester.⁸⁷ This task was undertaken in collaboration by the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research and the director of the study, and the resulting model report, with an explanatory foreword by the director, was issued to the investigators in printed form.⁸⁸

It seemed important that the local investigators, in addition to being provided with the manual and the model report on Rochester, should be furnished with an authoritative statement of the general scope and purpose of the investigation as a whole. It also seemed desirable that they should know something of the actual mechanics of the study made in Rochester. These requirements were met by circulating to the investigators a pamphlet outline of the project containing reprints of addresses on these respective subjects by the director of the study and by the investigator who made the Rochester investigation.⁸⁹

As the studies in the various communities progressed, certain modifications of the requirements set forth in the manual were found to be necessary. These in most cases involved

⁸⁶ The manual as issued to the investigator is reprinted as Appendix C to this report (pp. 511-552, *infra*).

⁸⁷ These data were for the year 1929, while the data called for by the manual were for 1930; but this difference, which was pointed out in the foreword to the Rochester report as printed for use of the investigators, did not, of course, impair its usefulness as a model.

⁸⁸ The model Rochester report as issued to the investigators is reprinted as Appendix D to this report (pp. 553-606, *infra*). Important assistance in preparing the model Rochester report was rendered by Miss Mary Daugherty, research assistant to the director of the study, and by Mr. E. I. Cristy, of the Rochester, N. Y., bar.

⁸⁹ These addresses were delivered before the annual convention of the Government Research Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 12, 1930. See p. 256, *supra*. The pamphlet also reprinted a brief discussion of the project from the standpoint of the governmental research organizations of the country by Dr. Luther Gulick, director of the National Institute of Public Administration, and contained a foreword by the chairman of the commission's subcommittee on the Cost of Crime. The pamphlet as issued to the investigators is reprinted as Appendix E to this report (pp. 609-633, *infra*).

either simplification of these requirements⁹⁰ made necessary by the demonstration by experience that certain desirable data called for by the manual were very difficult to secure in practice, or else the extension of time for completing the investigations.⁹¹ When such modifications were found to be necessary, instruction circulars were sent to all investigators.⁹² In addition, much information was furnished investigators by individual correspondence. All investigators were advised in the manual that the director of the study would furnish information and advice on special problems encountered,⁹³ and a number made requests for such advice.⁹⁴ In this way an attempt at continuous coordination and control of the individual investigations was made.⁹⁵

5. *Editing the reports.*—The responsibility of the local investigators ceased on the completion of their reports.⁹⁶ The editing of the reports was carried out in the office of the director of the study, which, up to the time the reports were received, had been charged with the task of general control and coordination.⁹⁷

In preparing the data contained in the individual reports for inclusion in this report especial attention was given to the question of comparability. The editing of the individual reports with this end in view was facilitated by the fact that the manual called for rather detailed figures, which made it possible to check with some degree of assurance the meth-

⁹⁰ Such as the elimination of the requirements that data be secured as to carrying charges on capital investment, and that fiscal year figures be reduced to a calendar year basis.

⁹¹ The manual provided that all reports of local investigators must be in the hands of the director of the study by March 1, 1931. This time limit was later extended to May 1, 1931.

⁹² The 7 instruction circulars thus issued are reprinted in Appendix F to this report (pp. 635-643, *infra*).

⁹³ See p. 513, *infra*.

⁹⁴ A total of 31 such inquiries were received and answered by the director of the study.

⁹⁵ The extent to which this attempt may be regarded as having worked out successfully in the securing of comparable data is discussed in a later chapter. See pp. 277-280, *infra*.

⁹⁶ Except in so far as it proved necessary in some cases to call on individual investigators for explanations and amplifications of the data furnished.

⁹⁷ The task of organizing the work of the field investigators was carried out entirely by the director of the study and two assistants. Special acknowledgment is made to Miss Helen M. Tunney, secretary to the director, and Miss Mary Daugherty, research assistant. Acknowledgment is also made to Miss Mary Coe Simpson for assistance in this connection. As to the editing of the reports, see note 99, *infra*.

ods followed by the investigators in reaching their results. All the cost figures presented in this part of the report⁹⁸ have been carefully edited, and, where necessary, adjusted, in such a way as to insure the greatest possible comparability.⁹⁹

The field investigators, the director of the study, and the editor of the reports of the investigators are thus jointly responsible for the accuracy of the cost figures presented in this part of the report, while the writers of this part are responsible for the plan presented for the analysis of those figures, and for the recommendations made as to the desirability of carrying that plan to completion.

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS OF COST DETERMINATION

1. *Introductory.*—This chapter will discuss the more important problems involved in determining municipal costs of criminal justice, and will indicate how those problems were dealt with in this investigation. The problems here discussed are not novel so far as this report is concerned; some arise in connection with all studies of criminal justice costs¹ and others in all studies of municipal costs of criminal justice,² and the applicable principles have already been the subject of discussion in earlier parts of the report³ and in the introductory chapter of this part.⁴ The detailed methods of dealing with these problems adopted in this investigation were for the most part prescribed in the manual for the investigation and illustrated in the model Rochester study, both of which are reprinted as appendices to this report.⁵ Hence, in order to avoid duplication, this chapter will not discuss the theoretical considerations involved, which, for the most part, have already been dealt with,

⁹⁸ See Tables 6 to 13, inclusive, *infra*.

⁹⁹ The editing of the reports was done, under the general supervision of the director, by Mr. William B. Hubbell, of the New York bar, one of the writers of this part of the report. In editing the reports, the figures were adjusted where necessary to take account of courthouse maintenance expenses, which, in the model Rochester report, had been included with carrying charges on capital investment in making allocations of cost. See p. 534, *infra*.

¹ Such as the problem of allocations of cost as between the civil and criminal functions of agencies having both.

² Such as the problem of the treatment of state and county costs.

³ See pt. 1 (pp. 37-46, *supra*) and pt. 3 (pp. 153-191, *supra*).

⁴ See pp. 244-252, *supra*.

⁵ See Appendices C and D (pp. 511-606, *infra*).

except where an amplification of the discussion already given seems necessary, and will concern itself with the detailed methods of solving accounting problems prescribed in the manual only to the extent that explanation of the reasons for adopting those methods seems desirable.

The problems here considered are: (a) the allocation of costs between civil and criminal functions in the case of agencies having both classes of functions; (b) the allocation of State and county costs; (c) the proper treatment of capital investment and carrying charges thereon; and (d) the proper treatment of receipts.⁶ These problems take different forms in dealing with different agencies for the administration of criminal justice, but the basic principles involved are the same. These basic principles will be discussed in this chapter; certain particular applications to police, prosecution, court, penal and probation costs will be dealt with in connection with the presentation of the data as to these various types of cost in Chapter V.⁷

The matters here dealt with are principally problems of cost accounting. It can hardly be said that governmental cost accounting has developed any well-established body of principles,⁸ so that analogies to the established cost accounting methods of business enterprises have necessarily been resorted to. The effort has been to work out principles and methods which would be accepted as correct by executives and accountants familiar with industrial cost accounting methods, on the theory, which is believed to be sound, that

⁶ The problem of the proper classification of operating costs was necessarily considered in preparing the manual, but is not discussed in the text for the reason that limitations of space have made it necessary to limit the data presented in this part of the report to total operating cost figures. The classification adopted in the manual was that which has already been referred to in an earlier part of this report as the minimum—viz, a division of operating costs into: (a) pay roll, (b) supplies and repairs, and (c) general overhead, with the further classification of (d) subsistence, in the case of penal and correctional institutions. The least satisfactory feature of this classification is the inclusion in the catch-all class of general overhead of all operating expenditures which are neither pay roll, supply or repair expenses. This lumping together of such wholly different items of cost as rent, pensions, and miscellaneous general expense is not wholly satisfactory from an accounting standpoint; but the only alternative was an attempt to secure a degree of detail in the city studies which was regarded as impracticable.

⁷ See pp. 281-330, *infra*.

⁸ Compare Committee on Uniform Street Sanitation Records, *The Measurement and Control of Municipal Sanitation* (Chicago, 1930) (tentative draft). This represents one of the first scientific attempts to apply modern cost accounting principles and methods to municipal administration and accounts.

the financial aspects of government and of business are not essentially different so far as basic principles of accounting are concerned. The principles and methods adopted have the approval of Price, Waterhouse & Co., and may be said, we think, to be sound from the standpoint of accepted theories and rules of cost accountancy.

2. *Allocation of cost of agencies having both civil and criminal functions.*—This very important problem arises primarily in connection with police and court costs, but may also be important in determining prosecution costs⁹ and even costs of penal and corrective agencies.¹⁰ In dealing with the problem three possible methods may be used. The first method is applicable where some of the persons employed by the particular law enforcement agency are primarily concerned with criminal functions, while others are concerned primarily with civil and administrative activities. In such cases the allocation may best be made on the basis of the relative pay roll of each group.¹¹ This method has proved principally applicable in the case of police costs,¹² but has also been used in a few instances in allocating the costs of large city or county attorneys' offices having definite divisions dealing, respectively, with civil and with criminal cases. The second method is applicable where all the individuals employed by the agency are concerned to some extent with both criminal and noncriminal matters, but where a definite amount of time is devoted first to one and then to the other. In such cases an allocation of cost on a time basis is appropriate. This method has been found to be primarily appli-

⁹ Where prosecuting agencies also have civil functions, as is not infrequently the case.

¹⁰ As where penal institutions are used to confine civil prisoners, or probation agencies handle domestic relations or dependency cases.

¹¹ Supervisory expense and overhead are excluded in developing the percentage used for allocation, but are included in the total cost to which the allocation factor is applied. For an example, see pp. 575-576, *infra*.

¹² Here certain squads or forces, such as the detective force, homicide squads, vice squads, etc., clearly have criminal functions only; others, such as the traffic force, license bureaus, etc., have noncriminal functions wholly or primarily; and still others, such as the chief's office, have supervisory functions. The uniformed patrol force has, for purposes of these studies, been treated as primarily criminal in function. (See p. 534, *infra*.) It is believed that this is correct in theory, since the *raison d'être* for the uniformed force is the prevention and suppression of crime. Any slight error due to disregarding the non-criminal activities of the patrol force will be to some extent compensated for by the fact that the minor criminal functions of the traffic force are also disregarded.

cable in the case of the courts¹³ and has also been used in the case of small prosecuting offices having some civil functions and in some cases of probation agencies handling some domestic relations or dependency cases. The third method applies where an agency deals with a number of individuals, some criminals and some not. In such cases costs may be allocated on the basis of the relative numbers of persons dealt with. This method has proved useful in dealing with the cost of penal institutions used in part for civil prisoners, and with the cost of some probation agencies handling non-criminal matters. It is believed that these methods, properly applied, yield sufficiently accurate results for all practical purposes.¹⁴

The principal difficulty which arises in making such allocations is due to uncertainties of definition of "criminal" and "noncriminal" functions.¹⁵ The allocation of police costs on the basis of the primary functions of the various divisions of each police department rather than on the basis of offenses for which arrests are made has largely eliminated

¹³ Wherever possible, the allocation has been made on the basis of an actual count of the number of court days spent on civil and criminal cases, respectively. In instances where records were not sufficient to permit this, it has been necessary to use less accurate methods based on relative numbers of cases filed or disposed of, with an estimated allowance for differences in the time required by cases of different types; or, in some cases, based on estimates by the judge or clerk of the court.

¹⁴ Reference should be made in passing to the suggestion, made to the director of the study by certain persons not familiar with cost accounting methods, that the only proper basis for allocation would be in each case an actual time-study of policemen, judges, etc., to see what part of their time was spent in criminal and what is noncriminal activities. Such a study might be very useful as a job analysis; but, from the standpoint of cost accounting theory it is not necessary and might be misleading. In the case of the uniformed patrol force of the police, it would clearly be misleading, since the time spent in incidental noncriminal duties (e. g., helping old ladies across the street, directing strangers, etc.) would be counted as noncriminal, while in fact the primary function of the uniformed patrolman while on his beat is crime prevention, a function which he exercises by his very presence even when engaged in some incidental noncriminal activity. In the case of the courts, the refinement is unnecessary. If a judge sits half of his court days on civil cases and the other half on criminal cases, an equal division of cost is proper even though he may spend several nights a week at home reading briefs in civil cases and none studying criminal cases. No cost accountant installing a cost system in a business enterprise would insist on a stop-watch study of the time devoted by the general manager to different departments of the business as the basis for allocating supervisory overhead.

¹⁵ See Ploscowe, *Some Causative Factors in Criminality*, in *National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Causes of Crime*, vol. 1, pp. 5-14; *Wines, Punishment and Reformation* (Lane ed.), pp. 11-26 (New York, 1910).

this difficulty so far as police costs are concerned, but it arises in connection with other classes of criminal justice costs. In the case of prosecution and court costs, all cases involving violations of criminal statutes (including traffic regulations, building inspection and sanitation laws, and other police regulations) have been treated as criminal, except criminal proceedings for nonsupport and truancy.¹⁶ In the case of penal and corrective agencies, all persons in prison or on probation for violation of criminal laws, including technical violations, have been treated as criminals. Since the same principles of distinction have been followed in all the studies, any possible incorrectness in those principles, although possibly affecting the absolute accuracy of the totals, will not affect the comparability of the figures.

3. *Allocation of State and county costs.*—The necessity of including in city costs of criminal justice allowances for State and county expenditures for the administration of criminal justice in the city has been discussed in the introductory chapter of this part.¹⁷ This problem arises primarily in the case of prosecuting offices, courts and penal and corrective agencies, although it may occasionally arise with regard to county police agencies.¹⁸

The allocation of county costs has been made in most instances¹⁹ on the basis of the relative contribution of the city and of the county outside the city to the county tax levy. This gives the actual payment by the city for county criminal justice, whether administered for the city or the county, on the assumption that the city contribution to county revenues is expended pro rata for all county purposes.²⁰ This is substantially the basis adopted by the Bureau of the Census

¹⁶ These were excluded for the reason that such matters are dealt with by criminal proceedings only in a few States, so that it was felt that the comparability of the data would be increased if such cases were eliminated in determining costs for those States.

¹⁷ See pp. 251-252, supra.

¹⁸ It does not arise with regard to State police, for the reason that the primary activities of State police forces are confined to the rural districts. See discussion in pt. 4 (pp. 195-196, supra).

¹⁹ The allocation of county costs was made on this basis in the case of over 60 per cent of the cities studied where such allocations were necessary. In most of the other cases, allocation was made on a straight population basis. In a very few instances, special methods of allocation were found necessary.

²⁰ This is obviously the only assumption which can be made.

in allowing for county expenditures in compiling financial statistics of cities,²¹ and is regarded as sound in principle.²²

The allocation of State costs is less frequently necessary than is the allocation of county costs. Where it has been necessary, one of two methods have been employed: (a) Where a State agency operates only in a limited territory, it has been treated like a city or county agency. Thus, where a city court has a State-paid judge, his entire salary is included in the city cost; where a county court has a State-paid prosecutor, his entire salary is included in the county cost and allocated to the city on the same basis as the other county costs; where a State court circuit includes several counties, the circuit has been treated as a larger county and an allocation made on that basis.²³ (b) Where a State agency is not thus localized but operates over the entire State, an allocation on the basis of relative population has been necessary in most instances.²⁴ These methods of allocation of State costs are not as satisfactory as that adopted for allocating county expenditures, but are believed to be the best available. Any error of allocation is minimized by the fact that State expenditures requiring allocation are relatively small.²⁵

It is believed that the methods of making allowance for county and State expenditures for criminal justice in computing city costs, while not exact, may be regarded as yielding reasonably accurate results.²⁶

²¹ See Instructions for Collection of Financial Statistics of Cities Over 30,000 Population, p. 11 (U. S. Census, 1928).

²² Two possible alternative methods of allocation may be briefly referred to. (a) An allocation on the relative time of county agencies spent on city and noncity cases would measure the cost to the county of city crime, not the cost to the city of county criminal justice. The latter figure is believed to be the more significant for present purposes. (b) An allocation on a population basis is an obvious makeshift, which does not measure exactly, except by accident, either the county cost of city crime, or the city cost of county criminal justice. It is permissible only where a more exact allocation is impossible, although it may be very useful in such cases.

²³ In such cases an allocation on a pro rata population basis has usually been necessary.

²⁴ This has been true in all cases where State revenues are in substantial part raised by an income, excise or similar tax, since in such cases there is no practical way of making an allocation on the basis of relative tax payments.

²⁵ State costs allocable to cities formed only 0.23 per cent of aggregate city costs for the 271 cities for which complete studies were secured.

²⁶ The problem of allowing for the cost of the penal treatment of city criminals in State institutions is discussed in a later chapter. See pp. 300-307, *infra*.

4. *Capital investment and carrying charges.*—Consideration has been given in an earlier part of this report²⁷ to the problem of capital investments in connection with the administration of criminal justice and carrying charges thereon, so that only brief mention of the subject is necessary here.

The manual for the city studies specially prescribed that all capital outlays were to be eliminated from operating expense and indicated the criteria to be observed in distinguishing between the two.²⁸ The principles so laid down are in accord with established accounting practice.²⁹

The manual also outlined in detail how carrying charges on capital investments were to be computed. The standard accounting basis of original cost was prescribed for the determination of total investment,³⁰ an interest charge of 4½ per cent was provided for,³¹ and appropriate depreciation rates for various kinds of property were indicated.³² It is believed that these instructions set forth a sound basis for computing carrying charges on capital invested in property used in connection with the administration of criminal justice. Unfortunately, however, the task of computing such charges proved hopelessly difficult in many cities, in most cases because of the absence of adequate records as to total investment. It was therefore necessary to eliminate the requirement of procuring such data from the mandatory requirements of the studies,³³ and they are available, even in part, for only 47 of the 300 cities studied.³⁴

²⁷ See pt. 3 (pp. 158-159, *supra*).

²⁸ See p. 527, *infra*.

²⁹ See the discussion in pt. 3 (pp. 158-159, *supra*).

³⁰ See pp. 527-529, *infra*. Compare Bureau of Internal Revenue, Bulletin F (revised): Income Tax Depreciation and Obsolescence, pp. 1-2, 4 (1931).

³¹ Based on average rates of interest on municipal borrowings in normal times. See p. 520, *infra*.

³² The rates indicated in the manual are, in general, consistent with the rates of depreciation indicated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to be *prima facie* proper, although made slightly higher in some instances in the interest of conservatism. Compare Depreciation Studies: Preliminary Report of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, pp. 3-4, 7 et seq. (1931). While it is ordinarily unsound to prescribe uniform rates which take no account of local conditions [Hatfield, *Accounting, Its Principles and Problems*, p. 148 (New York, 1927); Sillers, *Depreciation, Principles and Applications*, p. 234 (New York (1922))], it is not believed that serious error is introduced by using uniform rates in dealing with property of the kinds ordinarily used in connection with the administration of criminal justice.

³³ See Instruction Circular No. 2, reprinted in Appendix E to this report (pp. 636-637, *infra*).

³⁴ The data secured for these 47 cities is presented in Tables 6 to 12, *infra*.

In the case of police costs a partial substitute for carrying charges on capital was secured in the form of a 5-year average of expenditures for equipment.³⁵ This figure is available for 243 out of the 300 cities studied.

5. *Receipts.*—The general problem of receipts in connection with criminal justice³⁶ and the specific problem of such receipts by penal institutions³⁷ have already been discussed, and that discussion will not be repeated here. The manual gave detailed instructions as to the treatment of fines, receipts by penal institutions, and other receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice, requiring that the precise character of each class of receipts should be indicated and the amount of receipts of that class separately reported.³⁸ This has made it possible to take proper account of such receipts in editing and compiling the figures obtained as a result of the field studies.³⁹

6. *Summary.*—The accounting principles prescribed in the manual and applied in the model Rochester report are believed to be sound and in accordance with recognized accounting practice. The methods prescribed for working out the cost figures for the cities studied provide for (a) reasonably accurate allocations of costs between the civil and criminal functions of agencies having both; (b) the making of appropriate allowances, in ascertaining municipal costs, for county and State expenditures for criminal justice; (c) the elimination of capital outlays for operating expense, and the proper computation of carrying charges on capital investment where ascertainable; and (d) the segregation and definite earmarking of receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice. In so far, therefore, as the accounting methods prescribed have been followed by the local investigators, the figures obtained may, it is believed, be relied upon.⁴⁰ Even if some of the accounting methods adopted for use in this investigation are not accepted, this will not impair the value of the figures obtained for comparative purposes, since the same methods were used in

³⁵ Principally furniture and fixtures and motor and signal equipment.

³⁶ See pts. 2 (pp. 88-89, supra) and 3 (pp. 159-160, supra).

³⁷ See pts. 3 (pp. 160-161, supra) and 5 (pp. 211-212, supra).

³⁸ See pp. 530-531, infra.

³⁹ For a further discussion of receipts, see pp. 321-322, infra.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of how accurately the methods prescribed appear to have been followed, see pp. 277-280, infra.

all cases.⁴¹ It is believed, however, that the figures may be regarded, not only as accurate from a comparative standpoint, but also as correct from the standpoint of sound accounting theory.

CHAPTER IV

EXTENT AND CHARACTER OF THE COST DATA OBTAINED

1. *Introductory.*—In the preceding chapters we have outlined the general scope of the commission's project for a study of municipal costs of the administration of criminal justice, have stated the methods of investigation employed, and have explained the accounting principles applied in making the investigation. Before presenting the detailed results it will be desirable to indicate the extent to which it has proved possible to translate the project into actuality, and to discuss the probable accuracy of the data obtained. In this chapter, therefore, we will consider (a) the extent to which reports of studies have actually been secured for different geographical areas and different population groups; (b) the question of how far these actual studies may be regarded as representative of all the cities included in the project; and (c) the probable reliability of the cost data contained in the reports received.

2. *Number of studies made.*—Table 1 shows the number of reports of individual city studies received, classified to show the number and proportionate representation of (a) cities over 250,000 in population; (b) cities over 100,000 in population; (c) cities over 50,000 in population; and (d) cities over 25,000 in population.⁴²

TABLE 1.—Number and proportion of cities studied

Size of cities	Total number	Number studied ¹	Per cent studied	Total population ²	Population of cities studied ¹	Per cent of population covered
Over 250,000.....	37	37	100.0	28,784,770	28,784,770	100.0
Over 100,000.....	93	90	96.8	30,325,738	35,935,873	98.9
Over 50,000.....	191	177	92.7	42,817,184	41,753,420	97.5
Over 25,000.....	305	300	98.2	48,800,416	46,104,804	94.0

¹ Including incomplete reports. For details, see Table 2, infra.

² U. S. Census, 1930.

⁴¹ With a few minor exceptions, such as the use of different methods of allocation for State and county costs, which do not have any large effect.

⁴² These classifications of course overlap; the second includes the first, the third the second, and the fourth the third. Figures by population groups are presented later. See Table 4, infra.

The representation is thus complete for cities over 250,000 in population,⁴³ over 90 per cent for cities over 50,000, and over 80 per cent as regards numbers and over 90 per cent as regards population, for cities over 25,000 in population. The population of the cities represented is 65.8 per cent of the total urban population of the United States and 37.0 per cent of the total population.

Table 2 shows in detail the number of cities over 25,000 population in each State, the number of studies made, classified as between complete and incomplete studies, and the proportion of the population living in cities over 25,000 represented.

TABLE 2.—Number of cities studied, by States

State	Cities over 25,000	Complete studies	Incomplete studies ¹	Per cent of cities studied ²	Population of cities over 25,000	Population of cities studied ²	Per cent represented ²
Alabama	3	3		100.0	393,959	393,959	100.0
Arizona	2	1		50.0	80,624	32,506	40.3
Arkansas	2	2		100.0	113,108	113,108	100.0
California	20	14		70.0	3,178,118	2,993,340	93.2
Colorado	3	3		100.0	371,194	371,194	100.0
Connecticut	11	7	3, 2	81.8	840,450	791,959	93.5
Delaware	1	1		100.0	106,597	106,597	100.0
District of Columbia	1	1		100.0	486,869	486,869	100.0
Florida	7	1	3	57.1	467,291	299,095	64.0
Georgia	5	5		100.0	512,692	512,692	100.0
Idaho							
Illinois	24	23	10 1	100.0	4,486,441	4,486,441	100.0
Indiana	17	11		64.7	1,260,190	1,040,181	82.5
Iowa	10	4	12 2	60.0	549,064	411,536	75.0
Kansas	4	2	14 1	75.0	324,172	297,087	91.3
Kentucky	0	4		66.7	511,092	448,477	87.7
Louisiana	4	3		75.0	592,174	566,146	95.6
Maine	3	3		100.0	134,507	134,507	100.0
Maryland	3	2		66.7	873,482	835,736	95.7
Massachusetts	27	24	19 1	92.6	2,692,756	2,566,976	95.0
Michigan	17	9	21 1	58.8	2,606,335	2,280,777	87.5
Minnesota	3	3		100.0	837,425	837,425	100.0
Mississippi	2	1		50.0	80,236	48,282	60.2
Missouri	0	5	24 1	100.0	1,419,431	1,419,431	100.0
Montana	2	2		100.0	68,354	68,354	100.0
Nebraska	2	2		100.0	289,939	289,939	100.0
Nevada							
New Hampshire	3	1	25 2	100.0	133,525	133,525	100.0
New Jersey	24	13	26 6	79.2	2,124,416	1,831,703	86.2
New Mexico	1	1		100.0	26,570	26,570	100.0
New York	23	20	28 1	91.3	9,204,899	9,097,234	98.8
North Carolina	8	7		87.5	420,142	369,949	87.6
North Dakota	1	1		100.0	28,619	28,619	100.0
Ohio	20	16	31 1	65.4	3,308,765	2,929,763	88.7
Oklahoma	4	2		50.0	385,072	326,647	84.8
Oregon	2	2		100.0	328,081	328,081	100.0
Pennsylvania	26	20	34 2	88.0	4,022,571	3,940,255	97.9
Rhode Island	6	6		100.0	475,927	475,927	100.0
South Carolina	4	2	36 2	100.0	171,723	171,723	100.0
South Dakota	1	1		100.0	33,362	33,362	100.0
Tennessee	5	4		80.0	667,689	632,609	96.2
Texas	15	11	35 1	80.0	1,490,266	1,366,315	93.0
Utah	2	1		50.0	180,539	140,267	72.2
Virginia	7	7		100.0	531,191	531,191	100.0
Vermont							

See footnotes at end of table.

⁴³ There is in fact complete representation for all cities over 180,000 in population—i. e., for the 44 largest cities of the United States.

TABLE 2.—Number of cities studied, by States—Continued

State	Cities over 25,000	Complete studies	Incomplete studies ¹	Per cent of cities studied ²	Population of cities over 25,000	Population of cities studied ²	Per cent represented ²
Washington	5	4	1	100.0	649,304	649,304	100.0
West Virginia	5	5		100.0	256,128	256,128	100.0
Wisconsin	13	12		92.3	1,059,127	1,023,014	96.6
Wyoming							
Total	305	272	28	82.2	48,860,416	46,104,804	94.0

¹ Covering police costs and in some cases other direct municipal costs, but not county costs except as otherwise indicated in note 14, infra.

² Including incomplete studies.

³ Phoenix (population 48,118) not studied.

⁴ Bakersfield (population 26,015), Riverside (population 20,696), San Bernardino (population 37,481), San Jose (population 57,561), Santa Ana (population 30,322), and Santa Barbara (population 33,613) not studied.

⁵ New Haven (population 162,655). This incomplete study includes police costs only.

⁶ New London (population 29,640).

⁷ Bristol (population 28,451) and Torrington (population 26,040) not studied.

⁸ Jacksonville (population 129,549), Orlando (population 27,330), and Pensacola (population 31,579).

⁹ St. Petersburg (population 40,425), Tampa (population 101,161), and West Palm Beach (population 26,610) not studied.

¹⁰ Bloomington (population 30,930).

¹¹ Anderson (population 39,804), Kokomo (population 32,843), Lafayette (population 28,240), New Albany (population 25,819), Richmond (population 32,493), and Terre Haute (population 62,810) not studied.

¹² Sioux City (population 79,183, and Waterloo (population 46,191).

¹³ Clinton (population 25,720), Council Bluffs (population 42,048), Dubuque (population 41,670), and Ottumwa (population 28,075) not studied.

¹⁴ Wichita (population 111,110). This incomplete study includes only juvenile court costs.

¹⁵ Hutchinson (population 27,085) not studied.

¹⁶ Ashland (population 29,074) and Paducah (population 33,541) not studied.

¹⁷ Monroe (population 26,028) not studied.

¹⁸ Cumberland (population 37,747) not studied.

¹⁹ Piteburg (population 40,692).

²⁰ Brockton (population 63,797) and Quincy (population 71,983) not studied.

²¹ Muskegon (population 41,390).

²² Battle Creek (population 43,573), Bay City (population 47,355), Jackson (population 55,187), Kalamazoo (population 54,786), Pontiac (population 64,928), Port Huron (population 31,361), and Wyandotte (population 28,368) not studied.

²³ Meridian (population 31,954) not studied.

²⁴ University City (population 25,809).

²⁵ Manchester (population 78,334) and Nashua (population 31,463).

²⁶ Bloomfield (population 78,077), Clifton (population 46,875), East Orange (population 68,020), Montclair (population 42,017), Orange (population 35,399), and Passaic (population 62,956).

²⁷ Atlantic City (population 66,198), Camden (population 118,700), Garfield (population 29,839), New Brunswick (population 34,555), and Perth Amboy (population 43,516) not studied.

²⁸ Jamestown (population 45,155).

²⁹ Niagara Falls (population 75,466) and Watertown (population 32,205) not studied.

³⁰ Asheville (population 50,193) not studied.

³¹ Mansfield (population 33,525).

³² Elyria (population 25,633), Lima (population 42,287), Lorain (population 44,512), Marion (population 31,084), Portsmouth (population 42,560), Steubenville (population 35,422), Warren (population 41,062), Youngstown (population 170,002), and Zanesville (population 36,440) not studied.

³³ Enid (population 26,399) and Muskogee (population 32,026) not studied.

³⁴ McKeesport (population 54,632), and Sharon (population 25,908).

³⁵ Aliquippa (population 27,116), Lebanon (population 25,561), and Wilksburg (population 29,639) not studied.

³⁶ Charleston (population 62,265), and Greenville (population 29,154).

³⁷ Johnson City (population 25,080) not studied.

³⁸ Amarillo (population 43,132).

³⁹ Corpus Christi (population 27,741), Port Arthur (population 50,902), and San Angelo (population 25,308) not studied.

⁴⁰ Ogden (population 40,272) not studied.

⁴¹ Spokane (population 115,514).

⁴² Superior (population 36,113) not studied.

⁴³ If the 28 cities for which incomplete data only are available, are eliminated, this figure becomes 74.5 per cent.

⁴⁴ The cities for which incomplete data only are available have an aggregate population of 1,566,987. If these cities are eliminated, the proportion of total population in cities over 25,000 represented by the studies becomes 91.2 per cent.

As will appear from an examination of Table 2, studies have been made for all the cities over 25,000 in population in 22 States,⁴⁴ for over 90 per cent of such cities in 3 more States, for 80 per cent or more of such cities in 5 more States, and for 70 per cent or more of such cities in 4 more States—a total of 34 States out of 45 having cities over 25,000 in population.⁴⁵ Studies for at least half of the cities in each State over 25,000 in population have been made for every State. These studies have covered over 90 per cent of the population in such cities in 33 States, over 80 per cent of such population in 7 more States, and over 60 per cent of such population in all but one State.⁴⁶

Even if incomplete studies are eliminated, the investigation covers well over 70 per cent of the cities over 25,000 in population in the United States and well over 90 per cent of the population living in such cities. This, we believe, might in itself well be regarded as sufficiently indicating the representative character of the data; but, before coming to a final conclusion on this matter, it will be desirable to consider (a) the extent to which the studies secured are geographically representative, and (b) the extent to which they are representative of cities in different population groups.

3. *Geographical distribution of studies.*—Table 3 shows the distribution of the studies obtained as between the 9 regional divisions of the United States adopted by the Bureau of the Census for the geographical classification of statistics,⁴⁷ and indicates the percentage of representation in each region.

⁴⁴ Including the District of Columbia as a State.

⁴⁵ Again including the District of Columbia as a State.

⁴⁶ Arizona.

⁴⁷ For the details of the census classification, see p. 167, supra, note 60.

TABLE 3.—*Geographical distribution of cities studied*

Region	Number of cities ¹	Com- plete	Incom- plete ²	Percent ³	Population repre- sented ⁴	
					Cities over 25,000	Total urban
New England.....	50	41	5	82.0	95.0	59.4
Middle Atlantic.....	72	53	9	73.6	94.2	70.0
East North Central.....	97	71	3	73.2	90.5	69.6
West North Central.....	27	18	4	66.7	88.3	55.9
South Atlantic.....	41	31	5	75.6	85.7	56.0
East South Central.....	10	12	-----	75.0	94.3	55.8
West South Central.....	25	18	1	72.0	91.3	53.5
Mountain.....	10	8	-----	80.0	87.9	43.9
Pacific.....	27	20	1	74.1	92.1	69.1
Total.....	365	272	28	74.5	91.2	62.1

¹ Cities over 25,000 in population in region.

² See Table 2, supra, note 1.

³ Does not include incomplete studies.

⁴ Percentages. See Table 2, supra, for details.

The complete studies thus cover at least 65 per cent of the cities over 25,000 in each of the census regions, and over 85 per cent of the population of such cities in each region. The representation of total urban population is over 50 per cent in all but one region, including all the more populous ones. From a geographical standpoint, therefore, it is believed that the studies may be regarded as representative.

4. *Distribution of studies by population groups.*—Table 4 shows the distribution of the studies as between groups of cities of different sizes, indicating the percentage of representation in each group.⁴⁸

TABLE 4.—*Distribution of cities studied by population groups*

Population group	Number of cities	Studies		Per cent of cities ²	Per cent of population ³
		Com- plete	Incom- plete ¹		
Over 1,000,000.....	5	5	-----	100.0	100.0
500,000 to 1,000,000.....	8	8	-----	100.0	100.0
250,000 to 500,000.....	24	24	-----	100.0	100.0
100,000 to 250,000.....	56	49	4	87.2	87.9
50,000 to 100,000.....	98	81	6	82.7	83.5
25,000 to 50,000.....	174	105	19	60.3	76.8
Total.....	365	272	28	74.5	91.2

See Table 2, supra, note 1.

¹ Does not include incomplete studies.

² Percentage of total population of cities in group represented by studies. Does not include incomplete studies.

³ The grouping is that used by the Bureau of the Census. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, p. 14.

The studies, as shown by Table 4, cover completely the cities over 250,000 in population and more than 80 per cent of the cities between 50,000 and 250,000 population, both as regards numbers and as regards population. The representation falls off substantially, however, in the 25,000 to 50,000 population group, where slightly less than a 60 per cent representation is found as regards numbers. Even in the case of these smaller cities, however, it is believed that there is a fairly adequate representation, since the studies for these cities show a reasonably satisfactory geographical distribution, as is indicated by Table 5.

TABLE 5.—Geographical distribution of cities between 25,000 and 50,000 population studied

Region	Number of cities	Studies		Per cent
		Complete	Incomplete	
New England.....	25	20	3	80.0
Middle Atlantic.....	31	18	7	58.4
East North Central.....	53	32	3	60.4
West North Central.....	11	4	2	36.4
South Atlantic.....	18	12	3	66.7
East South Central.....	7	3	—	42.9
West South Central.....	10	4	1	40.0
Mountain.....	7	5	—	71.4
Pacific.....	12	7	—	58.3
Total.....	174	105	19	59.8

¹ Complete studies only.

While this distribution is not ideal, it does show reasonably satisfactory representation in the regions having the largest number of smaller cities—viz., the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and South Atlantic regions—all of which show a representation of 55 per cent or over. The representation of the smaller cities in the Northwest, South, and Southwest is the least satisfactory.

The representation of the larger cities is so nearly complete⁴⁰ that no detailed geographical analysis of represen-

⁴⁰ Of the 191 cities of 50,000 and larger, complete studies were secured for 167, or 87.5 per cent, including 96.0 per cent of the population living in such cities. Regional representations (percentage of cities in region represented by complete studies) are: New England, 84 per cent; Middle Atlantic, 85.3 per cent; East North Central, 88.6 per cent; West North Central, 87.5 per cent; South Atlantic, 82.6 per cent; East South Central, 100 per cent; West South Central, 93.3 per cent; Mountain, 100 per cent; Pacific, 86.7 per cent.

tation for different population groups would appear necessary.

5. *Accuracy of data obtained.*—The preceding sections of this chapter have presented data indicating that the figures as to municipal costs of administration of criminal justice obtained as a result of the field studies described in Chapter II⁶⁰ may be regarded as representative of cities over 25,000 in population in the United States, except possibly as regards cities between 25,000 and 50,000 in population in the Northwest, South and Southwest. It remains to consider whether and to what extent those figures may be relied upon as accurate.

There are, of course, two methods of appraising the accuracy of data of this character. The most obvious of these is to consider the possible sources of error affecting the data and to weigh the possibilities of errors resulting from these various sources in the light of the precautions which have been taken to avoid them. The more effective method of appraisal, however, involves a consideration of the inherent interrelationships of the data themselves in the light of a detailed statistical analysis. In this study, as it has progressed up to this point, it has not been possible to make use of the latter method of appraisal, and it is hence possible now to consider the accuracy of the data from the former standpoint only.

For the reasons outlined in Chapter III,⁶¹ it is believed that those figures, in so far as they have been worked out in accordance with the instructions prescribed in the manual for the investigation,⁶² may be relied upon as correct from the standpoint of accounting principle. The question to be considered here is how far it has been practicable to follow those instructions, and to what extent possible deviations therefrom are to be regarded as impairing the reliability of the data. Three possible sources of error must be considered: (a) mechanical errors in transcribing figures and in making computations; (b) inadequacy of the municipal and other records consulted; and (c) errors of accounting principle made by the investigators.

⁶⁰ See pp. 253-263, supra.

⁶¹ See pp. 263-271, supra.

⁶² See Appendix C, pp. 524-550, infra.

(a) There is little reason to believe, we think, that the data presented contain serious errors due to failure accurately to transcribe figures from the available records. The investigators who made the studies were carefully chosen; most of them were persons who had at least some experience in research; and the necessity for mechanical accuracy was impressed upon them. While it is impossible to be certain that no errors of this character have occurred in sporadic cases, there is no reason to believe that such errors have been frequent. Errors of computation are also unlikely, since the major part of the computations necessary were set forth in the reports themselves, and a careful watch was kept for mathematical mistakes in editing the reports. While there may be a few such errors of minor consequence, it is not believed that they are such as to affect substantially the accuracy of the figures as presented in this report.

(b) There are undoubtedly some errors to be found in most municipal accounting records. The practice of having a periodic independent audit of municipal and county books of account, although becoming increasingly common, is still by no means universal. Particularly in the smaller cities and in many counties, bookkeeping practices and methods leave much to be desired. It would obviously have been impossible to have made a complete audit of the public accounting records of every city and county studied. The most that could be done was to warn the investigators to be on the lookout for serious errors of accounting principle and to correct them when found.⁵³ However, while the figures here presented were necessarily compiled on the assumption of the reasonable accuracy of the public accounts in the cities and counties studied, we do not believe them to be unreliable on that account.

The investigation has clearly indicated, however, that the methods of keeping the public financial accounts in most counties and in many of the smaller cities of the country are in serious need of improvement. The putting into effect of the recommendations as to accounts of municipal subdivi-

⁵³ The most important instances of such errors found by investigators were in connection with the treatment of capital outlays, which were not always carefully segregated from operating costs.

sions of States presented in an earlier part of this report⁵⁴ would go far toward correcting this situation.

In connection with allocations of costs as between criminal and noncriminal functions, complete lack of adequate records was encountered in some cases.⁵⁵ Since allocations of police expenditures have been based primarily on pay-roll analyses,⁵⁶ and since police pay rolls have been obtainable in all cases, no difficulty arising from lack of records was encountered in computing criminal police costs. In the case of prosecution and court costs, however, the necessary data for allocation was in many cases wanting.⁵⁷ In such cases it has been necessary to rely upon more or less rough estimates, which may be somewhat in error.

Fortunately, however, errors due to the use of estimates, which undoubtedly occur in the figures but which are confined for the most part to prosecution and court costs, do not seriously affect the total costs for the cities studied. By far the largest element in the cost of administration of criminal justice is the cost of police,⁵⁸ which may be ascertained with very considerable accuracy,⁵⁹ so that errors resulting from the computation of prosecution and court costs on the basis of estimates, even if serious in themselves, are greatly reduced in the totals.⁶⁰

(c) It was inevitable that the manual should not cover in detail every possible question of accounting which might arise. Many, and, it is believed, most such questions were referred by the investigators to the director of the study⁶¹ and were answered in accordance with what were believed

⁵⁴ See pt. 3 (pp. 100-101, supra).

⁵⁵ The basic figures have been available in practically all cases because necessary for current municipal use. So far as allocations of county and State costs are concerned, either records have been available, or allocations on a basis of population have been made.

⁵⁶ See p. 265, supra.

⁵⁷ These allocations are primarily based, in most instances, on the relative time spent on different kinds of work. The records of clerks of courts and prosecuting officers were seldom found to be satisfactory as regards this matter.

⁵⁸ Police costs form 78.3 per cent of total cost for all the cities studied on a weighted average basis.

⁵⁹ The basic police figures were found in most cases to be accurately kept, and the data necessary for accurate allocation were found to be available.

⁶⁰ Thus, in a case where police costs and court costs form 80 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively, of total cost, an error of 20 per cent in determining court costs will result in an error of only 2 per cent in the total. Of course, the detailed court cost figures remain subject to the full 20 per cent error.

⁶¹ Cf. p. 262, supra.

to be sound cost accounting principles. In some instances investigators who did not thus consult the central office may have fallen into accounting errors, but it is not believed that any serious mistakes of this sort have been made in regard to important matters.

To sum up: It is believed that the figures presented are substantially free from mechanical errors of transcription and computation; that the municipal records on which they are based are in the main reliable; that errors of allocation due to estimates made necessary by inadequate records are not very great, and in any case do not seriously affect the total figures; that important errors of accounting principle in matters not covered by the manual have been infrequent; and hence that the cost data presented may be regarded as substantially accurate and reliable. We feel, however, that further analysis of the figures is necessary to reach a final conclusion as to their accuracy and reliability, and our tentative conclusions, as stated above, must be taken subject to such analysis.

6. *Comparability of figures.*—The figures presented in the next chapter are believed to be comparable so far as the accounting principles applied in compiling them are concerned. The reasons for this conclusion are implicit in the discussion in the preceding section of this chapter⁶² and in Chapter III of this part.⁶³ The only serious question of comparability, therefore, arises as a result of the fact that not all of the figures presented cover the same fiscal period.

It was originally hoped that figures could be secured covering the same fiscal period in all cases. The period chosen was the calendar year 1930.⁶⁴ It turned out, however, that this was impracticable, and that it would be necessary either to abandon the plan of securing only figures which could be reduced to a 1930 calendar year basis, or else to leave a number of important cities out of the study entirely. Under these circumstances, it was thought best to modify the requirement that figures covering the calendar year 1930 be secured, and the investigators were so notified.⁶⁵ Where

⁶² See §5, *supra*.

⁶³ See pp. 263-271, *supra*.

⁶⁴ This was the requirement prescribed by the manual. See pp. 531-532, 548, *infra*.

⁶⁵ See Instruction Circular No. 3, p. 638, *infra*.

calendar year figures for 1930 could not be obtained, the investigators were instructed to secure figures for the last fiscal year ending in 1930, and this proved to be possible in most cases. In a few instances, however, it was impossible to obtain anything but 1929 figures, and in those cases such figures were secured in preference to none at all. Figures for the calendar year 1930 are presented for 161 of the 300 cities studied; figures for fiscal years ending in 1930 are presented for 104; figures for fiscal years ending in 1931 are presented for 3; and figures for the calendar year 1929 are presented for 32.⁶⁶

It is not believed that these differences in the fiscal periods covered by the studies seriously impair the comparability of the figures.⁶⁷ Variations in the cost of criminal justice are usually gradual, and even a year's difference in the period covered by the figures, while introducing a certain factor of error, should not be an extremely serious matter.

7. *Summary.*—The discussion in the preceding sections of this chapter has, we believe, indicated (a) that the figures as to municipal costs of criminal justice presented in this part of the report are representative data for the cities of the United States over 25,000 in population; (b) that such figures may be regarded as substantially accurate and reliable; and (c) that they are substantially comparable. The presentation and discussion of the figures in the remaining chapters of this part of the report will proceed on the basis of these postulates.

CHAPTER V

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 POPULATION

1. *Introductory.*—This chapter presents the data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in 300 cities of the United States over 25,000 in population, collected as the result of the cooperative field investigation described in the previous chapters of this part.

The detailed tables giving police costs, costs of prosecution, costs of criminal courts, and costs of penal and corrective treatment presented in the next four sections of this

⁶⁶ For details see Appendix G (pp. 644-654, *infra*).

⁶⁷ This matter has already been discussed in some detail in this report. See pt. 3 (pp. 103-104, *supra*).

chapter relate to operating costs only, not to total annual costs, since data as to carrying charges on capital investment are not available for most of the cities studied.⁶⁸ They are, moreover, presented without deduction for receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice, except such receipts as are direct credits against cost (i. e., compensation paid to governmental units for the use of criminal justice personnel or facilities).⁶⁹ Other receipts, such as fines, profits of prison industries, etc., are not deducted in the detailed tables.⁷⁰

The detailed figures are presented without specifying in each case the fiscal period covered, except where figures for fiscal years ending in 1929 or 1931 are given. Data as to the fiscal period covered by each study are, however, made available so far as possible in an appendix to this report.⁷¹

2. *Police costs.*—Table 6 shows the operating cost of police chargeable to criminal functions for each of the cities studied, subdivided between municipal police costs and county police costs allocable to the city.⁷² The table also presents figures as to average expenditures for equipment over a 5-year period,⁷³ and, in a relatively small number of cases where the data are available, figures as to capital investment and carrying charges thereon. Finally, the table gives the per capita operating cost of criminal police activities for each city.

⁶⁸ See Tables 6 to 12, *infra*.

⁶⁹ See p. 270, *supra*.

⁷⁰ See pp. 321-322, *infra*.

⁷¹ See Appendix G (pp. 644-654, *infra*). This appendix also gives data as to the population of each city studied, the county in which each such city is located and its population, the form of municipal government, and, where available, the amount of crime in each such city as reflected by figures as to offenses known to the police reported to the Department of Justice.

⁷² No allowance for State police costs have been made in any instance. As to the reason for this, p. 268, *supra*, note 18. The cost of sheriff's offices has been omitted as negligible in several cases, even though the sheriff does exercise minor police jurisdiction within the city studied. The cost of coroners' offices has been included in county police costs for cities in Alabama, in view of the special situation existing in that State, but not elsewhere. See the discussion of the reasons for omitting such costs from the studies generally in the model Rochester report (p. 602, *infra*).

⁷³ The 5-year period ending with the year covered by the study.

CONTINUED

3 OF 7

TABLE 6.—Police costs in American cities, 1930

City and State	Operating cost				Average equipment expenditures ³	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Investment ⁴	Carrying charge ⁵
Alabama:							
Birmingham.....	\$568,828	*\$78,768	\$647,596	\$2.50	\$17,323		
Mobile.....	128,490	*25,255	153,745	2.25	3,684		
Montgomery.....	154,973	*8,324	163,297	2.47	3,143		
Arizona:							
Phoenix.....							
Tucson.....	50,382	10,954	70,336	2.16	965		
Arkansas:							
Fort Smith.....	734,625		34,625	1.10	968	\$25,000	\$1,500
Little Rock.....	7160,032		160,032	2.03	7,337	75,000	6,000
California:							
Alameda.....	95,355		95,355	2.72	4,194		
Alhambra.....	53,310		53,310	1.81	3,398		
Bakersfield.....							
Berkeley.....	151,022		151,022	1.84	5,245		
Fresno.....	161,405		161,405	3.03	4,568		
Glendale.....	158,520		158,520	2.63	0,836		
Long Beach.....	352,862		352,862	2.49	0,038		
Los Angeles.....	5,588,060		5,588,060	4.51	100,042		
Oakland.....	880,240		880,240	3.13	11,047		
Pasadena.....	220,062		220,062	2.80	8,673		
Riverside.....							
Sacramento.....	263,700		263,700	2.82	1,004		
San Bernardino.....							
San Diego.....	384,502		384,502	2.60	54,643		
San Francisco ¹²	3,203,039		3,203,039	5.14	47,343		
San Jose.....							
Santa Ana.....							
Santa Barbara.....							
Santa Monica.....	86,492		86,492	2.33	5,098		
Stockton.....	133,363		133,363	2.78	1,742		
Colorado:							
Colorado Springs ⁸	70,774		70,774	2.13	1,622		
Denver ^{8,12}	896,797		896,797	3.11	7,488		
Pueblo ⁸	107,798		107,798	2.15	2,244		
Connecticut:							
Bridgeport.....	613,931		613,931	4.18	8,601		
Bristol.....							
Hartford.....	778,067		778,067	4.74	7,533	566,123	
Meriden.....	92,034		92,034	2.30	2,190		
New Britain.....	236,573		236,573	3.47	2,950		
New Haven.....	855,830		855,830	5.20	3,088		
New London.....	115,147		115,147	3.88	2,084		
Newark.....	81,438		81,438	2.26	3,018		
Stamford.....	164,408		164,408	3.55	6,881		
Torrington.....							
Waterbury.....	354,021		354,021	3.54	5,377		
Delaware: Wilmington.....							
	332,261		332,261	3.12			
District of Columbia:							
Washington ¹²	3,505,015		3,505,015	7.10			93,681
Florida:							
Jacksonville.....	450,594		450,594	3.48	*28,812		46,786
Miami ⁸	454,859		454,859	4.11			19,361
Orlando.....	52,802		52,802	1.93			8,127
Pensacola.....	66,936		66,936	2.12	¹⁰ 2,800	117,641	9,483
St. Petersburg.....							
Tampa.....							
West Palm Beach.....							
Georgia:							
Atlanta.....	820,211		820,211	3.03	11,874		
Augusta.....	117,652		117,652	1.95	3,146		
Columbus.....	78,852		78,852	1.83	7,246		
Macon.....	116,646		116,646	2.17			
Savannah.....	248,593		248,593	2.92	10,582		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Police costs in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Average equipment expenditures ³	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Investment ⁴	Carrying charge ⁵
Illinois:							
Alton.....	\$42,474		\$42,474	\$1.41	\$1,120		
Aurora.....	80,145		80,145	1.85	1,540		
Bellville.....	31,025		31,025	1.09	1,712		
Berwyn.....	73,005		73,005	1.67	1,105		
Bloomington.....	7 00,384		7 00,384	2.15	10 1,860		
Chicago.....	10,244,240		10,244,240	5.70	118,855		
Cicero.....	112,520		112,520	1.69	1,050		
Danville.....	57,005		57,005	1.55	1,355		
Decatur.....	80,697		80,697	1.41	2,144		
East St. Louis.....	117,098		117,098	1.50	1,505		
Egla.....	58,143		58,143	1.02	1,284		
Evanston.....	240,034		240,034	3.89	3,874		
Galesburg II.....	10,180		10,180	0.60			
Granite City.....	29,437		29,437	1.17	697		
Joliet.....	75,180		75,180	1.75	1,955		
Maywood.....	29,403		29,403	1.14	510		
Moline.....	38,740	\$2,151	40,897	1.27	1,008		
Oak Park.....	120,371		120,371	1.88	1,034		
Peoria.....	200,589		200,589	1.00	1,023		
Quincy.....	72,039		72,039	1.85	1,054		
Rockford.....	170,300		170,300	2.05	1,247	\$3,400	
Rock Island.....	34,241	4,054	38,305	1.01	1,408	2,334	
Springfield.....	123,705		123,705	1.72	1,440		
Waukegan.....	50,825		50,825	1.70	3,002		
Indiana:							
Anderson.....							
East Chicago.....	134,095		134,095	2.40	2,763		
Elkhart.....	69,239		69,239	2.10			
Evansville.....	280,103		280,103	2.74	4,823		
Fort Wayne.....	203,050		203,050	2.20	1,952		
Gary.....	228,513		228,513	2.27	6,848		
Hammond.....	175,171		175,171	2.71	4,316		
Indianapolis.....	1,172,353		1,172,353	3.22	8,701		
Kokomo.....							
Lafayette.....							
Michigan City.....	55,204		55,204	2.00			
Mishawaka.....	40,400		40,400	1.41			
Muncie.....	93,252		93,252	2.00			
New Albany.....							
Richmond.....							
South Bend.....	184,481		184,481	1.77	2,600		
Terre Haute.....							
Iowa:							
Burlington.....	38,200	2,127	40,423	1.51			
Cedar Rapids II.....	7 91,090		7 91,090	1.03	7 2,741		
Cinton.....							
Council Bluffs.....							
Davenport.....	137,558		137,558	2.20	5,310	10,641	
Des Moines.....	344,307		344,307	2.42	4,400	38,834	
Dubuque.....							
Ottumwa.....							
Sloux City.....	172,150		172,150	2.17			
Waterloo.....	7 82,001		7 82,001	1.80			
Kansas:							
Hutchinson.....							
Kansas City.....	215,519		215,519	1.77	4,340	1,638	
Topeka.....	103,059		103,059	1.01	3,300		
Wichita.....							
Kentucky:							
Ashland.....		930					
Covington.....	110,863		117,352	1.80			
Lexington.....	131,064		131,064	2.86	8,262		
Louisville.....	825,378		825,378	2.68	54,073		
Newport.....	83,661		83,661	2.81			
Paducah.....							

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 8.—Police costs in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Average equipment expenditures ³	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Investment ⁴	Carrying charge ⁵
Louisiana:							
Baton Rouge.....	\$33,740		\$33,740	\$1.10			
New Orleans II.....	1,182,752		1,182,752	2.58			
Shreveport.....	167,166		167,166	2.18			\$10,032
Malac.....							
Ranger.....	70,727	\$6,300	77,027	2.68	\$3,000		
Lewiston.....	69,594	8,525	78,119	2.24	916		
Portland.....	210,350	18,764	229,114	3.24			
Maryland:							
Baltimore II.....	4,093,621		4,093,621	5.09	170,324	\$2,757,005	184,727
Hagerstown.....							
Massachusetts:							
Beverly.....	60,508		60,508	3.07	4,004		
Boston.....	5,102,085		5,102,085	6.53	170,271		
Brookton.....							
Cambridge.....	514,535		514,535	4.53	10,356		
Chelsea I.....	178,500		178,500	3.90			
Chicopee.....	120,400		120,400	2.74	3,348		
Everett.....	164,954		164,954	3.41			
Fall River.....	402,941		402,941	4.28	3,280		
Fitchburg I.....	7 113,790		7 113,790	2.80			
Haverhill.....	135,573		135,573	2.78	3,400		
Holyoke.....	235,144		235,144	4.16	6,551		
Lawrence.....	202,677		202,677	3.44	2,150		
Lowell.....	404,798		404,798	4.04			
Lynn.....	284,384		284,384	2.78	9,793		
Malden.....	172,881		172,881	2.08	5,232		
Medford.....	161,275		161,275	2.70	1,132		
New Bedford.....	520,005		520,005	4.62	13,260		
Newton.....	319,013		319,013	4.80	3,221		
Pittsfield.....	162,410		162,410	3.07	2,308		
Quincy.....							
Revere.....	94,708		94,708	2.65			
Salem I.....	128,042		128,042	2.95	2,488		
Somerville.....	265,743		265,743	2.56	1,722		
Springfield.....	531,755		531,755	3.55	6,458		
Taunton.....	113,167		113,167	3.03	893		
Waltham.....	106,457		106,457	2.71	2,455		
Worcester.....	932,139		932,139	4.77	27,327		
Michigan:							
Ann Arbor.....	38,404		38,404	1.43			
Battle Creek.....							
Bay City.....							
Dearborn.....	273,984		273,984	5.44	10 4,641		
Detroit.....	0 360,031		0 360,031	5.97	93,957		
Flint.....	303,335		303,335	2.51	20,520		
Grand Rapids II.....	381,278		381,278	2.20	5,531		
Hamtramck.....	233,803		233,803	4.15	3,603		17,224
Highland Park.....	231,194		231,194	4.36			
Jackson.....							
Kalamazoo.....							
Lansing.....	130,178		130,178	1.00	3,400		
Muskegon.....	61,310		61,310	1.48			
Pontiac.....							
Port Huron.....							
Saginaw.....	214,230		214,230	2.65	8,838		
Wyandotte.....							
Minnesota:							
Duluth.....	257,053		257,053	2.54	0,634		31,000
Minneapolis.....	1,232,274		1,232,274	2.65	14,212	167,881	10,431
St. Paul.....	714,107		714,107	2.63	30,563	373,904	42,999
Mississippi:							
Jackson.....	103,691		103,691	2.15	6,130		872
Meridian.....							

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Police costs in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Average equipment expenditures	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Investment ⁴	Carrying charge ⁵
Missouri:							
Joplin	\$42,302		\$42,302	\$1.27	\$1,040		
Kansas City	1,220,422		1,220,422	3.07	20,616		
St. Joseph	150,403		150,403	1.93	2,980		
St. Louis ¹²	4,814,693		4,814,693	5.80	10 03,900		
Springfield	75,261		75,261	1.31	3,205		
University City	53,480		53,480	2.07			
Montana:							
Butte	77,504		77,504	1.06		¹⁰ \$13,878	¹¹ \$1,387
Great Falls	50,973		50,973	1.08	¹² 4,280		3,708
Nebraska:							
Lincoln	58,675	\$2,067	61,332	.81	1,752		
Omaha ²	485,137		485,137	2.27	12,730		
New Hampshire:							
Concord ²	7 52,258		7 52,258	2.07	7 4,480		
Manchester ²	7 238,920		7 238,920	3.11			
Nashua ²	7 80,937		7 80,937	2.70			
New Jersey:							
Atlantic City:							
Bayonne	482,733		482,733	5.43	3,647		
Belleville	101,492		101,492	3.70	1,245		
Bloomfield	104,240		104,240	2.74	2,040		
Camden							
Clifton	¹⁴ 147,708		¹⁴ 147,708	3.15			
East Orange	242,800		242,800	3.57			
Elizabeth	207,387		207,387	2.00	8,700		
Garfield							
Hoboken	305,711		305,711	0.17	4,135		
Irvington	148,783		148,783	2.02	1,240		
Jersey City	¹² 3,013,054		¹² 3,013,054	7.45			
Kearney	104,005		104,005	4.78	7,578		
Montclair	180,263		180,263	4.20	1,460		
Nowark	2,547,930		2,547,930	5.70	25,501		
New Brunswick:							
Orange	172,050		172,050	4.80	4,372		
Passaic	¹⁴ 203,684		¹⁴ 203,684	3.24			
Paterson	573,851		573,851	4.14	3,854		
Port Amboy:							
Plainfield	154,257		154,257	4.48	3,815		
Trouton	538,810		538,810	4.37	6,580		
Union City	238,593		238,593	4.07	14,325		
West New York	184,140		184,140	4.00	5,005		
New Mexico:							
Albuquerque	34,700		34,700	1.31			
New York:							
Albany ²	581,234		581,234	4.50	8,400		
Amsterdam ²	47,450		47,450	1.30	3,048		
Auburn ²	73,105		73,105	2.00	1,157		
Binghamton ²	227,959		227,959	2.97	5,525		
Buffalo	2,072,820		2,072,820	4.00	20,645		
Elmira ²	128,338		128,338	2.71	3,440		
Jamestown ²	118,873		118,873	2.03	¹⁰ 2,057		
Kingston	80,277		80,277	3.18	1,500		
Mount Vernon	350,806		350,806	5.71	¹⁰ 2,377		
Newburgh ²	83,330		83,330	2.00			
New Rochelle	277,075		277,075	5.14			
New York ¹²	43,101,402		43,101,402	0.23	303,594		
Niagara Falls:							
Poughkeepsie ²	85,744		85,744	2.13			
Rochester	1,114,820		1,114,820	3.40	25,705	⁸ 208,770	⁸ 34,300
Rome	37,332		37,332	1.15	1,330	31,170	5,901
Schenectady ²	254,003		254,003	2.06	5,245		
Syracuse ²	700,930		700,930	3.78	10,031		
Troy ²	247,716		247,716	3.40	6,932		
Utica	257,064		257,064	2.53	2,000	181,072	15,715
Watertown:							
White Plains	173,787		173,787	4.85	5,271		
Yonkers	701,000		701,000	5.06	21,528		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Police costs in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Average equipment expenditures	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Investment ⁴	Carrying charge ⁵
North Carolina:							
Asheville							
Charlotte	\$130,577		\$130,577	\$1.05	\$3,503		
Durham	92,215		92,215	1.77	¹⁰ 143		
Greensboro	110,934		110,934	2.07	2,221		
High Point	71,328		71,328	1.94	1,801		
Raleigh	82,105		82,105	2.20	700		
Wilmington	74,050		74,050	2.31	1,900		
Winston-Salem	102,764		102,764	2.16	⁹ 3,215		
North Dakota: Fargo	48,020		48,020	1.71	1,630		
Ohio:							
Akron	300,368		300,368	1.44	8,058	\$137,180	\$17,030
Canton	181,900	⁶ \$3,148	184,547	1.78			
Cincinnati	1,545,700		1,545,700	3.43			
Cleveland	3,383,705		3,383,705	3.70	65,107	1,701,210	103,127
Cleveland Heights	115,098		115,098	2.27	1,105	77,318	4,530
Columbus	600,027		600,027	2.41	5,583		12,222
Dayton	488,107		488,107	2.43	18,063		
East Cleveland	77,705		77,705	1.00	1,817	57,040	927
Elyria							
Hamilton	95,310		95,310	1.83			
Lakewood	120,272		120,272	1.83	2,565	41,552	2,434
Lima							
Lorain							
Manusfield	58,205		58,205	1.74			
Marion							
Massillon	¹⁸ 16,770	⁶ 655	17,425	.66			
Middletown	48,375		48,375	1.61			
Nowark	51,410		51,410	1.08	1,033		437
Norwood	54,070		54,070	1.62			
Portsmouth							
Springfield	87,452		87,452	1.27			
Steubenville							
Toledo	1,047,450		1,047,450	3.60			
Warren							
Youngstown							
Zanesville							
Oklahoma:							
Enid							
Muskogee							
Oklahoma City	240,072	20,654	272,726	1.47	5,203		
Tulsa	200,808		200,808	1.01	7,402		18,052
Oregon:							
Portland	900,740	28,722	1,010,471	3.38	40,514		70,009
Salem	33,440		33,440	1.27			
Pennsylvania:							
Altoona	160,728		160,728	1.80	5,230		
Altoona	84,548		84,548	1.03	1,555	28,430	0,021
Bethlehem	114,098		114,098	1.98	2,011		
Chester	103,487		103,487	1.75	5,405		
Easton	63,150		63,150	1.83	2,844		
Erie	218,384		218,384	1.88	2,380		
Harrisburg	138,537		138,537	1.72	3,770		
Hazleton	30,030		30,030	1.00	281		
Johnstown	151,189		151,189	2.26	23,750	820,734	40,474
Lancaster	102,052		102,052	1.72	1,030		
Lebanon							
McKeesport	⁷ 130,717		⁷ 130,717	2.50			
Nanticoke	31,117		31,117	1.20	¹⁰ 700		
Now Castle ²	⁷ 88,559		⁷ 88,559	1.82			
Norristown	55,957		55,957	1.50	833		
Philadelphia ¹²	¹⁴ 222,671		¹⁴ 222,671	7.20	137,715		
Pittsburgh ²	2,852,081		2,852,081	4.26	⁷ 30,402	1,300,912	⁷ 63,035
Reading	234,549		234,549	2.11	5,886		
Scranton	405,103		405,103	2.82	6,622		
Sharon	⁷ 40,485		⁷ 40,485	1.70		17,220	
Wilkes-Barre	158,520		158,520	1.83	6,021		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Police costs in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Average equip- ment ex- pendi- tures ³	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Invest- ment ⁴	Carry- ing charge ⁵
Pennsylvania—Con.							
Wilkinsburg							
Williamsport	\$70,331		\$70,331	\$1.73	\$1,021	\$37,393	\$5,094
York	83,150		83,150	1.50	1,836		
Rhode Island:							
Central Falls ¹⁷	46,555		46,555	1.80	3,637	64,909	4,008
Cranston ¹⁷	70,707		70,707	1.05	6,800		
Newport ¹⁷	121,493		121,493	4.40	6,940	79,220	7,071
Pawtucket ¹⁷	225,718		225,718	2.93	31,300	100,079	12,508
Providence ¹⁷	1,252,736		1,252,736	4.95	42,304	1,000,883	85,002
Woonsocket ¹⁷	230,700		230,700	4.85	10,702		
South Carolina:							
Charleston	242,880		242,880	3.90			
Columbia	134,368		134,368	2.60			
Greenville	78,617		78,617	2.95			
Spartanburg	78,042		78,042	2.80			
South Dakota: Sioux							
Falls	48,164	\$0,370	54,543	1.64			
Tennessee:							
Chattanooga ⁸	234,658		234,658	1.90	3,136		
Johnson City							
Knoxville	227,632		227,632	2.14	3,919		
Memphis	469,820		469,820	1.86	7,16,832		
Nashville	360,700		360,700	2.34	10,9,407	96,993	15,601
Texas:							
Amarillo ⁸	89,004		89,004	2.00	9,899		
Austin	70,762	9,150	79,912	1.51	1,730		
Beaumont	87,243	7,078	94,321	1.64	5,305		
Corpus Christi							
Dallas	500,380	15,605	515,985	1.98	13,380		
El Paso	165,162	32,917	198,060	1.93	1,379		
Fort Worth	371,108	14,904	386,012	2.30	3,470		
Galveston	75,903	8,725	84,628	1.60	1,148		
Houston	477,599	20,148	503,747	1.72	9,654		
Laredo	28,169	7,468	35,637	1.00	136		
Port Arthur							
San Angelo							
San Antonio	387,105	30,973	418,138	1.81	10,880		
Waco	41,610	7,795	49,404	.93	3,652		
Wichita Falls	47,732	6,652	54,384	1.25	2,173		
Utah:							
Ogden							
Salt Lake City	274,034	23,077	298,011	2.12	10,4,137		23,042
Virginia:							
Lynchburg	97,902		97,902	2.41	10,2,212		
Newport News	86,752		86,752	2.52	10,1,797		
Norfolk	450,800		450,800	3.48	10,1,023		
Petersburg	69,093		69,093	2.42	10,1,043		
Portsmouth	84,040		84,040	1.84	10,1,762		
Richmond ¹⁸	572,556		572,556	3.13	0,556		
Roanoke	159,583		159,583	2.31	0,102		
Washington:							
Bellingham	65,396		65,396	2.12	2,870		
Everett	67,707		67,707	2.22	1,733		
Seattle ⁸	1,358,562		1,358,562	3.72	20,892		
Spokane	206,655		206,655	1.79	5,617		
Tacoma ⁸	257,355		257,355	2.41			
West Virginia:							
Charleston	113,021		113,021	1.87	2,669		
Clarksburg	66,476		66,476	2.30	4,230		
Huntington	106,382		106,382	1.41	2,457		
Parkersburg	35,863		35,863	1.21			
Wheeling	144,917		144,917	2.35	1,769		
Wisconsin:							
Appleton	37,765		37,765	1.49	10,1,600		
Eau Claire	45,979		45,979	1.75	2,407		
Fond du Lac	54,891		54,891	2.08	10,1,226		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Police costs in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Average equip- ment ex- pendi- tures ³	Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²		Invest- ment ⁴	Carry- ing charge ⁵
Wisconsin—Contd.							
Green Bay	\$64,075		\$64,075	\$1.84	\$4,694		
Keshish	172,705		172,705	3.44	9,350		
La Crosse	77,060		77,060	1.95	1,487		
Madison	104,585		104,585	1.81	4,539		
Milwaukee	2,307,202		2,307,202	3.07	32,911	\$2,870,130	\$252,154
Oshkosh	57,192		57,192	1.42	2,121		
Racine	105,202		105,202	1.50	1,893		
Sheboygan	61,502		61,502	1.57	2,017		
Superior							
West Allis	80,888		80,888	2.50			684

¹ As to basis of allocation to city, see pp. 207-208, supra.² For 5-year period, see p. 232, supra, note 73.³ On basis of population according to 1930 census.⁴ Original cost.⁵ Depreciation and interest. See p. 209, supra.⁶ Includes allowance for criminal functions of coroner's office.⁷ Entire cost treated as criminal by investigator.⁸ Figures are for the calendar year 1929.⁹ Average equipment cost for 4-year period.¹⁰ Equipment cost for 1930 only.¹¹ Figures are for fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1931.¹² City and county government consolidated.¹³ Include police court and jail equipment.¹⁴ Police pay roll only.¹⁵ Pay roll only; investigator estimated 50 per cent criminal.¹⁶ Average equipment cost for 3-year period.¹⁷ Adjusted to calendar year 1929.¹⁸ Figures are for fiscal year ending Jan. 31, 1931.¹⁹ Estimated.²⁰ Equipment only.²¹ Depreciation only.²² Equipment and capital outlays for 1930 included as part of an item of \$332,010 for supplies and repairs; police court expenses included.²³ Adjusted to calendar year 1930.

3. *Prosecution costs.*—Table 7 shows the operating cost of prosecuting agencies chargeable to criminal functions for each of the cities studied, subdivided between direct municipal costs of prosecuting agencies, other costs of prosecuting agencies allocable to the city, and grand jury costs allocable to the city.⁷⁴ The table also presents figures as to capital investment and carrying charges thereon in a few cases, and gives the per capita operating cost of criminal prosecution for each city.

⁷⁴In a few instances it has been impossible to separate grand jury costs from court costs.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) 1	Grand jury 2	Total	Per capita 3	Investment 4	Carrying charge 5
Alabama:							
Birmingham.....	\$7,532	\$38,200	\$3,868	\$40,081	\$0.19
Mobile.....	1,080	10,248	2,387	13,715	.20
Montgomery.....	2,117	8,286	1,707	12,200	.10
Arizona:							
Phoenix.....
Tucson.....	3,503	3,503	.11
Arkansas:							
Fort Smith.....	1,800	4,435	1,025	7,800	.25
Little Rock.....	2,475	14,100	2,809	19,444	.24
California:							
Alameda.....	7,301	851	8,152	.23
Alhambra.....	4,550	217	4,776	.10
Bakersfield.....
Berkeley.....	21,100	2,307	23,503	.20
Fresno.....	10,602	1,070	17,572	.33
Glendale.....	11,634	549	12,083	.19
Long Beach.....	18,844	20,088	1,420	50,258	.35
Los Angeles.....	208,801	280,032	13,301	503,154	.41
Oakland.....	408	70,474	8,911	85,793	.30
Pasadena.....	0,133	30,045	1,379	38,457	.61
Riverside.....
Sacramento.....	3,300	25,800	10,410	39,570	.42
San Bernardino.....
San Diego.....	4,740	33,153	2,000	30,901	.27
San Francisco 6	104,710	11,707	110,507	.18
San Jose.....
Santa Ana.....
Santa Barbara.....
Santa Monica.....	10,257	457	10,714	.20
Stockton.....	4,217	10,771	2,070	17,064	.36
Colorado:							
Colorado Springs 6	5,303	(?)	5,303	.16	\$14,427
Denver 6, 7	44,082	(?)	(?)	44,082	.10	\$4,421
Pueblo 6	4,225	(?)	4,225	.09	7,450
Connecticut:							
Bridgeport.....	14,000	7,873	21,873	.15
Bristol.....
Hartford.....	10,150	30,058	40,208	.25
Meriden.....	2,046	900	3,555	.09
New Britain.....	4,500	9,774	14,274	.21
New Haven.....
New London.....	3,000
Norwalk.....	3,590	1,306	4,800	.14
Stamford.....	5,034	3,021	8,055	.10
Torrington.....
Waterbury.....	5,040	9,908	14,048	.15
Delaware: Wilmington							
District of Columbia:	1,800	12,159	0,261	20,220	.19
Washington 8	80,850	80,850	.18
Florida:							
Jacksonville.....
Miami 9	32,900	2,002	34,002	.32	5,054
Orlando.....
Pensacola.....
St. Petersburg.....
Tampa.....
West Palm Beach.....
Georgia:							
Atlanta.....	95,184	5,724	100,808	.37
Augusta.....	8,270	8,270	.14
Columbus.....	0,364	0,364	.15
Macon.....	11,130	11,130	.21
Savannah.....	20,058	1,600	21,748	.20
Illinois:							
Alton.....	720	2,089	2,470	5,208	.18
Aurora.....	10,080	577	10,657	.23
Belleville.....	525	2,804	412	3,831	.14

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930—Con.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) 1	Grand jury 2	Total	Per capita 3	Investment 4	Carrying charge 5
Illinois—Continued.							
Berwyn.....	\$8,048	\$331	\$8,380	\$0.18
Bloomington.....	5,810	1,137	6,953	.22
Chicago.....	\$17,042	537,995	23,807	578,844	.17
Decatur.....	4,570	400	5,030	.08
Deerfield.....	600	1,001	5,449	.15
Decatur.....	0,000	1,490	0,800	.17
East St. Louis.....	2,000	2,437	12,037	.17
Elgin.....	7,777	435	8,212	.23
Evanston.....	10,845	440	11,291	.18
Grain Valley.....	1,300	429	2,038	.07	\$120
Granite City.....	1,400	840	2,645	.09
Joliet.....	0,490	535	7,484	.17
Maywood.....	4,305	180	4,545	.10
Moline.....	2,832	483	3,315	.10
Oak Park.....	10,913	440	11,302	.18
Peoria.....	2,015	11,722	1,050	10,500	.10
Quincy.....	1,000	0,078	8,432	8,432	.22
Rockford.....	22,044	1,400	23,450	.27
Rock Island.....	2,722	464	3,180	.08
Springfield.....	1,550	8,705	692	11,037	.10
Waukegan.....	8,250	137	8,387	.25
Indiana:							
Anderson.....
East Chicago.....	3,658	3,658	.07
Elkhart.....	538	538	.02
Evansville.....	0,067	0,067	.10
Fort Wayne.....	11,037	48	11,085	.10
Gary.....	6,028	6,028	.07
Hammond.....	4,315	4,315	.07
Indianapolis.....	2,400	42,417	4,536	40,353	.14
Kokomo.....
Lafayette.....
Michigan City.....	0,620	232	0,852	.30
Mishawaka.....	2,245	2,245	.08
Muncie.....	10,007	1,700	650	12,063	.28
New Albany.....
Richmond.....
South Bend.....	8,330	8,330	.08
Terre Haute.....
Iowa:							
Burlington.....	1,303	420	1,810	.07
Cedar Rapids 10	8,863	1,315	10,178	.18
Clinton.....
Council Bluffs.....
Davenport.....	7,301	2,800	10,191	.17	1,857
Des Moines.....	42,244	16,495	58,730	.41
Dubuque.....
Ottumwa.....
Sioux City.....
Waterloo.....
Kansas:							
Hutchinson.....
Kansas City.....	21,800	5,125	26,934	.22
Topeka.....	1,575	7,820	9,395	.15
Wichita.....
Kentucky:							
Ashland.....
Covington.....	2,270	3,470	790	6,530	.10
Lexington.....	7,235	1,173	8,408	.18
Louisville.....	5,600	16,810	7,712	30,022	.10
Newport.....	1,430	639	4,770	.16
Paducah.....
Louisiana:							
Baton Rouge.....	3,312	2,000	5,312	.17
Monroe.....
New Orleans 6	9,043	60,999	16,143	77,085	.17
Shreveport.....	2,100	12,608	14,708	.10

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930—Con.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) †	Grand jury ‡	Total	Per capita §	Investment †	Carrying charge ‡
Maine:							
Bangor		\$1,374	\$765	\$2,139	\$0.07		
Lowiston		950	826	1,776	.05		
Portland		3,532	1,069	5,201	.07		
Maryland:							
Baltimore †		38,014	14,222	53,136	.07		\$14,301
Cumberland							
Hagerstown	\$75	3,422	1,061	4,558	.15		
Massachusetts:							
Beverly		1,824	104	1,988	.08		
Boston		94,001	511	95,172	.12		
Brookton							
Cambridge		7,991	731	8,122	.07		
Chelsea †		5,543	27	5,570	.12		
Chicopee		985	145	1,130	.01		
Everett		2,712	208	2,950	.00		
Fall River		5,559	498	6,057	.05		
Fitchburg †							
Haverhill		2,750	247	2,997	.06		
Holyoke		2,780	294	3,074	.02		
Lawrence		5,365	482	5,837	.07		
Lowell		1,436	142	1,578	.02		
Lynn		5,520	407	6,020	.06		
Malden		2,604	274	2,938	.05		
Medford		2,741	314	3,055	.05		
New Bedford		6,604	611	7,505	.06		
Newton		6,000	584	6,583	.10		
Pittsfield		1,870	1,410	3,280	.07		
Quincy							
Roxbury		4,264	23	4,287	.12		
Salon †		2,287	205	2,492	.06		
Somerville		4,636	532	5,108	.05		
Springfield	3,000	2,023	792	5,785	.04		
Taunton		1,586	145	1,731	.05		
Waltham		2,180	216	2,396	.06		
Worcester		0,006	1,082	11,888	.06		
Michigan:							
Ann Arbor	300	2,042		3,242	.12		
Battle Creek							
Bay City							
Dearborn	4,423	13,010		17,433	.34		
Detroit		193,395	10,413	203,808	.13		
Flint	7,938	17,482		25,420	.16		
Grand Rapids †	0,220	10,812		17,032	.10		
Hamtramck	2,200	5,090	935	8,315	.15		
Highland Park	1,447	0,073		8,120	.15		
Jackson							
Kalamazoo							
Lansing	1,736	7,161		8,897	.11		
Muskegon							
Pontiac							
Port Huron							
Saginaw		0,414		9,414	.12		
Wyandotte							
Minnesota:							
Duluth	4,555	15,005	1,856	22,316	.22		2,885
Minneapolis	11,028	70,771	5,283	90,080	.21		
St. Paul	4,245	18,092	1,020	23,057	.09		3,600
Mississippi:							
Jackson	3,004	3,300		7,264	.15		
Meridian							
Missouri:							
Joplin		4,248		4,248	.13		
Kansas City		64,662	21,023	86,585	.22		
St. Joseph	253	13,770	1,181	15,210	.19		
St. Louis †	5,616	88,640	1,856	96,112	.12		
Springfield		8,261	2,071	10,332	.18		2,320
University City							

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930—Con.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) †	Grand jury ‡	Total	Per capita §	Investment †	Carrying charge ‡
Montana:							
Butte	\$4,537	\$7,404		\$11,041	\$0.30		
Great Falls		2,002		2,002	.10		\$28
Nebraska:							
Lincoln	1,218	6,550		7,768	.10		
Omaha †	6,070	23,073		29,043	.14		
New Hampshire:							
Concord †		2,090	\$207	2,207	.00		
Manchester							
Nashua							
New Jersey:							
Atlantic City							
Bayonne		23,747	3,067	27,714	.31		
Bellefonte		3,380	412	3,801	.14		
Bloomfield							
Camden							
Clifton							
East Orange							
Elizabeth		27,216	2,148	29,363	.26		
Garfield							
Hoboken		13,864	2,368	16,172	.27		
Irvinton		8,200	908	9,108	.16		
Jersey City		85,251	14,238	99,489	.31		
Kearney		11,105	1,855	12,960	.32		
Montclair							
Newark		90,074	12,059	111,133	.25		
New Brunswick							
Orange							
Passaic							
Paterson		34,647	6,227	40,774	.30		
Perth Amboy							
Plainfield		10,238	808	11,046	.32		
Trenton		32,438	8,800	41,238	.33		
Union City		9,800	1,701	11,507	.20		
West New York		7,024	1,181	8,505	.24		
New Mexico:							
Albuquerque		5,179		5,179	.10		
New York:							
Albany †		23,001	5,607	29,208	.23		
Amsterdam †		5,450	918	6,374	.18		
Auburn †		5,511		5,511	.15		
Blghampton †		8,211	1,300	9,577	.13		
Buffalo		57,000	14,926	71,932	.13		
Elmira †		4,125	1,581	5,706	.12		
Jamestown †							
Kingston		3,168	2,290	5,457	.10		
Mount Vernon		7,310	1,292	8,602	.14		
Newburgh †		4,283	1,911	6,190	.20		
New Rochelle		7,523	1,344	8,867	.10		
New York †	1,041,034	63,117	1,705,051		.25		
Niagara Falls							
Poughkeepsie †		12,881	11,187	24,071	.60		
Rochester		40,318	10,316	50,634	.18		8,067
Rome		4,181	4,714	8,895	.28	\$21,568	1,495
Schenectady †		12,062	6,107	18,769	.20		
Syracuse †		41,109	13,056	54,255	.26		
Troy †		13,562	4,720	18,291	.25		
Utica		20,766	23,233	43,999	.43	100,200	7,360
Watertown							
White Plains		6,450	1,153	7,603	.21		
Yonkers		16,716	2,988	19,704	.16		
North Carolina:							
Ashville							
Charlotte	\$1,500	\$1,355		\$2,855	.04		
Durham		\$3,161		\$3,161	.06		
Greensboro	\$3,000	\$751		\$3,751	.07		
High Point	\$1,350	\$336		\$1,686	.05		
Raleigh	\$2,400	\$660		\$3,060	.08		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930—Con.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) 1	Grand jury 2	Total	Per capita 3	Investment 4	Carrying charge 5
North Carolina—Contd.							
Wilmington		\$1,870		\$1,870	\$0.00		
Winston-Salem	\$2,500	894		3,394	.05		
North Dakota: Fargo		2,170		2,170	.08		
Ohio:							
Akron	4,559	21,017	\$3,033	29,609	.11		\$2,331
Canton	4,430	14,224		18,654	.18		
Cincinnati	14,071	43,247	11,220	68,538	.15		
Cleveland	43,365	66,015	13,526	122,906	.14		
Cleveland Heights	500	4,024	1,000	5,524	.12		
Columbus	3,331	21,340	6,045	30,716	.14		5,448
Dayton	3,592	23,482	4,704	31,778	.10		
East Cleveland	445	2,327	570	3,342	.10		
Elyria							
Hamilton	975	2,272	1,210	4,457	.08		
Lakewood	2,532	4,468	915	7,915	.11		
Lima							
Lorain							
Mansfield							
Marion							
Mason	1,360	3,209		4,569	.17		
Middletown	361	1,700	1,035	3,102	.11		
Newark	1,445	2,705		4,150	.14		
Norwood	1,034	3,007	803	4,844	.15		
Portsmouth							
Springfield	1,500	5,038		6,538	.11		
Steubenville							
Toledo	2,000	35,282	5,729	43,011	.15		
Warren							
Youngstown							
Zanesville							
Oklahoma:							
Enid							
Muskogee							
Oklahoma City		20,074		20,074	.10		
Tulsa	1,800	18,528	221	20,549	.16		
Oregon:							
Portland	12,183	30,530		42,722	.14		5,010
Salem		1,049		1,049	.04		
Pennsylvania:							
Alliquippa							
Allentown		10,174	1,188	11,362	.12		
Altoona		6,545	430	6,975	.09		
Bethlehem		15,900	630	16,530	.28		
Chester		7,184		7,184	.12		
Easton		10,800	935	11,735	.51		
Erie		30,072	12,408	42,480	.43		
Harrisburg		14,330	1,512	15,842	.20		
Hazleton		3,094	181	3,275	.11		
Johnstown		28,093	2,317	31,010	.40		2,030
Lancaster		4,555		4,555	.08		
Lebanon							
McKeesport							
Nanticoke		2,413	120	2,533	.10		
New Castle		32,594		32,594	.07		
Norristown		5,098		5,098	.10		
Philadelphia 4		314,592	17,836	332,428	.17		
Pittsburgh		222,314	19,870	242,184	.45		
Reading		21,578	1,180	22,758	.20		
Saratoga		40,466	4,254	44,720	.31		
Sharon							
Wilkes Barre		15,834	718	16,552	.10		
Williamsburg							
Williamsport		5,600	822	6,422	.14		760
York		4,752	687	5,439	.10		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930—Con.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) 1	Grand jury 2	Total	Per capita 3	Investment 4	Carrying charge 5
Rhode Island:							
Central Falls 13	\$304	\$1,200	(7)	\$1,604	\$0.00	(14)	
Cranston 13	000	2,049	(7)	2,049	.00	(15)	
Newport 13	437	1,323	(7)	1,760	.00	(16)	
Pawtucket 13	1,135	3,703	(7)	4,838	.00	(16)	
Providence 13	5,479	12,177	(7)	17,656	.07	(16)	
Woonsocket 13	1,441	2,380	(7)	3,821	.08	(16)	
South Carolina:							
Charleston							
Columbia		1,000		1,000	.03		
Greenville	1,200			(10)			
Spartanburg	1,000			(10)			
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	1,000	5,115		6,115	.18		
Tennessee:							
Chattanooga 6	8,500	10,335	\$2,400	21,235	.18		
Johnson City							
Knoxville		8,293	917	9,210	.09		
Memphis		27,885	4,154	32,039	.13		
Nashville		13,080	9,738	22,818	.15		
Texas:							
Amarillo							
Austin	750	6,208	2,700	9,658	.18		
Beaumont	400	7,515	4,882	12,797	.22		
Corpus Christi							
Dallas	1,800	30,074	24,003	61,877	.23		
El Paso		16,577	5,160	21,737	.21		
Fort Worth	640	33,275	12,725	46,640	.20		
Galveston	1,500	11,700	6,207	19,407	.37		
Houston	3,000	79,099	6,424	91,523	.31		
Laredo		5,786	2,384	8,170	.25		
Port Arthur							
San Angelo							
San Antonio	5,425	61,055	33,054	99,534	.43		
Waco	600	12,720	1,142	14,471	.27		
Wichita Falls	1,200	11,202	1,120	13,522	.31		
Utah:							
Ogden							
Salt Lake City	3,195	28,226		31,421	.22		\$5,846
Virginia:							
Lynchburg	3,830		65	3,895	.09		
Newport News	1,200		183	1,383	.04		
Norfolk	1,500		644	2,144	.02		
Petersburg	1,200		51	1,251	.04		
Portsmouth	300		107	407	.01		
Richmond 13	5,286		200	5,486	.03		
Roanoke	3,416		543	3,959	.00		
Washington:							
Bellingham		3,958		3,958	.13		
Everett	1,400	3,945		5,345	.18		
Seattle 6	4,795	51,250		56,045	.15		
Spokane							
Tacoma 6	1,200	15,000		16,200	.15		
West Virginia:							
Charleston	2,075	8,625		10,700	.18		
Clarksburg		4,181		4,181	.15		
Huntington		10,618		10,618	.14		
Parkersburg		4,279		4,279	.14		
Wheeling		14,420		14,420	.24		
Wisconsin:							
Appleton		2,132		2,132	.08		
East Claire		2,373	1,070	3,443	.17		
Fond du Lac		1,702		1,702	.06		
Green Bay		4,136		4,136	.11		
Kenosha		10,763		10,763	.21		
La Crosse		1,488		1,488	.04		
Madison		8,221		8,221	.14		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Cost of criminal prosecution in American cities, 1930—Con.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal	Other (city's share) ¹	Grand jury ²	Total	Per capita ³	Investment ⁴	Carrying charge ⁵
Wisconsin—Continued.							
Milwaukee.....		\$67,023		\$67,023	\$0.12		\$5,825
Oshkosh.....		3,757		3,757	.09		
Racine.....		12,301		12,301	.18		
Sheboygan.....		2,493		2,493	.06		
Superior.....							
West Allis.....		4,062		4,062	.12		

¹ Includes county, State, and district for circuit expenditures allocable to city.

² Whether municipal, county, or other.

³ On basis of population according to 1930 census.

⁴ Original cost.

⁵ Depreciation and interest charge.

⁶ Figures are for calendar year 1929.

⁷ Grand jury cost included in criminal court cost. See p. 289, supra, note 74.

⁸ City and county government consolidated.

⁹ Includes pay-roll cost only.

¹⁰ Data incomplete.

¹¹ Figures are for fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1931.

¹² City's share of county cost allocated on basis of population.

¹³ Figures adjusted to calendar year 1929.

¹⁴ Included under courts.

¹⁵ Figures are for fiscal year ending Jan. 31, 1931.

¹⁶ Figures adjusted to calendar year 1930.

4. *Cost of public defense of accused persons.*—A few cities, notably in the State of California, have adopted the public defender system, whereby regularly employed public officers are charged with the duty of defending indigent persons accused of crime.⁷⁵ Moreover, in States not having the public defender system, counsel are assigned by the courts to defend indigent persons, and are sometimes paid for their services from public funds. The cost of such public defense of indigent persons accused of crime is obviously an element in the public cost of criminal justice.

Table 8 shows the cost of the public defense of persons accused of crime for each of the cities studied where such costs have been reported by the investigators, and gives the per capita cost of public defense of accused persons for each city. No figures as to capital investment or carrying charges are available in the case of public defense costs.

⁷⁵ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Prosecution, pp. 30–33, 113. Compare the discussion in the manual, p. 538, infra.

TABLE 8.—Cost of public defense of accused persons in American cities, 1930

City and State	Operating cost		City and State	Operating cost	
	Amount (city's share) ¹	Per capita ²		Amount (city's share) ¹	Per capita ²
California:			Montana: Great Falls.....	\$168	\$0.006
Alameda.....	\$615	\$0.015	Nbraska: Omaha ³	1,466	.007
Alhambra.....	306	.010	Ohio:		
Glendale.....	774	.012	Canton.....	3,493	.033
Long Beach.....	2,012	.014	Cleveland.....	27,811	.031
Los Angeles.....	31,632	.026	Cleveland Heights.....	2,074	.041
San Francisco.....	27,046	.043	Columbus.....	4,070	.016
Connecticut:			Dayton.....	4,955	.025
Hartford.....	2,175	.013	Massillon.....	727	.028
New Britain.....	707	.010	South Dakota: Sioux Falls.....	213	.066
Norwalk.....	114	.003	Tennessee: Memphis.....	4,950	.020
Stamford.....	206	.006	Texas: Dallas.....	1,500	.006
Illinois:			Virginia:		
Berwyn.....	88	.002	Lynchburg.....	50	.001
Chicago.....	6,311	.002	Portsmouth.....	50	.001
Cicero.....	124	.002	Richmond.....	275	.002
Evanston.....	118	.002	Roanoke.....	375	.005
Indiana:			Wisconsin:		
Fort Wayne.....	512	.004	Appleton.....	59	.004
Indianapolis.....	477	.001	Sheboygan.....	102	.003
Mishawaka.....	195	.004			
South Bend.....	371	.004			

¹ Includes both municipal expenditures and city's share of county, State, or other expenditures.

² On basis of population according to 1930 census.

³ Figures are for the calendar year 1929.

5. *Cost of the criminal courts.*—Table 9 shows the operating cost of the courts chargeable to criminal cases for each of the cities studied, exclusive of the appellate courts,⁷⁶ subdivided between the cost of municipal courts other than juvenile courts, the cost of county and State courts other than juvenile courts allocable to the city, and the cost of juvenile courts allocable to the city.⁷⁷ The table also presents figures as to capital investment and carrying charges thereon, where available, and gives the per capita operating cost of the criminal work of the courts for each city.

⁷⁶ Except in so far as some States or county courts of general original jurisdiction may hear appeals from police magistrates, justices of peace, municipal courts of limited jurisdiction, etc. As to the cost of appellate courts proper, see pp. 304–306, infra.

⁷⁷ For a discussion of the reasons for including the cost of juvenile courts in the cost of criminal justice even though such courts are not technically criminal courts, see p. 44, supra.

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930

City and State	Operating cost				Capital		
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Investment ⁶	Carrying charge ⁷
Alabama:							
Birmingham.....	\$28,770	\$129,247	\$8,438	\$166,464	\$0.04		
Mobile.....	6,128	44,703	5,496	56,327	.83		
Montgomery.....	4,070	14,619	3,318	22,007	.34		
Arizona:							
Phoenix.....							
Tucson.....	2,103	9,857		11,960	.37		
Arkansas:							
Fort Smith.....	3,800	13,690	2,023	20,413	.05	\$2,250	
Little Rock.....	4,899	21,338	22,821	49,058	.00		2,600
California:							
Alameda.....	4,030	2,581	438	7,055	.22		
Alhambra.....	2,770	2,238		5,008	.17		
Bakersfield.....							
Berkeley.....	6,213	6,999	1,189	14,401	.17		
Fresno.....	14,130	7,377	1,338	22,840	.44		
Glendale.....	11,426	5,062		17,087	.27		
Long Beach.....	59,054	14,702		73,756	.52		
Los Angeles.....	310,146	137,724		447,870	.30		
Oakland.....	32,396	27,033	4,593	64,022	.22		
Pasadena.....	10,059	14,217		24,276	.33		
Riverside.....							
Sacramento.....	21,192	12,880	2,555	36,627	.39		
San Bernardino.....							
San Diego.....	15,140	34,143	900	50,201	.34		
San Francisco ⁹	41,206	74,320	5,400	120,935	.19		
San Jose.....							
Santa Ana.....							
Santa Barbara.....							
Santa Monica.....	4,235	4,718		8,953	.24		
Stockton.....	7,020	7,047	943	15,010	.32		
Colorado:							
Colorado Springs ⁸	1,940	7,908		9,848	.30		
Denver ^{8,9}	84,601		14,682	99,183	.34	13,265	
Pueblo ⁸	1,200	4,845		6,045	.12		22,384
Connecticut:							
Bridgport.....	23,777	37,083	10,067	70,927	.55		
Bristol.....							
Hartford.....	60,037	10,932	1,034	72,003	.44		
Meriden.....	5,344	4,513		9,857	.26		
New Britain.....	13,172	3,554	630	17,362	.25		
New Haven.....							
New London.....	6,091			(10)			
Norwalk.....	4,600	2,834		7,334	.20		
Stamford.....	15,388	14,220		29,617	.64		
Torrington.....							
Waterbury.....	11,833	9,883		21,716	.22		
Delaware: Wilmington.....	17,108	23,153	2,272	42,533	.40		
District of Columbia:							
Washington ⁹	353,641		52,118	405,759	.83		50,266
Florida:							
Jacksonville.....							
Miami ⁸	3,925	100,048	5,220	109,193	.99		
Orlando.....							
Pensacola.....	2,300			(10)			
St. Petersburg.....							
Tampa.....							
West Palm Beach.....							
Georgia:							
Atlanta.....	9,998	248,523	13,388	271,909	1.02		
Augusta.....	3,300	27,354	478	31,132	.52		
Columbus.....	3,177	17,275	2,854	23,306	.54		
Macon.....	4,810	38,301	1,470	44,641	.83		
Savannah.....	6,600	35,805	23,546	66,011	.78		
Illinois:							
Alton.....	5,212	1,646		6,858	.23		
Aurora.....	3,612	3,949		7,561	.16		
Belleville.....		3,212		3,212	.11		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930—Contd.

City and State	Operating cost				Capital		
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Investment ⁶	Carrying charge ⁷
Illinois—Continued.							
Berwyn.....		\$11,558	\$371	\$11,929	\$0.20		
Bloomington.....							
Chicago.....	\$347,507	830,644	20,051	1,204,802	.36		
Chicago.....		16,358	525	16,883	.25		
Chicago.....		7,084		7,084	.12		
Decatur.....	2,230	4,743		6,973	.12		
East St. Louis.....	4,404	6,009		10,413	.18		
Elgin.....		3,047		3,047	.08		
Evansville.....		15,574	500	16,074	.25		
Galesburg ¹¹	864	4,002	221	5,087	.18		\$343
Granite City.....	1,066	1,176		2,242	.13		
Joliet.....		3,740		3,740	.09		
Maywood.....		6,269	201	6,470	.25		
Moline.....	2,110	3,884		5,994	.19		
Oak Park.....		15,672	503	16,175	.25		
Poorland.....		8,410		8,410	.09		
Quincy.....	2,143	4,409		6,552	.17		
Rockford.....	5,327	10,321		15,648	.20		
Rock Island.....		3,732		3,732	.16		
Springfield.....	1,815	7,640		9,455	.13		
Waukegan.....		4,331		4,331	.13		
Indiana:							
Anderson.....							
East Chicago.....	14,918	10,240	2,754	27,912	.51		
Elkhart.....	1,400	1,091	461	2,952	.09		
Evansville.....	11,978	18,420	4,195	34,593	.34		
Fort Wayne.....	9,677	4,770	10,683	25,130	.22		
Indiana:							
Gary.....	12,598	18,552	4,989	36,139	.30		
Hammond.....	10,953	12,080	3,248	26,281	.41		
Indianapolis.....		70,231		70,231	.22		
Kokomo.....							
Lafayette.....							
Michigan City.....	2,976	2,070		5,046	.19		
Mishawaka.....	3,946	3,339	869	8,154	.20		
Muncie.....	4,398	9,809	605	14,812	.32		
New Albany.....							
Richmond.....							
South Bend.....	6,642	12,205	3,227	22,074	.21		
Terre Haute.....							
Iowa:							
Burlington.....	1,645	12,420		14,065	.23		
Cedar Rapids ¹²	1,263	3,288	1,718	6,269	.11		
Clinton.....							
Council Bluffs.....							
Davenport.....	3,580	2,822		6,402	.11		
Des Moines.....	30,014	77,750	7,070	114,834	.87		
Dubuque.....							
Ottumwa.....							
Sioux City.....							
Waterloo.....							
Kansas:							
Hutchinson.....							
Kansas City.....	1,800	14,198	680	16,678	.14		
Topeka.....	1,200	13,638	1,200	16,128	.25		
Wichita.....			6,812	(10)			
Kentucky:							
Ashland.....							
Covington.....	2,602	7,466	980	11,054	.17		
Lexington.....	3,560	7,312	4,965	15,837	.35		
Louisville.....	19,620	21,480	4,840	45,940	.15		
Newport.....	2,606	2,375	619	5,600	.19		
Paducah.....							
Louisiana:							
Baton Rouge.....	1,800	1,417	333	3,550	.12		
Monroe.....							
New Orleans ⁹		220,432	27,008	247,440	.54	\$500,000	32,500
Shreveport.....		13,000		13,000	.13		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930—Contd.

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Carrying charge ⁷
Maine:						
Bangor.....	\$7,002	\$4,882		\$12,884	\$0.45	
Leviston.....	4,433	5,844		10,277	.29	
Portland.....	3,400	5,392		8,792	.13	
Maryland:						
Baltimore ⁸	34,022	123,210	\$10,088	177,520	.22	\$70,845
Oumberland.....						
Hagerstown.....	1,417	4,302	1,438	7,217	.23	
Massachusetts:						
Beverly.....		13,508		13,508	.54	
Boston.....		1,204,085	31,441	1,235,526	1.06	
Brockton.....						
Cambridge.....		50,171		50,171	.42	
Chelsea ⁹		74,380	1,487	75,867	1.00	
Chicopee.....		10,007	280	10,287	.23	
Everett.....		10,197	10,413	20,610	.43	
Fall River.....		29,700	13,424	43,124	.37	
Fitchburg ⁹						
Rayville.....		20,306		20,306	.42	
Holyoke.....		17,954		17,954	.32	
Lawrence.....		30,000		30,000	.47	
Lowell.....		10,911		10,911	.11	
Lynn.....		40,046		40,046	.40	
Malden.....		21,240		21,240	.37	
Medford.....		22,080	1,870	24,050	.42	
New Bedford.....		51,027		51,027	.46	
Newton.....		45,065		45,065	.70	
Pittsfield.....		11,544		11,544	.23	
Quincy.....						
Revere.....		57,222	1,144	58,366	1.04	
Salom ⁸		10,936		10,936	.30	
Somerville.....		27,508	1,733	29,241	.28	
Springfield.....		41,320		41,320	.28	
Taunton.....		12,302		12,302	.33	
Waltham.....		10,500		10,500	.42	
Worcester.....		51,018		51,018	.26	
Michigan:						
Ann Arbor.....		5,104		5,104	.10	
Battle Creek.....						
Bay City.....						
Dearborn.....	11,558	26,650	3,425	41,633	.83	
Detroit.....	785,793		50,014	836,707	.53	
Flint.....	7,578	27,541		35,119	.25	
Grand Rapids ¹¹	17,317	21,204	5,230	43,760	.26	3,004
Hamtramck.....	14,282	12,322	1,580	28,190	.50	
Highland Park.....	0,250	13,050	1,757	21,057	.41	
Jackson.....						
Kalamazoo.....						
Lansing.....	4,006	10,455	2,404	17,015	.23	
Muskegon.....						
Pontiac.....						
Port Huron.....						
Saginaw.....	4,101	14,772	2,270	21,203	.26	
Wyandotte.....						
Minnesota:						
Duluth.....	21,533	0,048		21,581	.27	33,130
Minneapolis.....	10,270	57,518	12,323	80,116	.17	
St. Paul.....	15,105	21,210		36,315	.13	4,103
Mississippi:						
Jackson.....	13,210	28,032		41,242	.87	
Meridian.....						
Missouri:						
Joplin.....	1,837	7,714		9,551	.28	
Kansas City.....	20,549	55,406	15,035	91,500	.23	
St. Joseph.....	2,354	14,511		16,865	.21	
St. Louis ⁹	80,500	203,215	15,230	298,945	.36	
Springfield.....	3,155	7,737		10,892	.19	1,456
University City.....						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930—Contd.

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Carrying charge ⁷
Montana:						
Butte.....	\$2,542	\$3,935	\$220	\$6,007	\$0.17	
Great Falls.....	3,034	1,884		4,918	.17	\$821
Nebraska:						
Lincoln.....	4,000	0,280	710	11,050	.15	
Omaha ⁸	11,082	23,280	264	35,526	.10	
New Hampshire:						
Concord ⁸	2,775	8,600		11,441	.45	
Manchester.....						
Nashua.....						
New Jersey:						
Atlantic City.....						
Bayonne.....	13,044	41,842	3,880	59,675	.07	
Bellefonte.....	885	8,034	457	9,376	.37	
Bloomfield.....						
Camden.....						
Clifton.....						
East Orange.....	¹⁴ 7,212			⁽¹⁰⁾		
Elizabeth.....	4,710	27,508		32,308	.28	
Garfield.....						
Hoboken.....	7,008	24,326	2,201	33,595	.57	
Irvington.....	2,550	20,011	1,105	24,500	.43	
Jersey City.....	⁽¹⁵⁾	160,274	13,061	173,961	.52	
Kearney.....	5,050	10,500	1,810	20,447	.05	
Montclair.....						
Newark.....	¹⁴ 57,000	252,580	12,651	322,231	.73	
New Brunswick.....						
Orange.....	3,028			⁽¹⁰⁾		
Passaic.....						
Paterson.....	0,178	33,022		33,200	.31	
Perth Amboy.....						
Plainfield.....	4,400	10,382		14,782	.43	
Trenton.....	10,340	83,108		93,547	.76	
Union City.....	¹⁴ 0,000	17,282	1,006	24,888	.42	
West New York.....	¹⁴ 5,100	12,465	1,158	18,723	.51	
New Mexico: Albuquerque.....	587	8,801		9,448	.30	
New York:						
Albany ⁸	11,207	30,444	15,805	57,000	.45	
Amsterdam ⁸	3,250	5,302	3,557	12,109	.35	
Auburn ⁸	1,830	5,883	1,028	8,741	.24	
Binghamton ⁸	7,207	12,425	2,083	21,805	.28	
Buffalo.....	110,486	07,183	10,827	128,496	.35	
Elmira ⁸	0,872	0,481	4,273	5,626	.43	
Jamestown ⁸	0,088			⁽¹⁰⁾	.22	
Kingston.....	5,804	3,210	775	9,885	.35	
Mount Vernon.....	0,883	3,200	0,350	4,433	.32	
Newburgh ⁸	2,025	0,119	1,428	3,572	.33	
New Rochelle.....	12,554	3,300	0,552	16,406	.42	
New York ⁹	2,223,255	1,010,248	368,076	3,601,579	.05	
Niagara Falls.....						
Poughkeepsie ⁸	5,173	7,070	2,200	14,443	.38	
Rochester.....	31,541	28,430	78,503	138,474	.24	8,472
Rome.....	2,913	3,227	10,433	16,573	.32	\$24,063
Schenectady ⁸	8,150	13,011	4,520	25,681	.28	1,523
Syracuse ⁸	18,422	24,700	2,652	45,840	.22	
Troy ⁸	10,490	15,137	0,705	26,332	.45	
Utica.....	13,073	15,305	10,300	38,678	.49	140,402
Watertown.....						8,600
White Plains.....	0,049	2,034	5,018	7,001	.49	
Yonkers.....	32,075	6,004	14,500	52,579	.40	

See footnotes at end of table.

63666—31—20

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930—Contd.

City and State	Operating cost				Capital		
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Investment ⁶	Carrying charge ⁷
North Carolina:							
Asheville							
Charlotte	\$4,437	\$10,220	17 5,831	\$20,497	\$0.32		
Durham		18,010	405	18,415	.36		
Greensboro	8,411	9,304	17 4,290	22,605	.42		
High Point	9,238	4,385	17 5,100	18,789	.51		
Raleigh	7,064	9,309	17 1,408	16,371	.41		
Wilmington		9,000	17 1,683	10,682	.33		
Winston-Salem	10,900	11,991	17 2,612	25,412	.34		
North Dakota: Fargo		11,947		11,947	.42		
Ohio:							
Akron	21,305	14,279		35,584	.14		\$5,410
Canton	15,175	19 30,247	17 12,350	57,772	.55		
Cincinnati	59,884	57,970	19 50,853	102,707	.36		
Cleveland	108,454	150,770	27,809	293,102	.32		
Cleveland Heights	2,349	11,093	2,079	16,121	.32		
Columbus	34,588	31,819	10 10,305	82,212	.28		10,504
Dayton	20,902	11,077	5,451	38,030	.19		
East Cleveland	3,780	6,713	1,193	11,686	.29		
Elyria							
Hamilton	6,770	3,582	4,044	14,405	.28		
Lakewood	10,347	10,611	1,880	22,844	.33	\$25,000	1,405
Lima							
Lorain				(10)			
Mansfield	10,500						
Marion							
Massillon	14 3,610	16 6,295	17 2,509	12,474	.47		
Middletown	1,300	3,378	19 3,432	8,200	.27		
Newark	2,002	3,544	2,304	8,510	.28		
Norwood	722	4,151	19 3,641	8,514	.25		
Portsmouth							
Springfield	13 2,711	13 5,162		19 7,873	.11		
Staubenville							
Toledo	14,004	28,976	12,281	55,321	.19		
Warron							
Youngstown							
Zanesville							
Oklahoma:							
Enid							
Muskogee							
Oklahoma City	5,070	22,186		28,165	.15		
Tulsa	9,730	48,200	1,267	59,197	.42		
Oregon:							
Portland	11,607	18,326	27,200	57,223	.19		6,740
Salem	1,225	3,001	361	4,587	.17		
Pennsylvania:							
Alliquippa							
Allentown	3,071	41,204		44,365	.48		
Altoona	300	25,080		26,280	.32		
Bethlehem	4,036	37,735		41,771	.72		
Chester		18,520		18,520	.31		
Easton	1,997	27,521		29,518	.86		
Erie		20,473	1,235	21,708	.19		
Harrisburg		74,354		74,354	.03		
Hazleton		11,137		11,137	.30		
Johnstown	1,003	32,360		33,369	.50		1,608
Lancaster		11,465		11,465	.19		
Lebanon							
McKeesport							
Nanticoke		7,085		7,085	.27		
New Castle	902	22,061		22,963	.47		
Norristown		14,693		14,693	.41		
Philadelphia ⁸	315,074	834,827		1,149,901	.59		
Pittsburgh	93,410	21 609,096	21 170,602	909,708	1.36		
Reading		41,934		41,934	.38		
Scranton		78,279		78,279	.55		
Sharon							
Wilkes-Barre		40,530		40,530	.54		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930—Contd.

City and State	Operating cost				Capital		
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Investment ⁶	Carrying charge ⁷
Pennsylvania—Contd.							
Wilkesburg							
Williamsport		\$10,298		\$10,298	\$0.30		\$7,145
York		19,707		19,707	.30		
Rhode Island:							
Central Falls ¹¹	\$1,010	9,780	(11)	10,790	.42		
Cranston ¹¹		16,132	(11)	16,132	.38		
Newport ¹¹		10,422	(11)	11,220	.41		
Pawtucket	1,070	28,934	(11)	30,004	.40		
Providence ¹¹	6,030	61,376	(11)	68,006	.27		
Woonsocket ¹¹	1,736	18,287	(11)	20,023	.41		
South Carolina:							
Charleston							
Columbia		6,000		6,000	.12		
Greenville	1,600			(10)			
Spartanburg	900	8,342	\$1,160	10,411	.36		
South Dakota: Sioux Falls							
Falls	7,578	8,235		15,813	.47		
Tennessee:							
Chattanooga ⁸	10,100	23,085		33,185	.27		
Johnson City							
Knoxville	5,867	11,514	10,914	28,295	.27		
Memphis	35,127	45,005	24,087	105,119	.41		
Nashville	8,000	62,041	18,323	88,364	.57		4,122
Texas:							
Amarillo							
Austin	3,488	15,422		18,910	.30		
Beaumont	4,750	15,102	2,001	21,853	.38		
Corpus Christi							
Dallas	5,212	59,487	8,151	72,850	.27		
El Paso	4,240	23,851	2,322	30,413	.30		
Fort Worth	4,255	23,741	5,163	33,159	.20		
Galveston	3,750	23,420	540	27,710	.52		
Houston	21,503	51,980	10,263	83,746	.29		
Laredo		10,705		10,705	.33		
Port Arthur							
San Angelo							
San Antonio	33,870	50,632	5,950	90,752	.30		
Waco	2,755	19,315	531	22,602	.43		
Wichita Falls	1,350	14,436	163	15,949	.36		
Utah:							
Ogden							
Salt Lake City	21,170	11,492	12,161	44,820	.32		5,944
Virginia:							
Lynchburg	8,393			8,393	.21		
Newport News	7,230	1,096		8,326	.24		
Norfolk	27,014	6,935		33,949	.26		
Petersburg	8,010	1,030		9,040	.32		
Portsmouth	8,083			8,083	.19		
Richmond ¹⁴	38,890		13,876	52,676	.29		
Ronoke	10,028		983	11,011	.17		
Washington:							
Bellingham	1,010	10,301		11,311	.30		
Everett	1,396	6,153		7,549	.25		
Seattle ⁸	17,725	78,726		96,451	.29		
Tacoma ⁸	3,501	19,244		23,045	.21		
West Virginia:							
Charleston	5,000	21,270	1,180	27,450	.45		
Clarksburg	2,400	10,628		13,028	.45		
Huntington	1,620	19,805	4,205	25,630	.34		
Parkersburg		2,900		2,900	.10		
Wheeling	1,450	12,756		14,206	.23		
Wisconsin:							
Appleton		5,038	934	5,972	.24		
Bau Claire	1,500	3,320	1,069	5,889	.22		
Fond du Lac	5,549	3,510	262	9,321	.35		
Green Bay		8,282		8,282	.22		
Kenosha	6,510	2,110	5,417	14,035	.28		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—Cost of criminal courts in American cities, 1930—Contd.

City and State	Operating cost					Capital	
	Municipal ¹	Other (city's share) ²	Juvenile ³	Total ⁴	Per capita ⁵	Investment ⁶	Carrying charge ⁷
Wisconsin—Contd.							
La Crosse.....		\$4,718	\$1,215	\$5,933	\$0.15		
Madison.....		17,196		17,196	.30		
Milwaukee.....		142,330	10,325	152,655	.26		
Oshkosh.....		10,846		10,846	.27		
Racine.....		13,911		13,911	.21		
Sheboygan.....	\$730		564	3,064	.09		
Superior.....							
West Allis.....	1,853	8,626	600	11,079	.32		

¹ Exclusive of juvenile courts.² Includes cost of county, State, and district or circuit court allocable to city, exclusive of juvenile and appellate courts.³ Whether municipal, county, or other.⁴ Exclusive of appellate courts.⁵ On basis of population according to 1930 census.⁶ Original cost.⁷ Depreciation and interest charge.⁸ Figures are for calendar year 1929.⁹ City and county government consolidated.¹⁰ Data incomplete.¹¹ Figures are for fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1931.¹² Includes \$120.10 as city's share of cost of county coroner's office.¹³ Estimated.¹⁴ Pay roll cost only.¹⁵ Police court cost included under police.¹⁶ Includes pro rata share of operating cost of detention home.¹⁷ Includes county probation cost.¹⁸ Includes salary of juvenile court judge.¹⁹ Includes juvenile probation cost.²⁰ Includes city probation cost other than salary.²¹ City's share of county cost allocated on basis of population.²² Figures adjusted to calendar year 1929.²³ Included under other courts.²⁴ Figures are for fiscal year ending January 31, 1931.²⁵ Figures adjusted to calendar year 1930.

The figures presented in Table 9 do not include any allowance for the cost of appellate courts.⁷⁸ Logically, an appropriate allowance for such tribunals should be included in the cost of the criminal courts; so that it is desirable to consider the extent of the understatement of that cost in consequence of failure to make such allowance.

In general, the appellate courts for the cities studied were found to have either State-wide or at least county-wide jurisdiction,⁷⁹ extending to both civil and criminal appeals.⁸⁰ When the relatively small cost of appellate tribunals was allocated between civil and criminal work and the criminal cost allocated to the city being studied, the result was in

⁷⁸ Except as indicated in note 76, supra (p. 297).⁷⁹ This was found to be true in all cases.⁸⁰ The Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas is a conspicuous exception.

most cases so small as to be negligible⁸¹ and was disregarded by the investigators. In a few instances, however, this element of cost was of sufficient magnitude to justify investigation, and, in consequence, data as to the criminal cost of appellate courts are available for 28 cities.

Table 10 shows the amount of the criminal cost of appellate courts allocable to each city for which data are available, compared with total nonappellate criminal court costs for such city, and gives the percentage relation of the two figures.

TABLE 10.—Cost of criminal work of appellate courts, 1930

City and State	Operating cost		Per cent of cost of other criminal courts ³
	City's share ¹	Per capita ²	
Arkansas:			
Fort Smith.....	\$750	\$0.024	3.7
Little Rock.....	1,000	.008	2.0
Mississippi: Jackson.....	233	.005	0.6
Ohio:			
Akron.....	307	.001	0.9
Canton.....	53	.001	0.1
Cleveland.....	4,893	.005	1.5
Cleveland Heights.....	328	.003	2.0
East Cleveland.....	188	.005	1.6
Lakewood.....	297	.004	1.3
Massillon.....	11	.004	0.1
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City.....	2,770	.015	0.8
Rhode Island:			
Central Falls.....	122	.005	1.1
Cranston.....	184	.005	1.2
Newport.....	104	.007	1.7
Pawtucket.....	350	.005	1.1
Providence.....	1,149	.005	1.7
Woonsocket.....	225	.005	1.1
Texas:			
Austin.....	500	.011	3.0
Beaumont.....	749	.013	3.4
Dallas.....	3,510	.013	4.8
El Paso.....	1,002	.010	3.5
Fort Worth.....	1,972	.012	5.9
Galveston.....	756	.014	2.7
Houston.....	4,487	.015	5.4
Laredo.....	238	.007	2.2
San Antonio.....	2,432	.011	2.7
Waco.....	643	.012	2.8
Wichita Falls.....	601	.014	3.8

¹ Includes entire cost of appellate courts allocable to city.² On basis of population according to 1930 census.³ Based on total cost of criminal work of courts other than appellate courts allocable to city, from Table 9, supra.⁴ Figures are adjusted to calendar year 1929.⁸¹ See, for example, the account given in the model Rochester report (p. 602, infra) of the situation in Rochester, N. Y.

An examination of Table 10 indicates that the proportionate part of the cost of the criminal courts chargeable to the appellate work of the judicial system is extremely small even in the few cases where it is large enough not to be entirely negligible, and hence that this element of criminal court costs may be disregarded without substantial error in all cases.

6. *Cost of penal and corrective treatment.*—In presenting figures as to the cost of penal and corrective treatment for American cities, account must be taken of two very different kinds of treatment: (a) Confinement in penal and correctional institutions, and (b) probation and parole.⁸⁷ Moreover, account should theoretically be taken of county and State expenditures as well as of direct city expenditures. The studies made in the various cities included in the commission's investigation of municipal costs have taken account of all direct city and county costs of penal and corrective treatment, but not of State costs, which have formed the subject of a separate inquiry.⁸⁸ It would be necessary, however, to make appropriate allowances for State costs if the figures as to cost of penal and corrective treatment for the cities studied were to be made entirely comparable.⁸⁴

The problem of making appropriate allowance for the cost of State penal institutions might be dealt with in one of three ways: (a) The relative number of prisoners in State institutions committed from the city being studied could be ascertained, and the proportionate amount of State penal cost included in the cost for the city. This would require a detailed analysis of the prison population in each State institution, and would give a figure representing the State cost of city prisoners rather than the cost to the city of State penal institutions.⁸⁵ (b) The relative amount contributed by the city to the State revenues could be ascertained, and the proportionate amount added to direct city costs.⁸⁶ This would give the cost to the city of State penal

institutions, but would be very difficult to work out in many cases, especially where a large part of the revenues of the State are raised by income or excise taxation rather than by direct taxes on property.⁸⁷ (c) An estimated allowance could be made on a population basis. This method is easy of application, although not at all exact. It has been impracticable in this investigation to secure the data necessary to make allowance for State costs according to either the first or second of these methods, so that estimates on a population basis would have had to be resorted to if allowance for State costs was to be made. It was not believed that this method would give entirely satisfactory results in all cases,⁸⁸ and hence no attempt has been made to include any allowance for State penal and corrective treatment in the city figures here presented.

Figures as to total State cost of penal and corrective treatment are, however, presented in an earlier part of this report.⁸⁹ Those figures include State costs of penal and correctional institutions for adults, of correctional institutions for minors, and of parole agencies.⁹⁰ The fact that these figures are for the census year 1928, while the city cost figures are for the most part for 1930, is an additional reason for not attempting any allocation of State penal and corrective costs in the present report.⁹¹

Table 11 shows the operating cost of penal and correctional institutions for each of the cities studied,⁹² subdivided between (a) the cost of municipal institutions,⁹³ and (b) the city's share of the cost of county institutions.⁹⁴ The table also presents figures as to capital investment in penal and correctional institutions where available, and gives the per capita operating cost of penal and corrective treatment for each city.

⁸⁷ See p. 268, supra, note 24.

⁸⁸ See p. 268, supra, note 22.

⁸⁹ See pt. 5 (205-243, supra).

⁹⁰ Including State probation expenditures and the cost of pardon boards and officers. See p. 238, supra.

⁹¹ See, however, p. 225, supra, note 53; and compare p. 334, infra, note 4.

⁹² After appropriate elimination of noncriminal costs, if any. See p. 46, supra.

⁹³ Both institutions for adults and institutions for minors are included, as are municipal payments to State institutions.

⁹⁴ Including both penal institutions for adults and correctional institutions for minors.

⁸⁴ See the discussion in pt. 1 of this report (pp. 44-46, supra).

⁸⁵ See the instructions in the manual for the studies (pp. 542-543, infra).

⁸⁶ Compare p. 246, supra.

⁸⁷ It is believed that the latter figure is the more significant one, since the cost of criminal justice properly includes payments made for having facilities available even though they are not used. Compare p. 268, supra, note 22.

⁸⁸ This has been the method used in allocating county penal institutional costs in most cases.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) 1	Total	Per capita 2	Investment 3	Carrying charge 4
Alabama:						
Birmingham.....	\$4, 773	\$180, 337	\$234, 110	\$0. 00		
Mobile.....	17, 005	55, 008	72, 013	1. 07		
Montgomery.....	17, 080	0, 281	27, 267	. 41		
Arizona:						
Phoenix.....						
Tucson.....	0, 710	1, 301	11, 101	. 34		
Arkansas:						
Fort Smith.....	10, 078		10, 078	. 33		
Little Rock.....		17, 882	17, 882	. 21		
California:						
Alameda.....		6, 130	6, 130	. 18		
Alhambra.....	2, 422	4, 271	10, 693	. 36		
Bakersfield.....						
Berkeley.....		10, 323	10, 323	. 20		
Fresno.....		54, 020	54, 020	. 25		
Glendale.....		2, 471	26, 384	. 42		
Long Beach.....		80, 690	80, 690	. 63		
Los Angeles.....		916, 104	916, 104	. 74		
Oakland.....		103, 890	103, 890	. 37		
Pasadena.....		69, 109	69, 109	. 01		
Riverside.....						
Sacramento.....		30, 825	30, 825	. 30		
San Bernardino.....						
San Diego.....	35, 498	115, 050	155, 448	1. 05		
San Francisco.....	85, 295	322, 422	322, 422	. 67		
San Jose.....						
Santa Ana.....						
Santa Barbara.....						
Santa Monica.....	5, 364	19, 001	25, 655	. 69		
Stockton.....	4, 013	13, 732	18, 345	. 38		
Colorado:						
Colorado Springs.....		14, 700	14, 700	. 44		
Denver.....	37, 844		67, 844	. 24	\$10, 248	
Pueblo.....		8, 584	8, 584	. 17		7, 460
Connecticut:						
Bridgeport.....		22, 652	22, 652	. 15		
Bristol.....						
Hartford.....	4, 875	7, 848	12, 723	. 05		
Meriden.....		7, 572	7, 572	. 20		
New Britain.....		2, 571	2, 571	. 01		
New Haven.....						
New London.....						
Norwalk.....		3, 703	3, 703	. 10		
Stamford.....	3, 850	8, 509	12, 410	. 27		
Torrington.....						
Waterbury.....		26, 747	26, 747	. 44		
Delaware: Wilmington.....	2, 000	103, 074	105, 074	. 90		
District of Columbia: Wash- ington.....	470, 238		470, 238	. 93		164, 115
Florida:						
Jacksonville.....						
Miami.....	13, 010	30, 168	52, 168	. 47		4, 355
Orlando.....						
Pensacola.....						
St. Petersburg.....						
Tampa.....						
West Palm Beach.....						
Georgia:						
Atlanta.....	70, 420	433, 581	604, 001	1. 86		
Augusta.....	0, 813	65, 731	75, 544	1. 25		
Columbus.....	8, 463	42, 315	50, 808	1. 18		
Macon.....	7, 658	83, 004	91, 562	1. 70		
Savannah.....		170, 704	170, 704	2. 01		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) 1	Total	Per capita 2	Investment 3	Carrying charge 4
Illinois:						
Alton.....		\$3, 387	\$3, 387	\$0. 11		
Aurora.....	\$3, 681	0, 171	0, 862	. 21		
Belleleville.....		4, 848	4, 848	. 17		
Berwyn.....		8, 015	8, 015	. 10		
Bloomington.....						
Chicago.....	553, 515	640, 680	1, 194, 195	. 36		
Olcero.....		12, 617	12, 617	. 19		
Danville.....		5, 380	5, 380	. 15		
Decatur.....		7, 054	7, 054	. 12		
East St. Louis.....		13, 730	13, 730	. 19		
Elgin.....	452	5, 632	6, 084	. 17		
Evanston.....		12, 013	12, 013	. 19		
Galesburg.....	406	2, 105	2, 601	. 09		
Granite City.....		2, 390	2, 390	. 10		
Joliet.....		10, 062	10, 062	. 23		
Maywood.....		4, 835	4, 835	. 10		
Moline.....	1, 030	4, 914	5, 950	. 18		
Onk Park.....		12, 088	12, 088	. 10		
Peoria.....		17, 839	17, 839	. 17		
Quincy.....	0, 340	4, 366	10, 690	. 27		
Rockford.....		23, 788	23, 788	. 28		
Rock Island.....		4, 722	4, 722	. 13		\$4, 008
Springfield.....	28, 512	15, 931	44, 443	. 62		
Waukegan.....		2, 807	2, 807	. 00		
Indiana:						
Anderson.....						
East Chicago.....	1, 507	13, 672	15, 179	. 28		
Elkhart.....		7, 721	7, 721	. 23		
Evansville.....	16, 172	41, 440	57, 612	. 56		
Fort Wayne.....		31, 005	31, 005	. 27		
Gary.....	1, 800	24, 770	26, 570	. 26		
Hammond.....	1, 375	16, 131	17, 600	. 27		
Indianapolis.....		143, 241	143, 241	. 44		
Kokomo.....						
La Fayette.....						
Michigan City.....		5, 306	5, 306	. 20		
Mishawaka.....		5, 266	5, 266	. 18		
Muncie.....		13, 589	13, 589	. 20		
New Albany.....						
Richmond.....						
South Bend.....		18, 808	18, 808	. 18		
Terre Haute.....						
Iowa:						
Burlington.....	768	5, 301	6, 069	. 23		
Cedar Rapids.....		16, 920	16, 920	. 30		
Clinton.....						
Council Bluffs.....						
Davenport.....		24, 204	24, 204	. 40		3, 685
Des Moines.....	3, 161	30, 710	30, 871	. 28		
Dubuque.....						
Ottumwa.....						
Sioux City.....						
Waterloo.....						
Kansas:						
Hutchinson.....						
Kansas City.....	5, 337	17, 748	23, 085	. 19		
Topeka.....		10, 673	10, 673	. 17		
Wichita.....						
Kentucky:						
Ashland.....						
Covington.....	0, 614	3, 165	12, 770	. 20		
Lexington.....						
Louisville.....	48, 372	100, 764	155, 136	. 50		
Newport.....	10, 360	5, 460	15, 820	. 53		
Paducah.....						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²	Investment ³	Carrying charge ⁴
Louisiana:						
Baton Rouge	\$2,000	\$0,000	\$8,000	\$0.26		
Monroe						
New Orleans ⁵	130,091	144,214	283,305	.62	\$48,760	
Shreveport	7,902	24,190	32,098	.42		
Maine:						
Bangor		6,730	6,730	.23		
Lewiston		11,543	11,543	.33		
Portland		32,763	32,763	.46		
Maryland:						
Baltimore ⁶	167,118		167,118	.21	97,258	
Cumberland						
Hagerstown	2,760	10,269	13,038	.42		
Massachusetts:						
Beverly		6,360	6,360	.25		
Boston		796,018	796,018	1.02		
Brookton						
Cambridge		43,947	43,947	.39		
Chelsea ⁷		44,614	44,614	.97		
Chicopee		10,940	10,940	.25		
Everett		16,124	16,124	.33		
Fall River		26,419	26,419	.23		
Fitchburg ⁸						
Haverhill		9,591	9,591	.20		
Holyoke		22,153	22,153	.30		
Lawrence		18,678	18,678	.22		
Lowell		8,536	8,536	.09		
Lynn		19,283	19,283	.19		
Malden		16,441	16,441	.28		
Medford		14,765	14,765	.25		
New Bedford		31,779	31,779	.28		
Newton		35,727	35,727	.55		
Pittsfield		21,383	21,383	.43		
Quincy						
Revere		36,257	36,257	1.02		
Salem ⁹		7,976	7,976	.18		
Somerville		24,977	24,977	.24		
Springfield		57,451	57,451	.38		
Taunton		7,529	7,529	.20		
Waltham		12,963	12,963	.33		
Worcester		39,998	39,998	.21		
Michigan:						
Ann Arbor		8,296	8,296	.31		
Battle Creek						
Bay City						
Dearborn	16,492	28,450	44,942	.89		
Detroit	333,183	422,927	756,110	.48		
Flint	5,196	52,943	58,139	.37		
Grand Rapids ¹	2,151	22,583	24,734	.15		
Hamtramck	9,644	13,175	22,819	.41		
Highland Park	13,903	14,593	28,496	.54		
Jackson						
Kalamazoo						
Lansing	1,100	18,368	19,468	.25		
Muskegon						
Pontiac						
Port Huron						
Saginaw		17,117	17,117	.21		
Wyandotte						
Minnesota:						
Duluth	17,280	54,349	71,629	.71	48,387	
Minneapolis	115,940	79,506	195,446	.42		
St. Paul	48,474	37,807	86,281	.32		
Mississippi:						
Jackson	9,943	9,268	19,211	.40		
Meridian						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²	Investment ³	Carrying charge ⁴
Missouri:						
Joplin		\$6,180	\$6,180	\$0.18		
Kansas City	\$102,815	118,741	221,556	.65		
St. Joseph		8,891	24,384	.35		
St. Louis ⁴	433,728		433,728	.53		
Springfield		12,870	12,870	.22		\$3,212
University City						
Montana:						
Butte	6,664	17,926	24,590	.62		
Great Falls	6,334	7,930	14,264	.50		
Nebraska:						
Lincoln		10,330	10,330	.14		
Omaha ⁵		49,808	49,808	.23		
New Hampshire:						
Concord ⁶		1,911	1,911	.08		
Manchester						
Nashua						
New Jersey:						
Atlantic City						
Bayonne		41,149	41,149	.46		
Bellefonte		11,979	11,979	.45		
Bloomfield						
Camden						
Clifton						
East Orange						
Elizabeth		5,450	5,450	.05		
Garfield						
Hoboken		64,449	64,449	1.09		
Irvington		29,045	29,045	.51		
Jersey City		218,940	218,940	.69		
Kearney		13,782	13,782	.34		
Montclair						
Newark		351,127	351,127	.79		
New Brunswick						
Orange						
Passaic						
Paterson		45,540	45,540	.33		
Perth Amboy						
Plainfield		8,369	8,369	.24		
Trenton		88,235	88,235	.09		
Union City		25,845	25,845	.44		
West New York		13,844	13,844	.37		
New Mexico: Albuquerque	5,283	7,739	13,022	.49		
New York:						
Albany ⁷		66,403	66,403	.52		
Amsterdam ⁸		5,701	5,701	.17		
Auburn ⁹		5,262	5,262	.14		
Binghamton ¹⁰		39,243	39,243	.51		
Buffalo	14,839	293,948	308,787	.54		
Elmira ¹¹		4,313	4,313	.09		
Jamestown ¹²						
Kingston		6,760	6,760	.24		
Mount Vernon		11,763	11,763	.19		
Newburgh ¹³		7,913	7,913	.25		
New Rochelle		12,121	12,121	.23		
New York ¹⁴	848,152	2,567,966	3,416,118	.49		
Niagara Falls						
Poughkeepsie ¹⁵		6,874	6,874	.17		
Rochester		122,515	122,515	.37		11,075
Rome		8,276	8,276	.26	\$84,255	5,470
Schenectady ¹⁶		26,325	26,325	.27		
Syracuse ¹⁷		106,738	106,738	.51		
Troy ¹⁸		30,433	30,433	.42		
Utica		40,887	40,887	.40	424,732	27,684
Watertown						
White Plains		10,392	10,392	.29		
Yonkers	27,249	26,069	53,318	.39		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²	Investment ³	Carrying charge ⁴
North Carolina:						
Asheville						
Charlotte	\$2,002	\$78,222	\$81,124	\$0.98		
Durham		39,515	39,515	.76		
Greensboro	14,641	27,183	41,824	.78		
High Point	19,000	12,258	31,258	.85		
Raleigh	1,752	20,434	22,186	.50		
Wilmington		30,808	30,808	.96		
Winston-Salem	8,415	73,172	81,587	1.08		
North Dakota: Fargo		8,004	8,004	.30		
Ohio:						
Akron	23,823	105,308	129,221	.51	\$21,451	
Canton		59,804	59,804	.57		
Cincinnati	163,160	48,074	211,234	.47		
Cleveland	210,777	260,020	470,797	.52	82,303	
Cleveland Heights	150	19,394	19,543	.38		
Columbus	6,147	85,031	91,178	.31	13,092	
Dayton		41,576	41,576	.20		
East Cleveland	1,115	11,134	12,249	.31		
Elyria						
Hamilton		13,553	13,553	.26		
Lakewood	973	17,598	18,571	.26		
Lima						
Lorain						
Mansfield						
Marion		12,440	12,440	.47		
Massillon		11,505	11,786	.39		
Middletown	281	17,006	17,528	.57		
Newark	462	3,442	3,600	.11	3,481	
Norwood	158					
Portsmouth						
Springfield		34,302	34,302	.50		
Steubenville						
Toledo	65,810	125,672	191,482	.66		
Warren						
Youngstown						
Zanesville						
Oklahoma:						
Enid						
Muskogee						
Oklahoma City	20,876	42,231	69,107	.37		
Tulsa	19,410	61,705	81,115	.57		
Oregon:						
Portland	21,877	113,244	135,121	.45	59,204	
Salem	1,100	2,758	3,807	.15		
Pennsylvania:						
Aliquippa						
Allentown	2,809	50,610	53,425	.58		
Altoona	5,243	14,009	19,257	.23	5,519	
Bethlehem	1,077	35,107	36,184	.62		
Chester		16,615	16,615	.28		
Easton		24,285	24,285	.70		
Erie		44,408	44,408	.38		
Harrisburg		22,136	22,136	.78		
Hazleton		9,527	9,527	.26		
Johnstown	4,035	25,976	30,911	.46	11,930	
Lancaster		17,711	17,711	.29		
Lebanon						
McKeesport						
Nanticoke		5,756	5,756	.22		
New Castle		15,070	15,070	.31		
Norristown		8,578	8,578	.24		
Philadelphia ⁵		1,144,532	1,144,532	.59		
Pittsburgh		108,289	108,289	.16		
Reading		39,084	39,084	.35		
Scranton		37,172	37,172	.26		
Sharon						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²	Investment ³	Carrying charge ⁴
Pennsylvania—Continued.						
Wilkesbarre		\$37,769	\$37,769	\$0.43		
Wilkinsburg						
Williamsport		23,061	23,061	.63		
York		8,921	8,921	.10		
Rhode Island:						
Central Falls ¹⁰		(11)				
Cranston ¹⁰		(11)				
Newport ¹⁰		6,487	6,487	.24		
Pawtucket ¹⁰		(11)				
Providence ¹⁰		(11)				
Woonsocket ¹⁰		(11)				
South Carolina:						
Charleston						
Columbia		5,057	5,057	.10		
Greenville	\$3,000	(5)	(5)			
Spartanburg	9,846	3,688	13,534	.47		
South Dakota: Sioux Falls		12,510	12,510	.37		
Tennessee:						
Chattanooga ¹		139,023	139,023	1.16		
Johnson City						
Knoxville		63,410	63,410	.60		
Memphis		191,454	191,454	.76		
Nashville	60,924	87,310	148,233	.90	\$28,581	
Texas:						
Amarillo						
Austin	2,674	11,807	14,481	.27		
Beaumont	14,853	5,148	20,001	.35		
Corpus Christi						
Dallas	37,180	54,952	92,132	.35		
El Paso	21,905	26,999	48,904	.48		
Fort Worth	12,641	52,874	65,515	.40		
Galveston	2,000	24,014	26,014	.51		
Houston	23,627	55,635	79,262	.20		
Laredo		19,215	19,215	.50		
Port Arthur						
San Angelo						
San Antonio	23,182	66,771	89,953	.39		
Waco	10,504	11,358	21,862	.42		
Wichita Falls	3,703	15,379	19,082	.44		
Utah:						
Ogden						
Salt Lake City	20,500	35,412	55,912	.40	6,283	
Virginia:						
Lynchburg	8,556		8,556	.21		
Newport News	17,500		17,500	.51		
Norfolk	23,560		23,560	.18		
Petersburg	8,992		8,992	.31		
Portsmouth	4,208		4,208	.09		
Richmond ¹¹	18,067		18,067	.10		
Roanoke	29,577		29,577	.43		
Washington:						
Bellingham		6,724	6,724	.22		
Everett		4,175	4,175	.13		
Seattle ¹		37,045	37,045	.24		
Spokane						
Tacoma ¹		13,069	13,069	.13		
West Virginia:						
Charleston	5,475	27,184	32,659	.54		
Clarksburg	1,611	15,658	17,269	.40		
Huntington	6,944	35,000	41,944	.56		
Parkersburg	667	12,604	13,271	.45		
Wheeling	3,632	24,229	27,861	.45		
Wisconsin:						
Appleton		4,916	4,916	.20		
Eau Claire		12,072	12,072	.46		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—Cost of penal and correctional institutions in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost				Capital	
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²	Investment ³	Carrying charge ⁴
Wisconsin—Continued.						
Fond du Lac		\$0, 322	\$0, 322	\$0. 24		
Green Bay	\$314	0, 568	0, 882	. 18		
Kenosha		12, 054	12, 054	. 24		
La Crosse	275	13, 212	13, 487	. 01		
Madison		2, 373	2, 373	. 04		
Milwaukee	11, 000	202, 830	214, 730	. 37	\$88, 004	
Oshkosh		3, 452	3, 452	. 09		
Racine		0, 349	0, 349	. 10		
Sheboygan	1, 248	10, 032	12, 180	. 31		
Superior						
West Allis		20, 320	20, 320	. 50		

¹ As to method of allocation, see pp. 207-208, supra.

² On basis of population according to 1930 census.

³ Original cost.

⁴ Depreciation and interest charge.

⁵ Figures are for the calendar year 1929.

⁶ City and county government consolidated.

⁷ Figures are for the fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1931.

⁸ Data incomplete.

⁹ City's share of county cost allocated on basis of population. Figure does not include cost of county workhouse.

¹⁰ Figures are adjusted to calendar year 1929.

¹¹ Uses State penal institutions entirely.

¹² Figures are for fiscal year ending Jan. 31, 1931.

¹³ Does not include county jail cost.

¹⁴ Figures adjusted to calendar year 1930.

Table 12 shows the operating cost of probation agencies for each of the cities studied,¹⁵ subdivided between (a) the cost of municipal probation, and (b) the city's share of the cost of county probation. The figures given cover both adult and juvenile probation costs, but do not, unless specifically stated, include any State costs in respect of probation, pardon, or parole. The table also shows the per capita cost of probation for each city studied.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Alabama:				
Birmingham		\$13, 662	\$13, 662	\$0. 05
Mobile		2, 801	2, 801	. 04
Montgomery		1, 667	1, 667	. 03
Arizona:				
Phoenix				
Tucson		1, 750	1, 750	. 05

See footnotes at end of table.

¹⁵ See pp. 44-45, supra.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Arkansas:				
Fort Smith				
Little Rock				
California:				
Alameda		\$2, 370	\$2, 370	\$0. 07
Alhambra		2, 530	2, 530	. 00
Bakersfield				
Berkeley		0, 428	0, 428	. 08
Fresno		5, 368	5, 368	. 10
Glendale		0, 410	0, 410	. 10
Long Beach	\$5, 750	10, 083	22, 433	. 16
Los Angeles	43, 000	150, 270	190, 270	. 16
Oakland		24, 820	24, 820	. 00
Pasadena		10, 132	10, 132	. 21
Riverside				
Sacramento		7, 433	7, 433	. 08
San Bernardino				
San Diego		24, 820	24, 820	. 17
San Francisco ³		100, 876	100, 876	. 17
San Jose				
Santa Ana				
Santa Barbara				
Santa Monica		5, 347	5, 347	. 14
Stockton		2, 412	2, 412	. 05
Colorado:				
Colorado Springs ⁴		985	985	. 03
Denver ⁵	(⁶)		(⁶)	(⁶)
Pueblo ⁷				
Connecticut:				
Bridgeport	11, 950		11, 950	. 08
Bristol				
Hartford	32, 638	722	33, 360	. 20
Meriden	1, 800	238	2, 038	. 05
New Britain	0, 151	235	0, 386	. 09
New Haven				
New London	1, 500		1, 500	. 05
Norwalk	2, 250		2, 250	. 07
Stamford	7, 212		7, 212	. 15
Torrington				
Waterbury	4, 000	4, 945	8, 945	. 09
Delaware: Wilmington	3, 450	118, 208	11, 748	. 11
District of Columbia: Washington	8, 209		8, 209	. 02
Florida:				
Jacksonville				
Miami ⁸		0, 099	0, 099	. 06
Orlando				
Pensacola				
St. Petersburg				
Tampa				
West Palm Beach				
Georgia:				
Atlanta	0, 600	70, 287	70, 887	. 28
Augusta		744	744	. 01
Columbus		12, 546	12, 546	. 28
Macon		10, 977	10, 977	. 36
Savannah		(⁹)	(⁹)	
Illinois:				
Alton		424	424	. 01
Aurora		737	737	. 02
Bellville		224	224	. 01
Berwyn		1, 023	1, 023	. 04
Bloomington				
Chicago	70, 456	138, 312	208, 768	. 05
Cicero		2, 722	2, 722	. 04
Danville		849	849	. 02
Decatur		1, 242	1, 242	. 02

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Illinois—Continued.				
East St. Louis.....	\$1,800	\$636	\$2,496	\$0.03
Elgin.....		508	508	.02
Evanston.....		2,591	2,591	.04
Galesburg ⁶		486	486	.02
Granite City.....		302	302	.01
Joliet.....		504	504	.01
Maywood.....		1,043	1,043	.04
Moline.....		315	315	.01
Oak Park.....		2,608	2,608	.04
Peoria.....		2,665	2,665	.02
Quincy.....		753	753	.02
Rockford.....		5,871	5,871	.07
Rock Island.....		303	303	.01
Springfield.....		906	906	.01
Waukegan.....		490	490	.01
Indiana:				
Anderson.....		2,149	2,149	.04
East Chicago.....		1,192	1,192	.08
Elkhart.....		6,393	10,593	.10
Evansville.....	4,200	4,807	4,807	.04
Fort Wayne.....		3,911	5,711	.04
Gary.....	1,800	2,546	2,546	.08
Hammond.....		28,563	28,563	.07
Indianapolis.....				
Kokomo.....				
Lafayette.....		1,700	1,700	.07
Michigan City.....		1,925	1,925	.03
Mishawaka.....		1,180	1,180	.03
Muncie.....				
New Albany.....				
Richmond.....				
South Bend.....	3,200	7,805	11,005	.11
Terre Haute.....				
Iowa:				
Burlington.....		670	670	.02
Cedar Rapids ¹³		2,164	2,164	.04
Clinton.....				
Council Bluffs.....				
Davenport.....		1,774	1,774	.03
Des Moines.....		8,794	8,794	.06
Dubuque.....				
Ottumwa.....				
St. Louis City.....				
Waterloo.....				
Kansas:				
Hutchinson.....				
Kansas City.....	2,040	4,660	6,700	.05
Topeka.....		2,965	2,965	.04
Wichita.....				
Kentucky:				
Ashland.....				
Covington.....		2,590	2,590	.04
Lexington.....	1,318	1,978	3,296	.07
Louisville.....		24,317	24,317	.08
Newport.....		1,876	1,876	.06
Paducah.....				
Louisiana:				
Baton Rouge.....				
Monroe.....				
New Orleans.....				
Shreveport.....		113,150	113,150	.04
Maine:				
Bangor.....		443	443	.02
Lewiston.....		972	972	.03
Portland.....	2,820		2,820	.04

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Maryland:				
Baltimore ⁸	\$2,554		\$2,554	\$0.01
Cumberland.....				
Hagerstown.....				
Massachusetts:				
Beverly.....		\$3,617	3,617	.14
Boston.....		241,040	241,040	.31
Brookton.....				
Cambridge.....		3,204	3,204	.03
Chelsea ⁹		14,150	14,150	.31
Chicopee.....		2,402	2,402	.05
Everett.....		1,198	1,198	.02
Fall River.....		4,037	4,037	.04
Fitchburg ⁸				
Haverhill.....		5,455	5,455	.11
Holyoke.....		4,039	4,039	.07
Lawrence.....		10,622	10,622	.12
Lowell.....		634	634	.01
Lynn.....		10,987	10,987	.11
Malden.....		1,221	1,221	.02
Medford.....		0,016	0,016	.04
New Bedford.....		4,853	4,853	.10
Newton.....		2,653	2,653	.04
Pittsfield.....		2,875	2,875	.06
Quincy.....				
Revere.....		10,885	10,885	.31
Salem ³		4,536	4,536	.11
Somerville.....		8,162	8,162	.08
Springfield.....		12,334	12,334	.08
Taunton.....		1,150	1,150	.03
Waltham.....		963	963	.03
Worcester.....		19,083	19,083	.10
Michigan:				
Ann Arbor.....		305	305	.01
Battle Creek.....				
Bay City.....				
Dearborn.....	5,400	14,173	19,573	.39
Detroit.....	143,589	134,545	278,134	.18
Flint.....		8,262	8,262	.05
Grand Rapids ⁶	2,602		2,602	.01
Hamtramck.....		6,560	6,560	.12
Highland Park.....		7,268	7,268	.14
Jackson.....				
Kalamazoo.....				
Lansing.....	840	2,517	3,357	.04
Muskegon.....				
Pontiac.....				
Port Huron.....				
Saginaw.....		1,456	1,456	.02
Wyandotte.....				
Minnesota:				
Duluth.....	4,428	6,390	10,818	.11
Minneapolis.....	7,735	52,409	60,234	.13
St. Paul.....		24,378	24,378	.09
Mississippi:				
Jackson.....				
Meridian.....				
Missouri:				
Joplin.....		869	869	.03
Kansas City.....	7,937	49,151	57,088	.14
St. Joseph.....		6,958	6,958	.08
St. Louis ⁸	68,888		68,888	.08
Springfield.....		650	650	.01
University City.....				

See footnotes at end of table.

63666—31—21

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Montana:				
Butte				
Great Falls		\$2,111	\$2,111	\$0.07
Nebraska:				
Lincoln		7,289	7,289	.01
Omaha		6,437	6,437	.03
New Hampshire:				
Concord				
Manchester				
Nashua				
New Jersey:				
Atlantic City				
Bayonne		22,997	22,997	.20
Belleville		2,721	2,721	.10
Bloomfield				
Camden				
Clifton				
East Orange				
Elizabeth		7,292	7,292	.06
Garfield				
Hoboken		13,362	13,362	.22
Irvington		6,578	6,578	.12
Jersey City		82,459	82,459	.26
Kearney		10,740	10,740	.20
Montclair				
Newark		79,161	79,161	.18
New Brunswick				
Orange				
Passaic				
Paterson				
Perth Amboy				
Plainfield		813	813	.03
Trenton		16,715	10,715	.71
Union City		9,492	9,492	.16
West New York		6,846	6,846	.18
New Mexico: Albuquerque				
New York:				
Albany	\$1,330	2,309	3,639	.03
Amsterdam	1,000	366	1,366	.04
Auburn	1,048	431	1,479	.04
Binghamton	1,797	1,230	3,027	.04
Buffalo	38,936	54,624	93,560	.16
Elmira	4,066	528	4,594	.10
Jamestown				
Kingston		811	811	.03
Mount Vernon	3,380	4,522	7,902	.13
Newburgh	1,850	1,904	3,754	.12
New Rochelle	2,535	4,660	7,195	.13
New York	321,091	647,724	968,815	.14
Niagara Falls				
Poughkeepsie	1,013	2,003	3,016	.07
Rochester	8,830	33,784	42,614	.13
Rome		743	743	.02
Schenectady	1,637	1,177	2,814	.03
Syracuse	2,257	4,937	7,194	.03
Troy		3,852	3,852	.05
Utica	4,237	3,664	7,901	.08
Watertown				
White Plains		3,995	3,995	.11
Yonkers	2,655	10,355	13,010	.10
North Carolina:				
Asheville		()	()	
Charlotte		()	()	
Durham		2,469	2,469	.05
Greensboro		()	()	
High Point		()	()	
Raleigh		()	()	
Wilmington		()	()	
Winston-Salem		()	()	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
North Dakota:				
Fargo				
Ohio:				
Akron		\$12,138	\$12,138	\$0.05
Canton		()	()	
Cincinnati	\$2,040	18,204	20,204	.05
Cleveland	37,033	78,818	115,851	.13
Cleveland Heights		5,879	5,879	.11
Columbus	11 2,465	52,777	55,242	.19
Dayton		15,565	15,565	.08
East Cleveland		3,375	3,375	.09
Elyria				
Hamilton	360	238	598	.01
Lakewood		5,334	5,334	.03
Lima				
Lorain				
Mansfield				
Marion				
Massillon		()	()	
Middletown		11 202	11 202	.01
Newark		2,761	2,761	.09
Norwood		11 1,308	11 1,308	.04
Portsmouth				
Springfield		5,733	5,733	.03
Steubenville				
Toledo	1,000	24,323	25,323	.09
Warren				
Youngstown				
Zanesville				
Oklahoma:				
Enid				
Muskogee				
Oklahoma City		4,332	4,332	.03
Tulsa	5,200	905	6,105	.04
Oregon:				
Portland				
Salem		470	470	.02
Pennsylvania:				
Alliquippa				
Allentown		1,050	1,050	.01
Altoona		12,243	12,243	.15
Bethlehem		1,258	1,258	.02
Chester		3,092	3,092	.07
Easton				
Erie		1,280	1,280	.04
Harrisburg		3,570	3,570	.03
Hazleton		1,959	1,959	.02
Johnstown				
Lancaster		4,422	4,422	.07
Lebanon				
McKeesport				
Nanticoke				
Newcastle				
Norristown				
Philadelphia	196,272	106	106	.00
Pittsburgh		23,560	210,832	.11
Reading		130,043	130,043	.19
Scranton		6,794	6,794	.06
Sharon		3,618	3,618	.03
Wilkes-Barre				
Wilkinsburg				
Williamsport				
York		841	841	.02
		916	916	.02

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Rhode Island:				
Central Falls ³		¹⁰ \$2, 237	\$2, 237	\$0. 00
Cranston ⁴		¹⁰ 3, 557	3, 557	.08
Newport ⁵		¹⁰ 2, 205	2, 205	.08
Pawtucket ⁶		¹⁰ 6, 425	6, 425	.08
Providence ⁷		¹⁰ 21, 118	21, 118	.08
Woonsocket ⁸		¹⁰ 4, 131	4, 131	.08
South Carolina:				
Charleston.....				
Columbia.....				
Greenville.....				
Spartanburg.....				
South Dakota: Sioux Falls.....		811	811	.02
Tennessee:				
Chattanooga ⁹				
Johnson City.....				
Knoxville.....				
Memphis.....				
Nashville.....	(1)		(1)	
Texas:				
Amarillo.....				
Austin.....		1, 784	1, 784	.03
Beaumont.....		1, 462	1, 462	.03
Corpus Christi.....				
Dallas.....		15, 904	15, 904	.06
El Paso.....		11, 339	11, 339	.11
Forth Worth.....		10, 674	10, 674	.07
Galveston.....		2, 611	2, 611	.05
Houston.....	\$4, 800	14, 784	19, 644	.07
Laredo.....				
Port Arthur.....				
San Angelo.....				
San Antonio.....		3, 321	3, 321	.03
Waco.....		1, 741	1, 741	.03
Wichita Falls.....		2, 069	2, 069	.05
Utah:				
Ogden.....				
Salt Lake City.....	3, 360		3, 360	.03
Virginia:				
Lynchburg.....		2, 400	2, 400	.03
Newport News.....		1, 061	1, 061	.03
Norfolk.....		5, 423	5, 423	.04
Petersburg.....		593	593	.02
Portsmouth.....		761	761	.02
Richmond ¹⁰		15, 377	15, 377	.08
Roanoke.....		9, 019	9, 019	.13
Washington:				
Bellingham.....		1, 475	1, 475	.05
Everett.....		2, 123	2, 123	.07
Seattle ¹¹		36, 014	36, 014	.10
Spokane.....				
Tacoma ¹²		0, 458	0, 458	.00
West Virginia:				
Charleston.....		4, 826	4, 826	.03
Clarksburg.....				
Huntington.....		3, 218	3, 218	.04
Parkersburg.....		1, 022	1, 022	.03
Wheeling.....		3, 307	3, 307	.05
Wisconsin:				
Appleton.....				
EAU Claire.....		1, 028	1, 028	.04
Fond du Lac.....				
Green Bay.....				
Kenosha.....		12, 445	12, 445	.25
La Crosse.....		2, 406	2, 406	.06
Madison.....		10, 070	10, 070	.17
Milwaukee.....		71, 500	71, 500	.12
Oshkosh.....		1, 149	1, 149	.03

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—Cost of probation in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Operating cost			
	Municipal	County (city's share) ¹	Total	Per capita ²
Wisconsin—Continued.				
Racine.....		\$2, 220	\$2, 220	\$0. 03
Sheboygan.....		1, 584	1, 584	.04
Superior.....				
West Allis.....		4, 335	4, 335	.12

¹ As to method of allocation, see pp. 267-268, supra.² On basis of population according to 1930 census.³ Figures are for calendar year 1929.⁴ Included in cost of juvenile court.⁵ City's share of estimated county cost allocated on basis of population.⁶ Figures are for the fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1931.⁷ Probation work carried on only during last two and one-half months of 1930.⁸ City and county government consolidated.⁹ Figures adjusted to calendar year 1929.¹⁰ Figures are for fiscal year ending January 31, 1931.¹¹ Include \$1,534.00 for State parole.¹² Pay-roll cost only.¹³ Figures adjusted to calendar year 1930.¹⁴ Juvenile probation included under Juvenile Court.¹⁵ State probation.

7. *Receipts.*—The question of receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice has already been referred to in several connections.⁶⁶ In the figures presented above appropriate deductions have been made in respect of receipts regarded as true credits against the cost of administration of criminal justice—viz, payments to cities, counties, or other governmental units for the services of personnel or the use of facilities ordinarily employed for their own purposes in the administering of the criminal law;⁶⁷ but no account has been taken of receipts of other kinds, such as fines, profits of prison industries, receipts for prison labor, etc. As has been pointed out in an earlier part,⁶⁸ such receipts should not be deducted from operating expenses in making comparisons between the costs of administering the criminal law in different communities, although they do operate to lessen the tax burden due to criminal law enforcement and are of importance from that point of view.

The field investigators in the various cities studied assembled a considerable amount of material on receipts, other

⁶⁶ See pt. 2 (pp. 88-90, supra), pt. 3 (pp. 150-161, supra), and pt. 5 (pp. 211-212, supra). And see p. 270, supra.⁶⁷ Such as amounts paid as compensation for confining Federal prisoners, for special police details, etc.⁶⁸ See pp. 150-160, supra.

than true credits which have been deducted from operating cost, in connection with certain aspects of criminal justice administration. However, these data are not complete, and are of an order of accuracy substantially inferior to the data as to operating costs previously presented.⁹⁰ It has therefore been deemed best not to include in this part of the report any detailed figures as to receipts.

It may be stated, however, that the data collected indicate that the item of receipts is not important except in the case of the courts. Receipts are very small in the case of police,¹ and are practically nonexistent in the cases of prosecution and of probation. Receipts of county and municipal penal institutions are seldom large in amount.² The only important form of receipts is thus fines imposed by courts. These are quite substantial in a number of cities, but practice as regards the use of fine or imprisonment as punishment for crime differs so greatly as to render any comparisons of amounts of fines collected of little value.

8. *Total cost of criminal justice.*—Table 13 shows the total operating cost of the administration of criminal justice for each of the cities studied, subdivided between police costs, prosecution costs, costs of criminal courts, costs of penal and correctional institutions, and costs of probation. It also gives figures as to total operating costs per capita for each city.

⁹⁰ In most cases, only direct city receipts were obtained, since serious difficulty was met in attempting to work out appropriate allocations for county and other noncity receipts. Moreover, both municipal and county records of receipts were found to be inadequate in many instances.

¹ Some police departments report receipts from police-court fines. Compare p. 170, supra. These, however, are properly to be regarded as court receipts.

² The principal sources of receipts of State penal institutions are prison industries and labor of prisoners. Both of these sources are relatively unimportant in most municipal and county jails and similar institutions. Due allowance has been made for receipts on account of Federal prisoners. See note 97, supra.

TABLE 13.—Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930

City and State	Criminal police cost ¹	Cost of criminal prosecution ¹	Cost of public defense of accused persons ²	Cost of criminal courts ³	Cost of penal and correctional institutions ⁴	Cost of probation ⁵	Total ⁷	Per capita ⁸
Alabama:								
Birmingham.....	\$647,596	\$49,681		\$166,464	\$24,110	\$13,662	\$1,111,513	\$4.28
Mobile.....	153,745	13,715		56,327	72,913	2,891	290,591	4.39
Montgomery.....	163,297	12,200		22,607	27,268	1,667	227,039	3.44
Arizona:								
Phoenix.....								
Tucson.....	70,336	3,503		11,960	11,101	1,759	98,659	3.04
Arkansas:								
Fort Smith.....	34,625	7,860		20,413	10,978		73,876	2.35
Little Rock.....	166,022	19,444		49,058	17,382		251,916	3.08
California:								
Alameda.....	95,355	8,152		7,655	6,130	2,370	120,177	3.42
Alhambra.....	63,310	4,776	\$515	5,008	10,693	2,536	76,629	2.59
Bakersfield.....	151,022	22,503		14,401	16,623	6,428	211,977	2.88
Berkeley.....	161,436	17,572		22,816	13,029	5,398	220,340	4.20
Fresno.....	158,520	12,083	774	17,087	26,384	6,416	221,264	3.51
Glendale.....	352,862	50,258	2,012	73,756	89,699	22,453	591,020	4.15
Long Beach.....	5,583,660	503,154	31,632	447,870	915,194	199,276	7,685,786	6.18
Los Angeles.....	889,249	85,793		64,022	103,800	24,826	1,167,691	4.11
Oakland.....	220,062	38,457		24,876	69,199	16,132	368,726	4.85
Pasadena.....								
Riverside.....	263,706	39,579		36,653	36,825	7,453	384,176	4.10
Sacramento.....								
San Bernardino.....	384,502	39,901		50,201	185,448	24,820	654,872	4.43
San Diego.....	3,263,039	116,507	27,046	120,935	338,422	106,876	3,992,825	6.25
San Francisco.....								
San Jose.....								
Santa Ana.....								
Santa Barbara.....	85,492	10,714		8,953	25,555	5,347	137,061	3.69
Santa Monica.....	133,363	17,064		15,610	16,345	2,412	186,794	3.89
Stockton.....								
Colorado:								
Colorado Springs ¹¹	70,774	5,303		9,848	14,700	985	101,610	3.06
Denver.....	869,797	44,882		99,133	67,844		1,088,656	3.85
Fueblo ¹¹	107,793	4,223		6,045	8,384		126,625	2.35

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.—Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Criminal police cost ¹	Cost of criminal prosecution ²	Cost of public defense of accused persons ³	Cost of criminal courts ⁴	Cost of penal and correctional institutions ⁵	Cost of probation ⁶	Total ⁷	Per capita ⁸
Connecticut:								
Bridgesport	\$613,931	\$21,873		\$79,927	\$22,652	\$11,950	\$750,333	\$5.11
Bristol								
Hartford	778,067	40,208	\$2,175	72,903	12,723	33,360	939,436	5.71
Meriden	92,034	3,555		9,857	7,572	2,038	115,056	2.99
New Britain	236,573	14,274	707	17,362	2,571	6,386	277,873	4.09
New Haven	855,830						(9)	
New London	116,147						(9)	
Norwalk	81,438	4,896	114	7,334	3,703	2,280	99,765	2.77
Stamford	164,408	8,955	266	29,617	12,410	7,212	222,877	4.81
Torrington								
Waterbury	354,021	14,948		21,716	26,747	8,945	426,377	4.27
Delaware: Wilmington	332,261	20,220		42,533	105,974	11,748	612,736	4.81
District of Columbia: Washington	3,505,015	86,856		405,769	479,238	8,269	4,485,137	9.21
Florida:								
Jacksonville	450,594						(9)	
Miami ¹¹	454,859	34,962		109,193	52,168	6,699	657,881	5.95
Orlando	52,802						(9)	
Pensacola	66,936						(9)	
St. Petersburg								
Tampa								
West Palm Beach								
Georgia:								
Atlanta	820,211	100,808		271,909	504,001	76,887	1,773,516	6.56
Augusta	117,652	8,270		31,132	75,544	744	233,342	3.87
Columbus	78,852	6,364		23,306	50,808	12,546	171,876	3.98
Macon	116,646	11,130		44,641	91,562	19,977	283,956	5.27
Savannah	248,563	21,748		66,011	170,794		507,146	5.97
Illinois:								
Alton	42,474	5,298		6,858	3,387	424	58,441	1.04
Aurora	86,145	10,657		7,561	9,852	737	114,952	2.47
Belleville	31,025	3,831		3,212	4,848	224	43,140	1.62
Borwyn	73,995	8,380	88	11,929	8,915	1,923	105,230	2.24
Bloomington	66,384	6,953					(9)	
Chicago	19,244,249	578,844	6,311	1,204,802	1,194,195	208,768	22,437,169	6.65

Cicero	112,529	5,039	124	16,883	12,617	2,722	149,914	2.25
Danville	57,095	5,449		10,000	5,380	849	78,773	2.14
Decatur	80,697	9,696		6,982	7,054	1,242	105,571	1.84
East St. Louis	117,998	12,637		13,564	13,736	2,496	160,431	2.16
Elgin	58,143	8,212		3,047	6,084	568	76,054	2.12
Evanston	246,034	11,291	118	16,074	12,013	2,591	288,121	4.55
Galesburg ¹¹	16,186	2,038		5,087	2,601	486	26,458	.92
Granite City	29,437	2,345		3,142	2,899	302	37,625	1.50
Joliet	75,189	7,484		3,740	10,652	504	96,979	2.26
Maywood	29,463	4,545		6,470	4,835	1,043	46,356	1.79
Moline	40,897	3,315		6,000	4,950	315	56,477	1.75
Oak Park	120,371	11,362		16,175	12,088	2,608	162,604	2.54
Peoria	206,589	16,596		8,419	17,839	2,065	252,108	2.40
Quincy	72,639	8,433		6,642	10,696	753	99,163	2.53
Rockford	176,360	23,450		24,648	23,788	5,871	254,117	2.96
Rock Island	38,305	3,186		6,070	4,722	303	52,586	1.39
Springfield	123,795	11,037		9,455	44,443	906	189,636	2.64
Waukegan	56,825	8,387		4,331	2,867	490	72,900	2.18
Indiana:								
Anderson								
East Chicago	124,695	3,658		27,912	15,179	2,149	183,593	3.35
Elkhart	69,239	538		2,958	7,721	1,192	81,648	2.48
Evansville	280,193	9,967		34,593	57,621	10,593	392,967	3.84
Fort Wayne	263,650	11,085	512	25,130	31,065	4,807	303,249	2.92
Gary	228,513	6,628		36,139	28,576	5,711	303,567	3.02
Hammond	175,171	4,315		26,281	17,506	2,546	225,819	3.50
Indianapolis	1,172,353	49,353	477	79,231	143,241	28,563	1,473,218	4.05
Kokomo								
Lafayette								
Michigan City								
Mishawaka	55,294	9,852		5,052	5,306	1,700	77,204	2.89
Muncie	40,206	2,245	105	8,154	5,266	1,925	58,101	2.03
New Albany	93,252	12,963		14,812	13,589	1,180	135,796	2.92
Richmond								
South Bend								
Terre Haute	184,481	8,336	371	22,074	18,808	11,005	245,075	2.35
Iowa:								
Burlington	40,423	1,819		6,071	6,069	670	55,052	2.06
Cedar Rapids ¹¹	91,096	10,178		6,269	16,920	2,164	126,627	2.26
Clinton								
Council Bluffs								
Davenport	137,558	10,191		6,402	24,204	1,774	180,129	2.97
Des Moines	344,307	58,739		123,834	39,871	8,794	575,545	4.04
Dubuque								

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.—Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Criminal police cost ¹	Cost of criminal prosecution ²	Cost of public defense of accused persons ³	Cost of criminal courts ⁴	Cost of penal and correctional institutions ⁵	Cost of probation ⁶	Total ⁷	Per capita ⁸
Iowa—Continued.								
Ottumwa							(⁹)	
Sioux City	\$172,156						(⁹)	
Waterloo	82,901							
Kansas:								
Hutchinson								
Kansas City	215,519	\$26,934		\$16,678	\$23,085	\$6,700	\$288,916	\$2.37
Topeka	103,059	9,395		16,128	10,673	2,965	142,220	2.22
Wichita								
Kentucky:								
Ashland								
Covington	117,852	6,539		11,054	12,779	2,590	150,814	2.31
Lexington	131,064	8,408		15,837		3,296	158,605	3.47
Louisville	825,378	30,022		45,946	155,136	24,317	1,080,799	3.51
Newport	83,661	4,776		5,600	15,819	1,876	111,732	3.75
Paducah								
Louisiana:								
Baton Rouge	33,740	5,312		3,550	8,000		50,602	1.65
Monroe								
New Orleans	1,182,752	77,085		247,440	283,305		1,790,582	3.91
Shreveport	167,166	14,708		10,000		3,150	227,122	2.96
Maine:								
Bangor	77,027	2,139		12,844	6,730	443	99,183	3.45
Lewiston	78,119	1,776		10,277	11,543	972	102,687	2.94
Portland	229,114	5,201		8,858	32,763	2,820	278,756	3.94
Maryland:								
Baltimore	4,093,621	53,136		177,520	167,118	2,554	4,493,949	5.59
Cumberland								
Hagerstown	37,207	4,558		7,217	13,038		62,020	2.01
Massachusetts:								
Beverly	99,508	1,988		13,506	6,360	3,617	124,979	4.98
Boston	5,102,685	95,172		1,295,526	796,018	241,640	7,531,041	9.64
Brocton								
Cambridge	514,535	8,122		56,171	43,947	3,264	626,039	6.51
Chelsea ¹¹	178,566	6,570		75,876	44,614	14,150	318,776	6.96

Chicopee	120,496	530		10,296	10,940	2,402	144,664	3.28
Everett	164,954	2,980		20,010	16,124	1,198	205,866	4.25
Fall River	492,941	6,067		43,190	26,419	4,037	572,654	4.97
Fitchburg ¹¹	113,796							
Haverhill	135,573	2,997		20,366	9,591		(⁹)	
Holyoke	235,144	1,074		17,954	22,153	5,455	173,982	3.57
Lawrence	292,677	5,837		39,660	39,660	4,039	280,364	4.96
Lowell	404,798	1,578		10,911	8,678	10,622	367,474	4.32
Lynn	284,384	6,026		40,946	19,233	634	426,457	4.27
Malden	172,881	2,938		21,246	16,441	10,967	361,606	3.54
Medford	161,275	3,055		24,850	14,765	1,221	214,727	3.70
New Bedford	520,005	7,305		51,927	31,779	6,016	209,961	3.52
Newton	319,013	6,593		45,665	35,727	4,853	615,869	5.46
Pittsfield	152,416	3,289		11,544	21,383	2,875	409,651	6.28
Quincy							191,507	3.86
Revere	94,708	4,287		58,366	36,257	10,885	204,503	5.73
Salem ¹¹	128,042	2,492		16,936	7,976	4,636	159,982	3.69
Somerville	265,743	5,168		29,241	24,977	8,162	333,291	3.21
Springfield	531,755	5,785		41,320	57,451	12,334	648,645	4.33
Taunton	113,167	1,731		12,302	7,529	1,150	135,879	3.64
Waltham	106,457	2,396		16,569	12,963	963	139,348	3.55
Worcester	932,139	11,888		51,618	39,998	19,083	1,054,726	5.40
Michigan:								
Ann Arbor	38,494	3,242		5,104	8,296	305	55,441	2.06
Battle Creek								
Bay City								
Dearborn								
Detroit	273,984	17,433		41,633	44,942	19,573	397,565	7.89
Flint	9,360,031	203,809		836,707	756,110	278,134	11,434,791	7.29
Grand Rapids ¹²	393,335	25,420		35,119	68,139	8,262	520,275	3.32
Hamtramck	381,278	17,032		43,760	24,734	2,662	469,466	2.78
Highland Park	233,803	8,315		28,190	22,819	6,560	299,687	5.33
Jackson	231,194	8,120		21,672	28,496	7,268	296,750	5.60
Kalamazoo								
Lansing	130,178	8,897		17,915	19,468	3,357	179,815	2.29
Muskegon	61,310						(⁹)	
Pontiac								
Port Huron								
Saginaw								
Wyandotte	214,236	9,414		21,203	17,117	1,456	263,426	3.26
Minnesota:								
Duluth	257,953	22,316		27,581	71,629	10,818	390,297	3.85
Minneapolis	1,232,274	96,080		80,116	195,446	60,234	1,664,150	3.58
St. Paul	714,107	23,957		36,315	86,281	24,378	885,038	3.26

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.—Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Criminal police cost ¹	Cost of criminal prosecution ²	Cost of public defense of accused persons ³	Cost of criminal courts ⁴	Cost of penal and correctional institutions ⁵	Cost of probation ⁶	Total ⁷	Per capita ⁸
Mississippi:								
Jackson	\$103,691	\$7,264		\$42,142	\$19,211		\$172,308	\$3.57
Meridian								
Missouri:								
Joplin	42,392	4,248		9,551	6,180	\$869	63,240	1.89
Kansas City	1,224,422	86,555		91,590	221,556	57,088	1,683,241	4.21
St. Joseph	156,403	15,210		16,865	28,275	6,958	233,711	2.76
St. Louis	4,814,693	96,112		299,020	433,728	68,888	5,712,441	6.95
Springfield	75,261	10,332		10,892	12,870	650	110,005	1.91
University City	53,486						(⁹)	
Montana:								
Butte	77,504	11,941		6,697	24,590		120,732	3.05
Great Falls	56,973	2,902	\$168	4,918	14,264	2,111	81,336	2.82
Nebraska:								
Lincoln	61,332	7,768		11,056	10,330	289	90,775	1.21
Omaha ¹¹	485,137	29,643	1,466	35,526	49,808	6,437	608,017	2.84
New Hampshire:								
Concord ¹¹	52,253	2,297		11,441	1,911		67,907	2.69
Manchester ¹¹	238,926						(⁹)	
Nashua ¹¹	86,937						(⁹)	
New Jersey:								
Atlantic City								
Bayonne	482,733	27,714		59,675	41,149	22,997	634,268	7.13
Belleville	101,462	3,801		9,976	11,979	2,721	129,969	4.82
Bloomfield	104,240						(⁹)	
Camden							(⁹)	
Clifton	147,798						(⁹)	
East Orange	242,899			7,212			(⁹)	
Elizabeth	297,387	29,363		32,308	5,450	7,292	371,800	3.24
Garfield							(⁹)	
Hoboken	365,711	16,172		33,595	64,449	13,362	493,289	8.32
Irvington	148,783	9,204		24,566	29,045	6,578	218,176	3.85
Jersey City	3,013,954	99,489		164,235	218,940	82,459	3,579,077	11.30
Kearney	194,665	12,960		26,447	13,782	10,749	258,603	6.35
Montclair	180,262						(⁹)	

Newark	2,547,936	111,133		323,221	351,127	79,161	3,412,578	7.71
New Brunswick								
Orange	172,059						(⁹)	
Passaic	203,684						(⁹)	
Paterson	573,851	40,774		43,100	45,549		765,274	5.08
Perth Amboy								
Plainfield								
Trenton	154,257	11,046		14,782	8,366	813	189,264	5.50
Union City	538,816	41,238		93,547	88,235	10,715	772,551	6.26
West New York	238,593	11,507		24,888	25,845	9,492	310,325	5.29
New Mexico: Albuquerque	184,146	8,805		18,723	13,844	6,846	232,364	6.26
New York:	34,790	5,179		9,448	13,022		62,439	2.35
Albany ¹¹	581,224	29,208		57,606	66,403	3,639	738,090	5.79
Amsterdam ¹¹	47,459	6,374		12,109	5,701	1,366	73,009	2.10
Auburn ¹¹	73,105	5,511		8,741	5,262	1,479	94,098	2.57
Binghamton ¹¹	227,959	9,577		21,805	39,243	3,027	301,611	3.93
Buffalo	2,672,820	71,932		197,196	303,787	93,560	3,344,295	5.84
Elmira ¹¹	128,338	5,706		20,626	4,313	4,589	163,572	3.45
Jamestown ¹¹	118,873						(⁹)	
Kingston	89,277	5,467		9,885	6,760	811	112,200	3.99
Mount Vernon	350,866	8,602		19,508	11,763	7,902	398,641	6.48
Newburgh ¹¹	83,339	6,199		10,172	7,913	3,754	111,377	3.56
New Rochelle	277,675	8,867		22,472	12,121	7,195	328,330	6.08
New York	43,161,402	1,705,051		4,602,479	3,416,118	968,815	53,753,865	7.76
Niagara Falls								
Poughkeepsie ¹¹								
Rochester	85,744	24,071		15,442	6,874	3,016	135,147	3.35
Rome	1,114,829	59,634		78,503	122,515	42,614	1,418,095	4.32
Schenectady ¹¹	37,332	8,895		10,273	8,276	743	65,519	2.03
Syracuse ¹¹	254,663	18,769		26,596	26,325	2,814	329,167	3.44
Troy ¹¹	790,936	54,255		45,840	106,738	7,194	1,004,963	4.80
Utica	247,716	18,291		32,431	30,433	3,852	332,723	4.57
Watertown	257,664	43,930		49,347	40,887	7,951	399,788	3.93
White Plains	173,787	7,603		17,301	10,392	3,995	213,078	5.95
Yonkers	761,959	19,704		54,139	53,318	13,010	902,170	6.70
North Carolina:								
Asheville								
Charlotte								
Durham	136,577	2,855		26,497	81,124		247,053	2.99
Greensboro	92,215	3,161		18,415	39,515	2,469	155,775	2.99
High Point	110,934	3,751		22,505	41,824		179,014	3.34
Raleigh	71,328	1,686		18,789	31,253		123,061	3.35
Wilmington	82,105	3,050		15,371	22,186		122,712	3.28
Winston-Salem	74,656	1,879		10,592	30,898		118,025	3.66
North Dakota: Fargo	162,754	3,394		25,412	81,587		273,147	3.63
	48,929	2,170		11,947	8,694		71,740	2.51

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.—Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Criminal police cost ¹	Cost of criminal prosecution ²	Cost of public defense of accused persons ³	Cost of criminal courts ⁴	Cost of penal and correctional institutions ⁵	Cost of probation ⁶	Total ⁷	Per capita ⁸
Ohio:								
Akron.....	\$366,358	\$29,509		\$35,584	\$129,221	\$12,138	\$572,810	\$2.25
Canton.....	184,547	18,663	\$3,493	57,772	59,804		324,279	3.09
Cincinnati.....	1,545,700	68,538		162,707	211,234		2,008,483	4.45
Cleveland.....	3,383,705	122,906	27,811	293,102	470,797	115,851	4,414,172	4.90
Cleveland Heights.....	115,698	6,433	2,074	16,121	19,553	5,879	165,758	3.25
Columbus.....	698,027	39,625	4,670	82,212	91,178	55,242	971,954	3.35
Dayton.....	488,107	31,773	4,955	35,030	41,576	15,565	620,011	3.08
East Cleveland.....	77,765	3,851		11,686	12,249	3,375	108,926	2.75
Elyria.....								
Hamilton.....	95,319	4,466		14,405	13,553	598	128,341	2.46
Lakewood.....	129,272	7,915		22,844	18,571	5,334	183,936	2.61
Lima.....								
Lorain.....							(⁹)	
Mansfield.....	58,264							
Marion.....								
Massillon.....	17,425	4,669	727	12,474	12,440		47,635	1.80
Middletown.....	48,375	3,162		8,200	11,786	202	71,725	2.39
Newark.....	51,410	4,210		8,510	17,528	2,761	84,419	2.76
Norwood.....	54,076	4,935		8,514	3,600	1,308	72,433	2.17
Portsmouth.....								
Springfield.....	87,452	7,288		7,873	34,302	5,733	142,648	2.08
Steuenville.....								
Toledo.....	1,047,459	43,017		55,321	191,482	25,328	1,362,607	4.69
Warren.....								
Youngstown.....								
Zanesville.....								
Oklahoma:								
Enid.....								
Muskogee.....								
Oklahoma City.....	272,726	29,674		28,165	69,107	4,332	404,004	2.18
Tulsa.....	269,868	20,549		59,197	81,116	6,105	436,834	3.09

Oregon:								
Portland.....								
Salem.....	1,019,471	42,722		57,223	135,121		1,254,637	4.16
Pennsylvania:								
Alquippa.....	33,446	1,049		4,587	3,867	479	43,428	1.65
Allentown.....								
Altoona.....	166,728	11,362						
Bethlehem.....	84,548	6,975		44,365	53,425	1,050	276,930	2.99
Chester.....	114,698	16,542		26,280	19,257	12,243	149,303	1.82
Easton.....	103,487	7,184		41,771	36,184	1,258	210,453	3.54
Erie.....	63,150	17,735		18,520	16,615	3,992	149,798	2.53
Harrisburg.....	218,384	49,440		29,518	24,285	1,280	135,968	3.94
Hazleton.....	132,537	15,842		21,708	44,468	3,570	337,570	2.91
Johnstown.....	36,630	4,175		74,554	22,136	1,959	252,828	3.15
Lancaster.....	151,189	31,010		11,137	9,527		61,469	1.67
Lebanon.....	102,952	4,555		33,369	30,911	4,422	250,901	3.75
McKeesport.....				11,465	17,711		136,683	2.28
Nanticoke.....	139,717							
New Castle.....	31,117	2,533					(⁹)	
Norristown.....	88,559	32,594		7,085	5,756		46,491	1.79
Philadelphia.....	55,957	5,668		22,963	15,070		159,186	3.27
Pittsburgh ¹¹	14,222,671	332,428		14,593	8,578	106	84,902	2.37
Reading.....	2,532,681	302,984		1,149,901	1,144,532	219,532	17,069,364	8.75
Scranton.....	234,549	22,758		909,708	108,289	130,043	4,303,705	6.43
Sharon.....	405,103	44,720		41,934	39,084	6,794	345,119	3.10
Wilkes-Barre.....	46,485			78,279	37,172	3,618	568,892	3.97
Wilkesburg.....	158,520	16,552					(⁹)	
Williamsport.....				46,530	37,769		259,371	2.99
York:								
Central Falls ¹¹	79,331	6,431		16,298	28,961	341	131,862	2.88
Cranston ¹²	83,159	5,439		19,767	8,921	916	118,202	2.14
Newport ¹²	46,555	1,684		10,799		2,237	61,275	2.17
Pawtucket ¹²	70,707	2,649		16,132		3,557	93,045	2.37
Providence ¹²	121,493	1,760		11,220		2,295	143,235	3.19
Woonsocket ¹²	225,718	4,838		30,904	6,487	6,425	267,885	3.47
South Carolina:								
Charleston.....	1,252,736	17,656		68,006		21,118	1,359,516	5.37
Columbia.....	239,789	3,821		20,023		4,131	267,774	5.42
Columbia.....	242,889						(⁹)	
Greenville.....	134,363	1,600		6,000	5,057		147,025	2.85
Spartanburg.....	86,117						(⁹)	
South Dakota: Sioux Falls.....								
	80,342	1,600		10,411	13,534		105,887	3.69
	54,543	6,115	213	15,813	12,510	811	90,005	2.70

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.—Cost of criminal justice in American cities, 1930—Continued

City and State	Criminal police cost ¹	Cost of criminal prosecution ²	Cost of public defense of accused persons ³	Cost of criminal courts ⁴	Cost of penal and correctional institutions ⁵	Cost of probation ⁶	Total ⁷	Per capita ⁸
Tennessee:								
Chattanooga ¹¹	\$234,658	\$21,235		\$33,185	\$139,023		\$428,101	\$3.57
Johnson City								
Knoxville	227,032	9,210		28,295	63,410		327,947	3.10
Memphis	469,829	32,039	\$4,950	105,119	191,454		803,391	3.17
Nashville	360,700	23,424		88,364	148,243		620,740	4.03
Texas:								
Amarillo ¹¹	89,004						(^c)	
Austin	79,911	9,754		18,910	14,481	\$1,784	124,840	2.35
Beaumont	94,921	12,797		21,853	20,001	1,452	151,024	2.62
Corpus Christi								
Dallas	515,985	61,877	1,500	72,850	92,132	15,964	760,308	2.92
El Paso	198,069	21,737		30,413	48,964	11,339	310,522	3.03
Fort Worth	326,012	46,640		33,159	65,515	10,674	542,000	3.32
Galveston	84,628	19,413		27,710	26,914	2,611	161,276	3.05
Houston	503,747	91,523		83,746	84,262	19,644	782,922	2.68
Laredo	35,637	8,170		10,705	19,215		73,727	2.26
Port Arthur								
San Angelo								
San Antonio	418,133	99,534		90,752	89,953	8,321	706,698	3.05
Waco	49,414	14,471		22,602	21,952	1,741	110,180	2.09
Wichita Falls	54,684	13,528		15,949	19,082	2,069	105,312	2.41
Utah:								
Ogden								
Salt Lake City	298,011	31,421		44,829	55,912	3,860	434,033	3.09
Virginia:								
Lynchburg	97,902	3,895	50	8,393	8,556	2,499	121,295	2.98
Newport News	86,732	1,383		8,326	17,500	1,061	115,022	3.34
Norfolk	450,800	2,144		33,949	23,560	5,423	515,876	3.98
Petersburg	69,033	1,251		9,046	8,992	593	88,975	3.11
Portsmouth	84,049	497	50	8,633	4,208	761	98,248	2.15
Richmond ¹⁴	573,556	5,486	275	52,676	18,067	15,377	664,437	3.63
Roanoke	159,583	3,959	375	11,611	29,577	9,019	214,124	3.09
Washington:								
Bellingham	65,396	3,058		11,311	6,724	1,475	88,864	2.88
Everett	67,767	5,411		7,549	4,175	2,123	87,025	2.85

Seattle ¹¹	1,358,562	56,051		96,451	87,048	36,944	1,635,026	4.47
Spokane	206,655						(^c)	
Tacoma ¹¹	257,355	16,200		23,045	13,669	9,458	319,727	2.99
West Virginia:								
Charleston	113,021	10,700		27,459	32,659	4,826	188,665	3.12
Clarksburg	66,475	4,181		13,028	14,270		97,954	3.39
Huntington	106,382	10,618		25,630	42,010	3,218	187,858	2.49
Parkersburg	35,863	4,279		2,990	13,271	1,022	-57,425	1.94
Wheeling	144,917	14,429		14,236	27,861	3,307	64,750	3.32
Wisconsin:								
Appleton	37,765	2,132	89	5,972	4,916		50,874	2.01
Eau Claire	45,979	4,352		5,889	12,072		69,320	2.64
Fond du Lac	54,891	1,702		9,321	6,322	1,028	72,236	2.73
Green Bay	64,975	4,136		8,282	6,882		84,275	2.25
Kenosha	172,705	10,763		14,055	12,054	12,445	222,022	4.42
La Crosse	77,060	1,488		5,933	487	2,496	87,464	2.21
Madison	104,565	8,221		17,196	2,373	10,077	142,425	2.46
Milwaukee	2,307,202	67,023		152,655	214,730	71,500	2,813,110	4.86
Oshkosh	57,192	3,757		13,911	6,349	1,148	76,396	1.90
Racine	105,262	12,301		10,846	3,452		140,043	2.07
Sheboygan	61,502	2,493	102	3,664	12,180	1,584	81,525	2.08
Superior								
West Allis	89,888	4,062		11,079	20,329	4,335	129,693	3.74
Total costs	194,119,511	8,484,059	126,621	20,144,148	20,523,410	4,415,883	243,551,915	5.47

¹ Exclusive of State police. From Table 6, supra.
² Including allowances for State prosecution in trial courts. From Table 7, supra.
³ From Table 8, supra.
⁴ Exclusive of appellate courts. From Table 9, supra.
⁵ Exclusive of State institutions. From Table 11, supra.
⁶ From Table 12, supra.
⁷ Operating cost allocable to city.
⁸ On basis of population according to 1930 census.

⁹ Data incomplete.
¹⁰ Municipal costs only.
¹¹ Figures are for the calendar year 1929.
¹² Figures are for fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1931.
¹³ Figures are adjusted to calendar year 1929.
¹⁴ Figures are for fiscal year ending Jan. 31, 1931.
¹⁵ Figures are adjusted to calendar year 1930.

Table 14 shows the average per capita cost of criminal justice for cities of different sizes.³

TABLE 14.—Average costs of administration of criminal justice in American cities, by population groups

Population group	Total population	Cost of administration of criminal justice	
		Total cost	Per capita
Over 1,000,000.....	15,004,555	\$112,380,075	\$7.40
500,000-1,000,000.....	5,703,987	30,005,538	6.35
250,000-500,000.....	7,050,228	38,145,295	4.79
100,000-250,000.....	0,032,275	25,027,473	3.01
50,000-100,000.....	5,413,000	10,008,548	3.53
25,000-50,000.....	3,707,112	11,394,080	3.08
Total.....	44,537,817	243,551,015	5.47

Table 15 shows the relationship between the direct municipal cost of criminal justice and total municipal expenditures for governmental purposes for 218 cities for which the data are available.⁴

³ Includes 272 cities for which complete studies are available. Compare p. 342, supra, note 12.

⁴ The data as to total governmental expenditures are from data collected by the Bureau of the Census for use in preparing Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000: 1929 (not yet published). Acknowledgement is made to Dr. Lemuel A. Carruthers, expert chief of division, Bureau of the Census, for cooperation in making this material available. Since the total figures are for the census year 1929, while the criminal cost figures are for the following year, the percentages given in Table 15 will be slightly too high in most instances. No figures as to total municipal governmental expenditures for 1930 are available. The census figures for 1929 are available for 250 cities only, and complete studies of direct municipal costs of criminal justice have been made for 218 of them; hence Table 15 covers 218 cities only. In a few instances, the census figures for total expenditures include allowances for county expenditures (cf. p. 160, supra); and in these instances figures as to the cost of criminal justice including allowances for county costs have been used.

TABLE 15.—Direct municipal costs of criminal justice as related to total municipal expenditures for general departments

City and State	Total municipal governmental-cost payments for operation of general departments ¹	Direct municipal cost of criminal justice	
		Amount ²	Per cent
Alabama:			
Birmingham.....	\$5,788,275	\$2,040,012	11.2
Mobile.....	1,500,708	153,003	9.9
Montgomery.....	1,250,509	179,740	13.9
Arkansas: Little Rock.....	1,054,012	173,400	10.5
California:			
Berkeley.....	3,040,450	157,235	6.2
Fresno.....	2,357,808	170,810	7.4
Long Beach.....	5,033,154	404,031	7.8
Los Angeles ³	72,204,406	7,055,780	10.0
Oakland.....	10,612,300	931,047	9.1
Pasadena.....	4,070,117	247,063	7.1
Sacramento.....	4,058,307	288,198	7.1
San Diego.....	4,005,410	443,880	8.0
San Francisco ⁴	28,000,112	3,002,825	14.0
Stockton.....	2,027,107	140,313	7.4
Colorado:			
Denver ⁵	12,023,080	1,108,860	8.8
Colorado Springs.....	1,244,076	72,714	5.8
Pueblo.....	1,230,001	108,098	8.8
Connecticut:			
Bridgeport.....	0,234,702	603,658	10.6
Hartford.....	7,015,083	880,067	11.2
New Britain.....	2,440,181	200,306	10.7
Stamford.....	2,232,340	109,702	8.8
Waterbury.....	4,340,047	374,894	8.6
Delaware: Wilmington.....	2,035,252	356,010	12.1
District of Columbia: Washington ⁶	20,337,347	4,485,137	15.3
Florida:			
Jacksonville.....	4,145,400	450,504	10.0
Miami.....	3,081,080	471,704	11.8
Georgia:			
Atlanta.....	8,014,180	907,220	11.3
Augusta.....	1,622,355	130,765	8.1
Macon.....	1,207,181	90,492	6.0
Columbus.....	1,049,756	129,114	12.3
Savannah.....	1,890,970	255,193	13.5
Illinois:			
Aurora.....	1,128,051	93,438	8.3
Chicago ⁷	148,778,907	22,437,169	15.1
Cicero.....	1,825,072	113,520	6.2
Danville.....	845,033	60,911	7.2
Decatur.....	1,307,711	84,130	6.4
East St. Louis.....	1,084,010	126,322	7.5
Elgin.....	011,285	58,505	6.4
Evanston.....	2,020,730	246,034	9.4
Joliet.....	1,198,703	75,180	6.3
Moline.....	865,065	41,808	4.8
Oak Park.....	1,895,117	120,371	6.4
Peoria.....	2,520,240	209,504	8.3
Quincy.....	923,175	82,122	8.0
Rockford.....	2,226,998	181,087	8.2
Rock Island.....	742,500	36,579	4.0
Springfield.....	1,804,441	155,072	8.6
Indiana:			
East Chicago.....	1,001,770	151,120	9.1
Evansville.....	2,513,700	312,543	12.4
Fort Wayne.....	3,151,791	273,327	8.7
Gary.....	3,425,440	244,711	7.1
Hammond.....	1,862,880	187,409	10.1
Indianapolis.....	14,470,301	1,473,218	10.2
Muncie.....	1,142,620	108,257	9.5
South Bend.....	2,017,328	194,323	6.7
Iowa:			
Cedar Rapids.....	1,512,036	92,350	6.1
Davenport.....	1,702,388	141,138	8.3

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.—Direct municipal costs of criminal justice as related to total municipal expenditures for general departments—Continued

City and State	Total municipal governmental-cost payments for operation of general departments ¹	Direct municipal cost of criminal justice	
		Amount ²	Per cent
Iowa—Continued.			
Des Moines.....	\$4,831,005	\$380,482	8.0
Sloux City.....	2,537,053	172,150	6.8
Kansas:			
Kansas City.....	2,852,407	224,600	7.9
Topoka.....	1,003,028	105,834	5.3
Kentucky:			
Covington.....	1,348,543	131,340	9.7
Lexington.....	1,411,444	4,878	0.3
Louisville ³	10,037,503	1,080,790	10.2
Louisiana:			
New Orleans ⁴	13,995,356	1,700,582	12.8
Shreveport.....	1,813,780	177,108	9.8
Maine:			
Lewiston.....	758,689	74,027	9.8
Portland.....	2,701,601	216,030	7.8
Maryland: Baltimore ⁴	30,014,995	4,493,040	15.0
Massachusetts:			
Boston.....	53,871,022	7,531,041	14.0
Cambridge.....	5,848,874	514,635	8.8
Chelsea.....	2,051,033	178,569	8.7
Chicopee.....	1,407,920	120,490	8.2
Everett.....	2,090,033	164,954	7.9
Fall River.....	4,870,000	402,041	10.1
Fitchburg.....	1,704,524	113,700	6.3
Haverhill.....	2,076,835	135,673	6.5
Holyoke.....	2,708,929	235,144	8.7
Lawrence.....	3,414,150	292,677	8.6
Lowell.....	3,032,420	404,708	10.3
Lynn.....	3,003,434	284,384	7.3
Malden.....	2,160,012	172,881	8.0
Medford.....	2,100,001	161,275	7.6
New Bedford.....	5,022,949	520,005	10.4
Newton.....	3,508,700	310,013	8.0
Pittsfield.....	1,788,010	152,416	8.5
Salem.....	1,692,425	128,012	7.0
Somerville.....	3,412,810	265,743	7.8
Springfield.....	8,030,098	634,755	6.7
Taunton.....	1,368,719	113,107	8.3
Waltham.....	1,728,048	100,457	6.2
Worcester.....	0,974,037	932,130	0.3
Michigan:			
Detroit ³	75,500,460	11,434,701	15.1
Flint.....	5,340,883	414,047	7.7
Grand Rapids.....	0,118,713	400,028	6.7
Hamtramck.....	2,404,460	200,010	10.8
Highland Park.....	3,031,178	252,800	8.3
Lansing.....	2,420,307	138,850	5.7
Muskegon.....	1,515,432	61,310	4.0
Saginaw.....	2,401,754	218,397	9.1
Minnesota:			
Duluth.....	3,000,369	305,749	7.6
Minneapolis ³	10,240,536	1,064,150	8.6
St. Paul.....	8,155,140	781,031	9.6
Missouri:			
Kansas City ³	10,185,805	1,083,241	10.4
Springfield.....	1,170,120	78,410	6.7
St. Joseph.....	1,092,788	162,001	8.2
St. Louis ⁴	33,255,974	5,712,441	17.2
Montana: Butte.....	1,093,558	91,247	8.3
Nebraska:			
Lincoln.....	2,204,727	63,053	2.9
Omaha.....	0,020,710	602,789	7.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.—Direct municipal costs of criminal justice as related to total municipal expenditures for general departments—Continued

City and State	Total municipal governmental-cost payments for operation of general departments ¹	Direct municipal cost of criminal justice	
		Amount ²	Per cent
New Hampshire: Manchester.....	\$2,200,060	\$235,920	10.8
New Jersey:			
Bayonne.....	4,745,044	400,077	10.5
East Orange.....	2,814,000	250,111	8.9
Elizabeth.....	3,087,001	302,007	7.0
Hoboken.....	3,200,123	372,719	11.3
Jersey City ³	10,450,170	3,570,077	18.4
Newark ³	20,802,112	3,412,578	11.4
Orange.....	1,470,118	175,087	11.0
Passaic.....	3,043,424	203,084	6.7
Paterson.....	0,128,521	583,020	9.5
Trenton.....	5,000,705	543,105	9.8
Union City.....	2,403,705	244,503	9.0
New York:			
Albany.....	5,504,010	503,861	10.8
Amsterdam.....	1,200,106	51,700	4.1
Auburn.....	1,081,413	75,083	7.0
Binghamton.....	3,804,031	237,053	6.2
Buffalo ³	33,544,166	3,344,205	10.0
Elmira.....	1,761,566	130,270	7.0
Jamestown.....	1,830,804	128,561	7.0
Mount Vernon.....	3,334,433	304,120	10.9
Newburgh.....	1,286,803	87,814	6.8
New Rochelle.....	3,830,552	292,764	7.6
New York.....	381,402,635	53,763,805	14.1
Poughkeepsie.....	1,764,615	91,930	5.2
Rochester ³	20,480,428	1,418,095	6.0
Schenectady.....	4,815,095	264,456	5.5
Syracuse.....	0,871,007	811,615	8.2
Troy.....	2,020,401	258,212	8.8
Utica.....	4,163,079	275,624	6.0
Yonkers.....	8,431,470	824,578	9.8
North Carolina:			
Charlotte.....	1,836,257	145,410	7.0
Durham.....	1,213,002	92,215	7.6
Greensboro.....	1,232,409	130,986	11.1
Wilmington.....	803,097	74,059	9.3
Winston-Salem.....	1,764,434	184,578	10.5
Ohio:			
Akron.....	7,120,670	410,045	5.8
Canton.....	3,151,076	201,013	6.4
Cincinnati ³	21,637,980	2,008,483	9.3
Cleveland ³	43,403,026	4,414,172	10.1
Columbus.....	8,792,903	750,558	8.5
Dayton.....	5,848,795	512,601	8.8
Hamilton.....	1,195,157	103,433	8.7
Lakewood.....	2,232,900	143,124	6.4
Springfield.....	1,877,091	91,763	4.9
Toledo.....	10,830,477	1,130,333	10.4
Oklahoma:			
Oklahoma City.....	3,110,348	278,927	8.9
Tulsa.....	3,692,207	300,008	8.3
Oregon: Portland.....	9,810,871	1,036,500	10.6
Pennsylvania:			
Allentown.....	2,360,228	172,608	7.3
Altoona.....	1,833,462	90,096	4.8
Boylehem.....	1,514,477	110,811	7.0
Chester.....	1,372,804	103,487	7.5
Easton.....	1,288,188	65,147	5.1
Erie.....	3,231,568	218,384	6.8
Harrisburg.....	2,083,659	138,537	6.2
Hazleton.....	890,444	36,030	3.7
Johnstown.....	2,160,805	157,127	7.3
Lancaster.....	1,411,549	102,052	7.3
McKeesport.....	1,553,042	130,717	9.0
New Castle.....	1,483,030	89,401	6.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.—Direct municipal costs of criminal justice as related to total municipal expenditures for general departments—Continued

City and State	Total municipal governmental-cost payments for operation of general departments ¹	Direct municipal cost of criminal justice	
		Amount ²	Per cent
Pennsylvania—Continued.			
Norristown.....	\$788,241	\$55,957	7.1
Philadelphia.....	92,744,470	17,000,864	18.4
Pittsburgh.....	35,824,298	4,303,705	12.0
Reading.....	3,254,860	234,649	7.2
Seranton.....	4,507,860	405,103	9.0
Wilkes-Barre.....	2,778,734	158,520	5.7
Williamsport.....	1,195,461	79,331	6.6
York.....	1,326,810	83,159	6.3
Rhode Island:			
Pawtucket.....	2,230,678	223,823	10.3
Providence.....	10,287,608	1,264,845	12.3
Woonsocket.....	1,456,505	242,976	16.7
South Carolina:			
Columbia.....	1,219,340	134,368	11.0
Charleston.....	1,593,475	242,889	15.2
Tennessee:			
Chattanooga.....	2,129,324	253,258	11.9
Knoxville.....	2,775,904	232,899	8.4
Memphis.....	5,495,259	504,956	9.2
Nashville.....	3,493,007	429,633	12.3
Texas:			
Austin.....	1,190,248	77,664	6.5
Beaumont.....	1,247,551	107,246	8.6
Dallas.....	6,633,830	544,672	8.2
El Paso.....	2,227,370	191,357	8.6
Fort Worth.....	4,159,883	388,644	9.3
Galveston.....	1,469,443	83,153	5.7
Houston.....	7,572,198	535,689	7.1
San Antonio.....	5,492,579	440,642	8.2
Waco.....	1,235,347	55,669	4.5
Wichita Falls.....	1,030,603	53,985	5.2
Utah: Salt Lake City.....	4,173,500	323,665	7.8
Virginia:			
Lynchburg.....	1,217,823	121,180	10.0
Newport News.....	897,052	113,743	12.7
Norfolk.....	4,209,545	508,207	12.1
Petersburg.....	745,092	87,888	11.8
Portsmouth.....	1,050,685	95,001	9.3
Richmond.....	5,721,070	650,989	11.4
Roanoke.....	1,760,389	212,223	12.1
Washington:			
Seattle.....	16,678,004	1,635,026	9.8
Spokane.....	3,608,141	208,655	5.7
Tacoma.....	3,617,754	262,356	7.3
West Virginia:			
Charleston.....	1,309,858	125,571	9.2
Huntington.....	2,023,333	114,946	5.7
Wheeling.....	1,843,620	150,029	8.1
Wisconsin:			
Green Bay.....	1,218,440	65,280	5.4
Kenosha.....	1,093,456	179,224	9.0
LaCrosse.....	1,110,676	77,335	7.0
Madison.....	2,430,856	104,565	4.3
Milwaukee.....	23,212,990	2,813,110	10.0
Oshkosh.....	1,306,244	67,192	4.4
Racine.....	2,017,530	105,262	5.2
Shoboygan.....	1,241,313	63,489	5.1

¹ From census data collected for Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000: 1929 (not yet published). The figures are for the census year 1929. See p. 334, supra, note 4. They include allowances for county cost only where specifically indicated.

² Direct municipal cost only, except where otherwise indicated.

³ Includes city's share of county expenditures.

⁴ City and county government consolidated.

CHAPTER VI

PLAN FOR COMPLETION OF INVESTIGATION

1. *Introductory.*—The cost of administration of criminal justice differs in different communities. Some of the causes of this variation may be assumed to be due to differences in the intrinsic character of those communities—their size, location, racial composition, industrial character, etc. Other causes may perhaps be found in community characteristics more readily susceptible of voluntary change, such as form of government and the character and organization of law enforcement machinery. Still another factor resulting in such variation may be looked for in the manner in which the agencies of crime prevention and law enforcement are administered, whether efficiently or inefficiently, whether honestly or corruptly. To some extent, also, differences in the cost of criminal justice may be the result of variations in prevailing wage scales and living standards as between different communities. Moreover, the cost of criminal justice and the amount of crime in the community may be expected to have some relationship—probably a complicated one, since, on the one hand, expenditures for criminal law enforcement may be expected to be increased as crime increases, while, on the other hand, increased expenditures for criminal justice may be expected, other things being equal, to reduce the amount of crime in a given community.

Any comparative analysis of costs of criminal justice must take account of such community factors if significant results are to be obtained. The mere fact that one city spends more per capita than another in the administration of criminal justice proves nothing as to the relative economy and efficiency of administration in those two cities,⁵ and is of little significance for any purpose. It is only by analyzing the causes for such variations and making allowance for irrelevant correlants that useful results can be obtained.

The making of such a complete analysis of costs of administering criminal justice for the 300 cities covered by the study here discussed is a task of large magnitude. Never-

⁵ Compare the discussion of the use of cost figures for comparative purposes in pts. 4 (pp. 203-204, supra) and 5 (pp. 226-227, 241-242, supra).

theless, it had been the intention of the writers of this part of the report to attempt that analysis, and, to facilitate making it, the field investigators were asked to include in their reports a considerable amount of data as to the cities studied in addition to data as to costs.⁶ It has been impossible to carry this plan to completion, first, because the reports of the field investigations could not be finished in time,⁷ and, second, because a large part of the data as to community factors, in the form of material collected by the Census, which it was originally thought would be in hand for use, have not yet become fully available.⁸ For these reasons, this part is to a considerable extent a progress report only, and not a final and definitive report of a completed investigation.⁹

We are able, however, to report substantial progress. The field work planned has been completed; the basic cost data are presented in Chapter V of this part in readily available form for future use; a careful canvass has been made of the additional data necessary for the completion of the study; and a definite plan for completing it has been developed.

2. *Objective of investigation.*—The objective of the present study has been the analysis by modern statistical methods of the cost of criminal justice in representative American cities in the light of community conditions, the ascertainment of the factors on which that cost depends, and the determination, if possible, of optimum expenditures for criminal justice in cities of various types. In other words, its ultimate purpose is the development, in so far as possible, of municipal standards of expenditure in the field of criminal justice which may be used to measure the efficiency of criminal law enforcement in urban communities.

This objective will obviously be a difficult one to attain. The data are highly complex, and the process of analysis and

⁶ See Chap. II of the manual for the study (pp. 518-524, *infra*).

⁷ These reports were finally due May 1, 1931, but some were not received until over a month later. This left barely sufficient time to check and tabulate the basic figures, and none for detailed analysis.

⁸ See Instruction Circular No. 4 (pp. 639-640, *infra*) for an indication of some of the data which did not become available in time.

⁹ Cf. p. 245, *supra*.

interpretation must be carried out with the greatest caution if potentially misleading results are to be avoided. Nevertheless, while realizing fully the difficulties involved, the writers of this progress report believe that the task is one which may be accomplished, at least in part. It is believed that most of the difficulties which will be met may be made to yield to the application of appropriate statistical methods, and that the completion of the study may, in the language of one of the members of our advisory group, result in the development of "new techniques for handling comparative governmental and social facts."¹⁰

3. *Community data.*—The first essential step toward the ultimate goal of developing objective standards of efficiency and economy in the administration of criminal justice is, in our judgment, a detailed analysis of the extent to which the cost of criminal justice is related to intrinsic community factors and to the form and organization of machinery for local government and for the administration of the criminal law. Before useful comparisons of cost can be made, the effect of various community characteristics must be understood. If, for example, the total cost of administering the criminal law in city A is twice as high as in city B, but because of the fact that city A has twice the population of city B, the difference in cost proves nothing. Similarly, if the per capita cost of criminal justice in city C exceeds that of city D, but because city C has a large illiterate slum population while city D is a rich residential suburb, no conclusions as to relative efficiency of administration can be drawn from the difference in cost. It is essential, therefore, that the data as to costs be analyzed in relation to significant indices of community conditions.

We will not undertake to discuss in detail the various community data which should be investigated statistically in relation to the cost of criminal justice.¹¹ Mention may be

¹⁰ See the remarks of Dr. Luther Gulick, director of the National Institute of Public Administration, reprinted in the outline of the project for the present study distributed to the field investigators (Appendix D, p. 632, *infra*).

¹¹ Some of the kinds of community data requiring consideration are discussed in the manual used in the field investigations. See pp. 518-524, *infra*.

made, however, of such obvious factors as population,¹² geographic location and character, racial composition and nativity stock,¹³ population density and overcrowding, industrial character, labor conditions,¹⁴ form of governmental organization, distribution of community wealth, illiteracy and other educational factors, and public health conditions. We would not be understood as regarding this enumeration of community factors and characteristics having a possible relation to crime and the cost of criminal justice as complete, nor as taking the position that all the factors enumerated will be found on analysis to have in fact significant correlations with the cost data presented in this report; we merely refer to them as indicating the kind of community data requiring consideration. Some of the enumerated factors might well be found on statistical analysis to be irrelevant, and other factors not enumerated would no doubt require consideration.

A large part of the data necessary is believed to be readily available for study. The United States census for 1930, for example, will provide a large amount of information as to racial composition and other characteristics of the population of the cities being studied, as to occupational distribution and certain other economic factors, and as to certain

¹² An inspection of the cost figures given in Table 14, supra (p. 334), indicates that not only does the total cost of criminal justice increase with increase in population, but that the per capita cost also increases. Compare Mead, *Police Statistics, Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 89 (1929). Two reasons for this may be suggested. In the first place, the larger the city, the larger the personnel of the agencies for administering the criminal law must be, and the larger those agencies are, the greater the proportion of personnel that must be devoted to supervisory and overhead duties. A squad of 8 men may be efficiently commanded by 1 man, and a company of 250 men may be commanded, administered, and supplied by officers and noncommissioned officers forming only 20 per cent of its strength, but an army of 300,000 men must have over 50 per cent of its strength devoted to supervisory and overhead duties. The same principles apply to police forces, and in lesser degree, because the number of persons involved is less, to prosecuting offices, courts, and probation agencies. In the second place, it may be that there is a greater likelihood of crime in the larger cities, so that the larger the city the greater the expenditure required to keep down crime. These are tentative suggestions only; further analysis of the figures and study of the results of such analysis is needed.

¹³ Compare National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Crime and the Foreign Born*, pp. 91-96.

¹⁴ Compare Winslow, *Relationships between Employment and Crime Fluctuations as shown by Massachusetts Statistics in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report of the Causes of Crime*, vol. I, pp. 255-310.

educational factors.¹⁵ Other significant data as to community conditions are known to be available.¹⁶ Much, at least, of the necessary analysis of the cost data in relation to community characteristics can therefore be carried out without further field investigation.

4. *Data as to amount of crime.*—Any satisfactory comparative study of the cost of criminal justice must take account of the amount of crime in the communities under consideration. If, for example, the per capita expenditure for law enforcement in city X is twice as great as in city Y, this might at first glance be regarded as tending to show that the government of city X was the less economically administered—but, if we know, in addition, that city X has only one-third as much violent crime as city Y, a very different conclusion may be indicated.

As is stated in a recent report to the commission on criminal statistics: "The best index of the number and nature of offenses committed is police statistics showing offenses known to the police"; where such statistics are unavailable or inaccurate, "police statistics of arrests or court statistics of prosecutions commenced are commonly used as the best available indication of the number and nature of crimes committed."¹⁷ The use of statistics of the latter class as an index of amount of crime is subject to the serious objection that they are in many cases much more an index of official activity; a small number of prosecutions, for example, might well be related to a large amount of crime which flourished because it was not prosecuted. Moreover, statistics of arrests and prosecutions are not available on a nation-wide scale. The extent and value of existing statistics of these sorts are discussed in the commission's *Report on Criminal Statis-*

¹⁵ See the community data presented in Ch. I of the model Rochester report (pp. 561-574, *infra*). Such data will be available in the near future for all the cities studied.

¹⁶ Data of this character has been used by one of the authors of this part of the report (Doctor Franzen) in making comparative studies of public health conditions in urban communities.

¹⁷ See Warner, *Survey of Criminal Statistics in the United States, in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics*, p. 25. Compare Mead, *Police Statistics, Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 76 (1929).

tics,¹⁸ where it is pointed out that the available figures are neither comparable nor complete. Hence, if any index of amount of crime is to be made use of, it must be that furnished by statistics as to offenses known to the police.

Since January, 1930, statistics as to certain specified classes of offenses known to the police have been collected and published for most of the larger cities of the country. For the first eight months of 1930 these figures were compiled by the committee on uniform crime records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and since that time have been compiled by the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. The data as to number of offenses are secured directly from the police departments of the reporting cities, and are made up by those departments in accordance with a manual of instructions provided by the International Association of Chiefs of Police.¹⁹ The offenses covered are (1) homicide, divided into (a) murder and non-negligent manslaughter, and (b) manslaughter by negligence;²⁰ (2) rape;²¹ (3) robbery; (4) aggravated assault; (5) burglary; (6) larceny (other than auto theft), divided into (a) larceny of property valued at \$50 and over, and (b) larceny of property valued at less than \$50; and (7) auto theft. These so-called "Part I offenses" are those which it is believed may be expected to be known to the police in most cases even though no arrest is made,²² and are distinguished from Part II offenses,²³ where it is improbable in many instances that the offense will be known to the police unless some one is actually arrested. Figures as to Part I offenses known to the police were reported for the entire year 1930 by the police departments of 259 of the 365 cities of the country over 25,000 in population, including most of the

larger cities,²⁴ and are available for 216 of the 272 cities of that group for which complete cost studies have been made.²⁵

Theoretically these police statistics of offenses should make it possible to work out a set of reasonably satisfactory indices of the amount of crime in the cities covered. The types of crimes included among Part I offenses are the most common forms of serious offenses against the person and direct crimes against property, and the total number of such offenses is of considerable significance as indicating the amount of crime in a given community. In any case, moreover, it is the only index available, since it is impossible to secure accurate figures as to the number of Part II offenses committed or as to the amount of such crimes as commercialized fraud and racketeering.²⁶ The question, therefore, is whether the available police statistics of offenses are sufficiently reliable to be used as indices of crime conditions.

Serious questions have been raised as to the reliability of these statistics.²⁷ The problem of determining whether the defects of the data are such that figures as to Part I offenses known to the police can not be used as an index of the amount of crime in American cities is one which, in our judgment, can be solved only by the application of modern methods of statistical analysis to these figures. Limitations of time and funds have prevented us from doing this, and we, therefore, are not in a position to express any opinion as to whether or to what extent the existing data as to Part I offenses known to the police would prove to be usable in making a comparative analysis of the cost and efficiency of municipal criminal justice in American communities. The making of such a detailed statistical examination of existing police statistics of offenses will not only be an important

¹⁸ See pp. 34-36 (statistics of arrests); pp. 50-60 (court statistics).

¹⁹ Uniform Crime Reporting (New York, 1929).

²⁰ Largely deaths resulting from automobile accidents.

²¹ Including statutory rape. The propriety of including rape in this classification seems doubtful in the extreme.

²² This is not true of statutory rape of (cf. note 21, supra), but is true in the main of the other crimes classed as Part I offenses.

²³ Such as violating traffic laws, liquor laws, unlawful possession of weapons, sex offenses generally, etc. Some serious crimes, such as embezzlement, are included in Part II offenses. For a discussion of the basis for the distinction, see Uniform Crime Reporting, pp. 24, 25, 180.

²⁴ New York is not included, and the figures for Chicago are incomplete, but 73.0 per cent of the cities of the country over 100,000 in population are included.

²⁵ For a complete list of these cities, see Appendix G to this report (pp. 644-654, *infra*). Acknowledgment is made to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, director, and Mr. J. J. Waters, statistician, Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, for cooperation in supplying these data.

²⁶ See pp. 400-413, *infra*.

²⁷ See Warner, Survey of Criminal Statistics in the United States, in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 52-55.

preliminary study to be made in carrying out the investigation and analysis of the data presented here which we recommend,²⁸ but should also assist in the improvement of the police statistics.²⁹

5. *Plan for completing investigation.*—The next step toward completing the study of municipal costs of criminal justice begun under the auspices of the commission is a detailed statistical analysis of the basic cost data, secured as a result of the field investigation now completed, in relation to community facts and conditions. As a part of this analysis, it will be possible to appraise more exactly the accuracy and reliability of the cost data, and to determine whether any of these figures should be discarded and what weight should be given to those which are used. This will require careful preliminary study to determine what the scope of the analysis should be and what additional data as to the cities included in the study should be obtained. Before the actual work of analysis is begun, the additional data tentatively determined to be desirable should be assembled. When these preliminary steps have been taken, a detailed plan for the detailed study of all the data can be prepared, appropriate data sheets filled out for each city to be included in the study, and punch-cards prepared for Hollerith analysis. The precise details of the statistical analysis which should be made will not be set forth here—indeed, such details can not be satisfactorily worked out until the preliminary steps outlined above have been taken—but it may be said, in general, that all possible correlations of the data should be attempted, and that the progress of the statistical work must involve constant experimentation and the bringing into the analysis of additional community data whenever the desirability of doing so is indicated by current study of the tentative results obtained.

We believe that such a detailed analysis, carried out without preconceived ideas as to the results to be expected

²⁸ See p. 348, *infra*. The detailed police figures for 1930 for cities over 25,000 in population are given in Appendix G to this report (pp. 644-654, *infra*) as an aid to such preliminary study, not because we regard those figures as being of proven accuracy.

²⁹ The desirability of perfecting these statistics has been emphasized by the commission. See Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 15.

or desired, and guided throughout by the principles of modern statistical method, will result in the ascertainment of whatever significant relationships exist in the data. After these relationships have been worked out, the problem of interpretation will arise. This will require much caution, and must be guided throughout by close adherence to the facts shown by statistical analysis and by expert knowledge of the actual workings of the machinery of criminal justice. Finally, when analysis and interpretation are completed, it will be possible to present a definitive report of the investigation which will exhaust the possibilities of the data.

6. *Desirability of completing investigation.*—The completion of the investigation along the lines indicated in the preceding section is, we believe, desirable for four reasons. In the first place, it will greatly increase the usefulness of the basic data collected as the result of the cooperative investigation on a nation-wide basis which has already been made.³⁰ These data are useful in themselves, but their value will be much greater if the study contemplated when their collection was undertaken, and with a view to which they were collected, is fully carried out. Second, the study contemplates a pioneer effort to apply modern statistical methods to social and governmental data, which, whether it turns out to be successful or not, is believed to be worth making. The basic data are available, a definite plan has been worked out for the study, and a favorable opportunity for investigating the feasibility of developing new techniques which may turn out to be of general importance and value is presented. Third, there is a possibility of developing comparative figures as to the cost and efficiency of criminal law administration in American cities. The value of such figures, if they can be developed, does not require emphasis. Finally, it is possible that at least a beginning may be made in the development of norms or standards as regards efficiency and expense in the administration of criminal justice in urban communities which will make possible scientific and objective judgment of this aspect of public administration in the

³⁰ These data have been collected as a result of the arduous labor of literally hundreds of public-spirited individuals, and at considerable expense. It would be unfortunate if the results of all this work and expenditure of money were not used in such a way as to be of maximum value.

future. The potential importance of success of the study in this respect can hardly, we think, be overestimated.

Whether or not all the possibilities which we believe to be inherent in the present study can be realized is, of course, problematical. No one can say what the study will yield until it has been completed. It may be that the data are so complex that statistical method can only, in the words of Mr. Justice Stone, "be used to indicate tendencies * * * and to point the direction which should be given to * * * investigation of a nonstatistical character."³¹ Or it may be that, so far as the particular subject-matter is concerned, the methods of modern statistical analysis will be found to have a broader usefulness. We do not know. We do believe that it is worth while to complete the projected study and to determine to what extent the possibilities inherent in it can be realized.

7. *Recommendation.*—We recommend to the commission that the study of the cost of municipal criminal justice in its broad aspects, which has been completed in part during the life of the commission, be carried to full completion along the lines which we have indicated. To complete the investigation will require some expenditure of money for the statistical analysis of the data and the publication of the results. It seems to us immaterial whether the study is finished, as it was begun, under the auspices of the Federal Government, or whether its completion is sponsored and financed by some responsible private organization in the governmental research field; but we do recommend that some means of completing the study be found. We believe that the results to be expected are such as will more than justify the relatively small expenditure required to carry the study to completion.

³¹ Book review of *Criminal Justice in Cleveland*, Harvard Law Review, vol. 35, p. 908 (1922), quoted in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 28.

PART 7

PRIVATE EXPENDITURES FOR PROTECTION AGAINST CRIME

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON and SYDNEY WALDECKER *

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—This part of the report analyzes the various kinds of expenditures by private individuals and organizations for the prevention and detection of crime, and for the correctional treatment of criminals. It has been impossible to secure exact and comprehensive quantitative data as to such costs,¹ and this part, therefore, will not attempt to present total figures as to private expenditures for protection against crime, but rather will describe the various kinds of expenditures of this character which have been and are being made in this country, and will present illustrative quantitative data where possible. In this way, while no total figures will be given, a general descriptive account of the character and importance of this aspect of the cost of crime will be presented.

2. *Classes of private expenditures.*—Private expenditures for protection against crime are of the same general character, analytically, as certain classes of public expenditures for the administration of criminal justice. The function performed is basically the same in each case; the difference is primarily in the source of the funds expended.

The principal phase of criminal justice with respect to which public administration is supplemented by private expenditures is police. Here the activities of the uniformed patrol force in suppressing and preventing crime and arresting criminals are supplemented by private protective

* The investigations reported in this part of the report were planned and directed, and the text of this part has been prepared, by Mr. Simpson. Mr. Waldecker prepared the detailed cost data presented and is responsible for its completeness and accuracy.

¹ See pp. 52-53, supra.

agencies, devices and services.² Moreover, the detective activities of the police are supplemented by private detective agencies and organizations.

The function of prosecution is not ordinarily, in this country,³ exercised at private expense. A few jurisdictions do permit the victim of a crime, or his family, to employ and pay special prosecuting counsel, but in most cases the public prosecutor has exclusive charge. Moreover, even where private prosecution is permitted, it is comparatively rare in practice, and the amounts expended are small. Private expenditures for prosecution will therefore be disregarded in this discussion.

The penal and correctional treatment of criminals and delinquents is carried out primarily by public agencies, but in some instances private expenditures for this purpose may be made. This is particularly true in the case of delinquent minors, who are sometimes committed to privately supported institutions, or placed under the tutelage of private probation agencies.⁴

The field of private expenditures to be discussed in this part thus includes expenditures for private police service, and expenditures for private penal and correctional treatment. The police expenditures are much the more important and varied, and require subdivision. Hence the following chapters will deal with (a) expenditures for protective agencies; (b) expenditures for protective devices and services; (c) expenditures for detective agencies; and (d) expenditures for private correctional treatment of criminals and delinquents.

3. *Method of investigation.*—The material presented in the following chapters has been assembled almost entirely from original sources. Very little work has been done on the subject, so far as can be judged from the published material available,⁵ and resort to a wide variety of sources was nec-

² For a discussion of the distinction, made for purposes of this discussion, between protective agencies, devices, and services, see p. 351, *infra*.

³ As to the situation in England, where private prosecution is permitted to a limited extent, see Howard, *Criminal Prosecution in England*, *Columbia Law Review*, vol. 20, p. 715 (1920).

⁴ See pp. 51-52, *supra*.

⁵ The only satisfactory published study found was Shalloo, *The Private Police of Pennsylvania*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 55 (1920).

essary. Most of the material was assembled through correspondence and personal interviews.⁶

CHAPTER II

COST OF PROTECTIVE AGENCIES

1. *Protective agencies, devices and services.*—Methods of protection against crime may involve primarily the activity of human beings, or may primarily depend upon the resistance or warning power of inanimate devices, or may make use of both to an important extent. For purposes of the present discussion, those methods of protection which involve, primarily, the activities of human beings will be termed protective agencies; those which rely primarily on inanimate mechanisms or devices will be termed protective devices; and those which employ both human beings and mechanical devices will be termed protective services.

The distinction between these three classes of protective methods is, of course, by no means a sharp one. An ordinary watchman will frequently be armed with a revolver, an inanimate device; a burglar alarm may be worthless unless some human being hears the alarm and takes action; and so with almost all protective agencies and devices. But there is a clear practical distinction, as will appear in the following discussion, and it is believed that the three-fold classification adopted will justify itself as a matter of convenience, if not as a matter of strict logic.

This chapter will deal with private expenditures for protective agencies; protective devices and services will be discussed in the next chapter.

2. *Kinds of protective agencies.*—All private protective agencies involve the employment of one or more individuals to act as private policemen. Not all such individuals have

⁶ The work of assembling the material on private police expenditures was largely carried out by Mr. Sydney Waldecker, of the New York bar. Material was also made available by Prof. Jeremiah P. Shalloo, of the University of Pennsylvania, and by Capt. George F. Lumb, secretary for industrial police, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa. Assistance in securing material as to private costs of penal and correctional treatment of delinquents was rendered by Miss Alice Johnston, formerly of the staff of the Girl's Service League, New York, N. Y., and by Mr. A. O. Dawson, vice-president of the Big Brother Movement of Greater New York. Acknowledgement is made to these individuals for their cooperation, and also to the numerous persons and organizations who supplied detailed data on various particular topics.

general police authority, but all of them function in preventing and suppressing criminal acts in a police capacity. In the usual case, private protective agencies protect property, although, in somewhat exceptional instances, they may be employed to protect the persons of individuals.

Private protective agencies may best be classified with regard to their size, permanence, and degree of organization. There is a wide difference between the individual night watchman of a small building or plant and large organized, uniformed private police forces such as the industrial police of Pennsylvania—and there are many gradations between the two. While exact classification is impossible, it will be convenient to consider the following general classes of private protective agencies: (a) private police forces; (b) private policemen and guards; and (c) watchmen.

3. *Private police forces.*—The largest and best known private police forces are the industrial police of Pennsylvania⁷ and the police forces of the various railroad companies. Such private forces have a definite organization and a distinctive badge (in some cases, as in the case of the industrial police, a uniform), and are vested with substantial police powers, either by statute, as in the case of the industrial police⁸ and the railroad police in some States, or by designation of the members of the force as deputy sheriffs or as other peace officers. The main functions of such forces in ordinary times are the maintenance of the peace on and near the property of the large corporations which employ them, and the prevention and detection of minor crimes. In times of labor trouble, however, their primary function frequently becomes that of protection of their employers' properties.

No exact figures as to the total cost of the industrial police of Pennsylvania are available, but an estimate is possible. On May 15, 1931, 69 companies employed police,

⁷ Formerly the coal and iron police. The name was changed by statute April 18, 1929. The governor of Pennsylvania has recently announced that the industrial police will be abolished June 30, 1931, by the wholesale exercise of his statutory power to cancel industrial police commissions.

⁸ The industrial police are commissioned by the State, and have their own bureau in the State government under a secretary for industrial police who is responsible to the governor, but are paid by the private companies which employ them.

and 1,050 industrial police commissions were in effect.⁹ This is less than have been outstanding in the past.¹⁰ The average salaries of such police may be estimated at approximately \$1,200 a year,¹¹ and, on this basis, the annual cost of the industrial police may be estimated as being at least \$1,260,000.¹² This may be compared with the expenditure of \$810,610.81 for the Pennsylvania State police during the fiscal year ending May 31, 1928.¹³

No other State has an organization comparable to the Pennsylvania industrial police.¹⁴ While, in numerous other localities, private guards or watchmen are commissioned as policemen or deputized as deputy sheriffs, this practice has not been followed to the extent of permitting the building up of large permanent organized private police forces exercising powers concurrent with those of publicly-paid peace officers, except, to a limited extent, in the case of the railroads.

No exact figures are available as to the number of private police employed by the railroads of the United States, nor as to the cost of such police.¹⁵ Expenditures for this purpose, however, are known to be large.¹⁶ Railroad police

⁹ Information from Capt. George F. Lumb, secretary for industrial police, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

¹⁰ The total number of industrial police commissioned since April 18, 1929, when the old coal and iron police were reorganized into the industrial police, was 1,336, and the maximum number of companies employing police at any one time was 74. On March 1, 1928, there were 2,474 coal and iron policemen in the bituminous coal fields alone. See Shalloo, *The Private Police of Pennsylvania*, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 59.

¹¹ Estimate by the secretary for industrial police. The cost of the State bureau of industrial police is approximately \$12,000 per year.

¹² The actual cost is probably substantially in excess of this figure, since most such police receive allowances in addition to their salaries.

¹³ See p. 199, supra, Table 1.

¹⁴ See Shalloo, *The Private Police of Pennsylvania*, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 55.

¹⁵ The American Railway Association does not compile any data of this character.

¹⁶ As illustrating this fact, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. spends approximately \$80,000 per month on its police department, and approximately \$4,000 per month for detective service—a total of more than \$1,000,000 per year. This is more than the cost of any State police department except that of New York. (See p. 199, supra.) The annual police pay roll of the Lehigh Valley Road Co. for 1920 was \$234,024, and that of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. was \$407,832. (Information compiled by Prof. Jeremiah P. Shalloo, University of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.) If it be assumed that all the major railroads of the United States expend money for private police protection at the same rate in proportion to net railway operating income, the total annual expenditure would appear to be in the neighborhood of \$13,000,000.

forces are ordinarily organized on a semimilitary basis and are frequently uniformed. Their primary function is the protection of railroad property and property in transit and the prevention and suppression of crime on trains and on the right of way.

It must be remembered, however, that not all of the cost of organized private police forces can be regarded as incurred in preventing and suppressing crime. Both industrial and railroad police have and exercise noncriminal functions, such as guarding against fire, preventing civil trespass, etc., and a part of their cost is chargeable to such activities. For this reason, the figures here given can not be regarded as representing in their entirety private costs of protection against crime. They do, however, give some idea of the general order of magnitude of the cost of such protection by industrial and railroad police.

4. *Private policemen and guards.*—Closely related to the industrial and railroad police, but differing in that they either are not organized into large forces or are only temporarily employed, are private policemen and guards. Two types may be distinguished: first, the permanent policeman or guard who is similar to a watchman, but differs in that his principal function is the protection of persons or property from criminal acts and that he is not charged with other equally or more important noncriminal functions; and, second, temporary forces of private policemen or guards employed in times of emergency. These classes of protective agencies are intermediate between organized private police forces on the one hand and ordinary watchmen on the other.

Private policemen or guards are employed by most large banks, by express companies, and by some industrial concerns. It has not been possible to secure figures as to aggregate expenditures for such policemen, nor as to their number. Most of these policemen and guards, however, are probably reported to the Bureau of the Census as watchmen, and so are included in the total figure for number of watchmen given in the next section.¹⁷

Temporary forces of private police or guards are frequently employed by industrial concerns in times of

¹⁷ Sec § 5, *infra*.

emergency, and especially in times of labor disturbance. Frequently such guards are operatives of detective agencies, but sometimes they consist of personnel locally recruited. An outstanding example of the latter type of temporary private police has been the privately-paid deputy sheriffs used as mine guards in some of the counties of West Virginia.¹⁸ No figures as to the number or cost of temporary policemen or guards are available. Both numbers and cost vary widely from year to year, largely depending upon labor conditions in various sections of the country. Moreover, even if basic cost figures were available, it would be practically impossible to determine what part of the cost of such private agencies was chargeable to crime prevention and repression, and how much, if any, was chargeable to administrative duties, to the desire of employers for the moral effect of potential force to overawe the other parties to labor disputes, and even to aggressive strikebreaking activities. The question of the actual character of the activities of private police and guards in labor disputes has been the subject of vigorous and sometimes acrimonious dispute; but it would nevertheless be necessary to resolve these disputed questions in order to determine to what extent the cost of private guards and police was, in fact, chargeable to protection against crime. This, for obvious reasons, can not be undertaken in this report.

5. *Watchmen.*—In 1920 there were 115,553 private watchmen employed in the United States.¹⁹ If it be assumed that the number of persons so employed has increased in proportion to the increase in total population, the number so employed in 1930 may be estimated as approximately 132,000. The average salaries paid to watchmen probably do not exceed the average wages of employees generally, which have been estimated at \$1,205 per annum.²⁰ This would indicate a total expenditure for watchmen of some \$159,000,000 per annum.

Many watchmen are supplied with watch clocks or similar equipment, which makes it possible to check whether a

¹⁸ See Report of the United States Coal Commission, Pt. I, pp. 169, 171, 180 (Washington, 1923).

¹⁹ See Abstract of the Fourteenth Census, 1920, p. 493.

²⁰ See King, *The National Income and Its Purchasing Power*, p. 146 (New York, 1930). This estimate is for 1927.

watchman is making his rounds properly, and so increase the efficiency of the watch service. The cost of such equipment is an expenditure of the same character as the salary paid the watchmen himself, except, of course, that it is a capital outlay. Table 1 gives estimated aggregate expenditures for watch clocks for the 6-year period ending in 1930.

TABLE 1.—*Expenditures for watch clocks, 1925-1930*

Year	Expenditure ¹	Year	Expenditure ¹
1925.....	\$807,086	1929.....	\$985,689
1926.....	917,532	1930.....	912,236
1927.....	897,000		
1928.....	901,551	Average.....	919,477

¹ Estimated on the basis of data supplied by Detex Watchclock Corporation, New York, N. Y., and Davis-Paradis Watchmen's Clock Corporation, New York, N. Y.

There are other similar expenditures for watchmen's equipment—e. g., for revolvers, where provided by the employer—but these are relatively small in amount, and no figures have been developed with regard to them.

Expenditures for watchmen and outlays for watchmen's equipment may not, however, be considered as forming in their entirety a part of the cost of private protection against crime. Many—perhaps most—watchmen are more concerned with preventing fires, protecting property from elements, providing security against civil trespass, etc., than with protection against criminal acts. Moreover, the relative importance of the criminal and noncriminal aspects of watchmen's activities will differ widely in individual instances, so that the basis for an accurate allocation of costs could be developed only by inordinate labor, if at all, while any estimate based on existing data would be a mere guess. Consequently, the basis does not exist for estimating the amount of that element of private costs of protection against crime which is represented by the cost of watchmen. The figures already given merely afford some rough indication of the maximum order of magnitude of that cost.

6. *Other protective agencies.*—In some cities there are private patrolmen who patrol a given district under a financial arrangement with the residents of that district, thus supplementing the patrol work of the uniformed force of

the municipal police.²¹ These patrolmen, unlike ordinary private policemen, are independent contractors who serve a number of employers. No figures as to the cost of private patrolmen are available.²² They are not, however, numerous.

In some instances, a municipality may detail its regular police for temporary private duty for a consideration paid either to the city or to the policeman detailed. Frequently such duty is administrative in character, such as traffic control, supervision of public dance halls, etc., but in some cases it may be of a criminal character, in which case the amount paid the city or the policemen is a private cost of protection against crime, and a credit against the public cost of criminal justice. Existing data are insufficient to make possible an estimate of the total amount of such payments.

Private protective services operating in connection with burglar-alarm systems or other protective devices are considered in the next chapter.

7. *Conclusion.*—It will be apparent from the foregoing discussion that, while a very substantial amount of money is spent in this country each year to supplement the protection against crime afforded by State and municipal police forces, the precise amount of such private expenditures can not be satisfactorily estimated. Moreover, it may be difficult in some cases to determine whether expenditures for private police, especially permanent industrial police and temporary forces of guards in cases of labor disturbance, operate in fact to decrease crime, or whether the existence of such private police forces provokes violence and criminal acts.²³ Any discussion of this question would, of course, be out of place in this report, especially as the basic cost data as to private police are not available in any event; nevertheless, it must be pointed out that a wholly satisfactory determination of the precise cost of private protective agencies chargeable to crime prevention and suppression would necessarily involve consideration of this

²¹ See Shalloo, *The Private Police of Pennsylvania*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, pp. 55, 56.

²² Some of the companies engaged in furnishing protective services also act as private patrolmen. See pp. 301-302, *infra*.

²³ It has frequently been charged, especially by representatives of labor, that such private police or guards frequently cause or even initiate violence.

matter. This emphasizes the practical impossibility of developing satisfactory figures as to total cost on the basis of existing data.

CHAPTER III

COST OF PROTECTIVE DEVICES AND SERVICES

1. *Introductory.*—Protective devices and services involve either complete or partial dependence on mechanical constructions to protect property from crime. As distinguished from private police agencies, which may operate to suppress or prevent crime of all kinds, protective devices, and to a very considerable extent protective services, are useful only in protecting against a relatively limited class of crime—viz, various forms of theft, and, to some slight extent, embezzlement and forgery.²⁴

Protective devices operate to render the taking of property difficult or impossible and to facilitate the detection and capture of the criminal. Examples are safes and ordinary burglar alarms. When, in addition to the installation of a protective device, there is an organized agency which operates the device or responds to its call, a protective service exists. This chapter will first discuss protective devices proper, including several such devices which have other functions in addition to protection against crime, and will then discuss protective services.

2. *Safes.*—The most familiar example of a protective device is probably the safe; and it is also an admirable example of a device which has important functions other than protection against crime. Many safes are installed primarily with a view to protection against fire, and practically all are installed with this purpose in view to some extent.²⁵ The relative importance of these functions, moreover, will differ widely. The elaborate vault of a bank may be largely for protection against burglary, while the safe of an individual merchant who banks his cash daily may be almost exclusively for fire protection. The determination of how much of the cost of safes should be charged to crime protection is, therefore, impracticable.

²⁴ See the discussion of cash registers and check protectors, p. 361, *infra*.

²⁵ Some, moreover, are installed very largely for purposes of show and because of their advertising value.

Moreover, figures as to cost of safes, even without such allocation, are difficult to secure. Information on the subject was sought from all the larger manufacturers listed in the published lists of inspected fire and burglary protective appliances,²⁶ but only very incomplete data were obtained. Table 2 shows actual sales by 5 manufacturers of fire and burglary resisting safes, chests, and vaults for the 10-year period ending in 1929, but these figures are very incomplete.²⁷

TABLE 2.—*Expenditures for safes, chests, and vaults, 1920-1929 (incomplete)*

Year	Expenditure ¹	Year	Expenditure ¹
1920.....	\$3,002,235	1926.....	4,500,100
1921.....	4,015,196	1927.....	4,308,125
1922.....	3,848,074	1928.....	4,440,820
1923.....	3,910,760	1929.....	4,217,748
1924.....	3,810,185		
1925.....	4,455,454	Average.....	4,227,271

¹ Reported by 5 manufacturers of safes, chests, and vaults.

The most that can be said definitely, therefore, is that an average of more than \$4,000,000 has been spent annually in this country over the 10 years ending in 1929 for safes, chests, vaults, and similar protective devices, and that an indeterminate part of the amount so spent is chargeable to protection against crime.

3. *Burglar and fire alarms.*—Expenditures for burglar alarms are obviously a cost of protection against crime. Moreover, since an appreciable proportion of all fires are due to arson,²⁸ a part of the cost of fire-alarm and sprinkler systems is similarly chargeable. However, due to the practical impossibility of determining the proportion of incendiary to the total fires,²⁹ no attempt will be made here to take account of expenditures for fire-alarm and sprinkler systems as part of the cost of protection against crime.

²⁶ Published by Underwriters' Laboratories, Inc., New York, N. Y.

²⁷ The totals given are for only 5 out of the 11 principal manufacturers of such devices. One company replying to the questionnaire sent out for the purpose of securing these data estimated total expenditures at between \$18,000,000 and \$23,000,000; another at over \$16,000,000. Both estimates are over three times the totals shown by the table.

²⁸ See p. 380, *infra*.

²⁹ See p. 381, *infra*.

Burglar alarms may be of two sorts: (a) those which merely warn the owner of the property protected, perhaps incidentally notify persons outside, including the police, and in some cases scare off the burglar; and (b) those which are operated by a protective organization which has men available to respond to the alarm. While it is known that the former type of burglar alarms are used to a very considerable extent, it has not been found possible to develop any adequate data as to their annual cost.⁸⁰ The latter type are discussed in a later section dealing with protective services.⁸¹

4. *Other protective devices.*—Brief mention may be made of certain other protective devices:

(a) Bullet-resisting glass is now used to a considerable extent by banks and in the manufacture of armored cars for the transportation of money and valuables.⁸² Table 3, which, while not complete for the entire industry, includes data from 3 principal manufacturers, shows total sales of such glass for the 3-year period ending in 1930.

TABLE 3.—*Expenditures for bullet-resisting glass, 1928-1930*¹
(incomplete)

Year	Expenditures ¹
1928	\$334,281.83
1929	307,450.68
1930	203,283.00
Average	311,708.20

¹ Data supplied by Indestructo Glass Corporation, Farmingdale, N. Y.; Safetec Glass Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; and Triplex Safety Glass Co. of North America, Clifton, N. J.

The cost of such glass may, it is believed, be regarded in its entirety as a private outlay for protection against crime.

(b) Gas protective devices against holdups are now being manufactured for installation in banks. These devices, which make possible the discharge of tear-gas in the event of an attempted holdup, are to be regarded as still in the

⁸⁰ Such devices can be manufactured by any electrician, and there is no practicable way of ascertaining how many are in use and how much they cost annually.

⁸¹ See § 5, *infra*.

⁸² For a discussion of the cost of armored cars, see pp. 362-363, *infra*.

experimental stage. Nevertheless, it seems probable that expenditures for the purchase of such equipment during 1931 will approximate \$1,000,000.⁸³ The entire amount so expended, whatever it may be, is to be regarded as a private cost of protection against crime.

(c) Cash registers serve to a certain extent as a protection against petty embezzlement and thefts by employees, but are primarily employed for other purposes. The proportionate cost chargeable to protection against crime is impossible of accurate determination, and, without such an allocation, there would be no significance in total figures. Hence no data are here presented as to cash register costs.

(d) Check protectors and similar devices are used to prevent forgery through the raising of checks, and the cost of such devices may properly be charged to protection against crime. These devices are manufactured by so many different companies that a determination of total cost has proved impractical, although it may be noted that check protectors are not extremely expensive and that the total annual expenditure for them can not be very great.

Other mechanical devices are made use of in connection with protection against crime, such as revolvers and other firearms, motor equipment for police purposes, etc.;⁸⁴ but these are all utilized incidentally by some public or private protective agency or service, and so need not be separately dealt with here.

5. *Protective services.*—Private protective services are well established in most of the larger cities.⁸⁵ The services install and maintain burglar-alarm devices, provide night-watch and fire-patrol service and police-call service, and, in general, operate to supplement the protection against

⁸³ Estimated on the basis of data furnished by Diebold Safe & Lock Co., Canton, Ohio; Federal Laboratories, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Lake Erie Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio. Actual figures for 1930 are not available.

⁸⁴ As to watchmen's clocks, see p. 356, *supra*.

⁸⁵ The companies providing such services which have furnished cost data to the commission include the American District Telegraph Co., operating in over 100 cities of the United States; the Holmes Electric Protective Co., operating in New York, N. Y., and Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; the Rhode Island Electric Protective Co., operating in Providence and Pawtucket, R. I.; the Owl Protective Co., the United Electric Service Co., the Metropolitan Electric Protective Co., the Automatic Fire Alarm Co., and the Consolidated Fire Alarm Co., operating in New York, N. Y.; and the Instantaneous Alarm Co., operating in Seattle, Wash.

crime provided by the municipal police. The following table shows the aggregate amount spent by the public for night watch and fire-alarm service, automatic-sprinkler service, burglar-alarm service, watch signal and patrol service (rendered to banks only as a protection against burglary), and police-call service, rendered by 9 of the leading companies³⁶ for the 10-year period ending in 1929.

TABLE 4.—*Expenditures for protective services, 1920-1929*

Year	Expenditures ¹	Year	Expenditures ¹
1920.....	\$7,193,278.99	1926.....	11,434,189.29
1921.....	8,485,133.86	1927.....	12,203,087.32
1922.....	9,051,817.64	1928.....	12,040,373.43
1923.....	9,448,069.70	1929.....	13,427,359.84
1924.....	10,023,094.91		
1925.....	10,708,424.82	Average.....	10,465,265.64

¹ Total for 9 companies, including expenditures for fire protection.

Probably the major part of the cost of protective services of the character here under discussion is chargeable to protection against crime, although protection against fire is also important. However, it is practically impossible to arrive at an accurate basis for allocation of such expenditures between crime protection and other functions, and no such allocation will be made here. Consequently, it must be remembered that the figures presented above do not represent in their entirety private expenditures for protection against crime.

6. *Armored cars.*—The use of armored cars for the transportation of money and valuables, especially in and around the larger cities, has now become very common. This service is performed, in the main, by 3 companies.³⁷ These companies carry on the general business of transporting money and valuables, collect and distribute pay rolls, and perform other similar services. Each car used is manned by 3 or 4 trained and armed guards, and is, in effect, a miniature fort on wheels. Each such car is armored with

³⁶ Those listed in note 35, supra.

³⁷ The Armored Service Corporation, operating in and about New York City and Westchester County, N. Y., Philadelphia, Pa., Newark and Trenton, N. J., and the southern part of Connecticut; the United States Distributing Corporation, operating in and about New York City, Buffalo, N. Y., and Boston, Mass.; and Brinks Express Co., operating in and about New York City, Chicago, Ill., and some other cities. Some banks and other companies provide their own armored-car service.

chrome-steel armor and bullet-resisting glass which will withstand bullets from a .45-caliber revolver, and is fitted with loopholes permitting the guards inside to shoot out, but preventing anyone from shooting in. The cars are built on stock chassis by the companies themselves, and cost from \$3,000 to \$10,000 each.³⁸ The contents of each car are insured at all times for from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000. There are approximately 550 armored cars now in use by these companies, and the investment therein is probably at least \$2,750,000.³⁹

The entire cost of armored-car service is a private expenditure for protection against crime. The amount paid during 1929 to companies engaged in the business of furnishing such service was approximately \$3,900,000.⁴⁰ Expenditures for armored-car service have been increasing slightly, but steadily, year by year for the past 10 years, indicating that the armored car has proven itself to be an efficient protection against robbery of money and valuables in transit.

7. *Conclusion.*—The public expends a substantial amount each year for devices and services for protection against crime. Such private expenditures supplement and make easier the work of the police, and tend to reduce insured losses and so to affect insurance rates. While limited in their usefulness to the prevention of certain forms of theft, robbery, burglary, and, to a slight extent, of forgery and embezzlement, they appear to operate efficiently so far as these classes of crime are concerned. While it is impossible accurately to ascertain the amount spent annually for such devices and services, it is clear that that amount runs into large figures.

³⁸ The bullet-resisting glass in the ordinary armored car alone costs approximately \$700.

³⁹ Data furnished by Mr. Lawrence J. Kitching, president, Armored Service Corporation, and Mr. Harry N. Taylor, president, United States Distributing Corporation.

⁴⁰ Exact figures are not available for the reason that the Brinks Express Co. did not supply data as to that company's operations. The total given includes an estimate for that company. The cost of armored-car service to banks and other companies which supply their own service is not included in the total figure given. No data as to these latter costs are available.

CHAPTER IV

COST OF DETECTIVE AGENCIES

1. *Introductory.*—Private expenditures for detective services fall into two general classes: (a) amounts paid by individuals or business organizations to private detective agencies; and (b) amounts expended by business organizations in maintaining permanent investigation departments having detective functions.

In addition to these classes of agencies, which have as at least one of their primary functions the detection of crime, there are other agencies which may, and frequently do, discover crime and detect criminals incidentally to other work, as, for example, auditors or auditing departments who discover defalcations. The work of these latter agencies, however, is only incidentally criminal, and their cost is not considered here.⁴¹ Here we will deal only with private agencies having the detection of crime as at least one of their primary functions.

2. *Private detective agencies.*—The character and the scope of the activities of private detective agencies are extremely varied. In size, they vary from small one or two-man agencies to national organizations having offices throughout the country. The work handled may include the securing of evidence in domestic relations cases, the settling of blackmailing and similar cases without publicity, the providing of guards in labor disturbances, the supplying of undercover men to industrial companies for work among their employees, and many other activities in addition to the detection of crime.⁴² Partly because of this fact, partly because of the large number of agencies, and partly because of the not unnatural reluctance on the part of those agencies to disclose the details of their business, it has proved impracticable to secure definite figures as to the amounts paid annually to the private-detective agencies of the country for criminal work.

While a complete study of private expenditures for protection against crime would necessarily include quantitative

⁴¹ Compare the omission of the auditing branches of the Federal Government in determining the cost of Federal criminal justice (p. 91, supra).

⁴² Compare pp. 51, 355, supra.

data as to the cost of the criminal work of detective agencies, it is not believed that the omission of these data is very serious. The major part of the ordinary work of most detective agencies is probably of a civil nature, and the aggregate amounts paid such agencies annually, while substantial, cannot be extremely large.

3. *Investigation departments.*—Some large corporations maintain investigation departments which have some detective functions. This is principally true of the large insurance companies—fire, life, burglary, fidelity, and casualty. Not all of the activities of these departments involve detective work, but a substantial part of them may do so in some instances.⁴³ The primary difficulty, as far as determining the cost of the criminal work of such departments is concerned, is that a correct allocation of cost would be extremely difficult to make, even if the basic cost figures were available. Moreover, to secure detailed basic cost figures from all the companies in the United States having investigation departments would be a very large task. Consequently, no attempt has been made to develop detailed figures as to the cost of the detective activities of private investigation departments.

4. *Conclusion.*—Detailed figures as to private expenditures for detective agencies and activities are thus unavailable. Moreover, even if the basic figures were available, and even if the proportion of the time of private detective organizations and of the investigation departments of business organizations devoted to criminal work could be ascertained, it is by no means clear that the amount of private expenditures for the detection of criminals, computed on the basis of those data, could properly be included among private costs of protection against crime on the same footing as other expenditures. In many cases, the primary objective of private detective work is the recovery of money or property wrongfully taken, rather than the bringing of the criminal to justice. If this objective is not attained by the means of letting the criminal go free, the cost of such private detective work is clearly a proper private cost of

⁴³ The same thing is true, to a certain extent, of the claims department of many public utility companies.

protection against crime. But if, as sometimes happens, the bringing of the criminal to justice is sacrificed to the recovery of the property which he has taken, it is a fair question whether the cost of recovering such property should be treated as a cost of protection against crime at all; whether it is not really rather an expenditure which promotes crime. The fact that this question exists, and the extreme practical difficulty of determining whether, and to what extent, practices of the character above referred to are prevalent among private detective agencies and investigation departments, furnish additional reasons for omitting detailed figures as to the cost of such agencies from this report.

CHAPTER V

PRIVATE EXPENDITURES FOR CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT

1. *Introductory.*—Private expenditures for the penal and corrective treatment of criminals and delinquents are in most cases either (a) expenditures for the support of correctional institutions for minors, or (b) expenditures for private probation activities. It is not usual for penal institutions for adults to be privately administered or supported by private funds, nor for parole activities to be privately financed.⁴⁴

There are certain private expenditures which are closely related to the post-conviction treatment of criminals, which may, from one standpoint, be regarded as elements of cost related to crime, but which can hardly be considered as part of the private cost of protection against crime except in a rather remote sense. Such, for example, are private welfare expenditures in connection with penal institutions, aid extended to indigent criminals on their release from imprisonment, and the like. Such expenditures are not dealt with in this report since it is perhaps doubtful whether they should be regarded as costs due to crime,⁴⁵ and also

⁴⁴ A few private institutions for wayward girls receive adult delinquents, and some private aid to the work of parole officers may be given in a few instances.

⁴⁵ Such expenditures are of the same general character as many other social service expenditures, which may operate incidentally to reduce crime, but which are not made primarily for that purpose.

because it would be wholly impracticable to determine the aggregate amount of such expenditures for the entire United States without an inordinate expenditure of time and money in investigation.⁴⁶

2. *Private correctional institutions for delinquent minors and wayward girls.*—While most industrial schools and detention homes for juvenile delinquents are public institutions, a considerable number are privately administered. In 1923, the Bureau of the Census collected data as to the number of juvenile delinquents in 36 such institutions. These included 22 institutions (9 for boys, 12 for girls, and 1 for both sexes) operated primarily for delinquent children,⁴⁷ and 14 institutions (6 for boys, 5 for girls, and 3 for both sexes) which received delinquents, but were not operated primarily for that purpose.⁴⁸ In addition to these institutions for delinquent children, there were 69 private homes for delinquent women and girls and 197 private institutions for wayward women or girls and unmarried or destitute mothers and their children.⁴⁹ These included such institutions as Houses of the Good Shepherd, Florence Crittenton Homes, and homes under similar auspices.⁵⁰

No comprehensive published figures on the cost of private institutional care of juvenile and female delinquents are available,⁵¹ and it has not been possible, in view of limitations of time and funds, to collect this data by field investigation. It is extremely difficult, moreover, to make even a rough estimate of the amount of private expenditures for such institutions. In the first place, private institutions for delinquent minors receive substantial financial aid from

⁴⁶ Private expenditures for the support of indigent families of imprisoned criminals, which are of a somewhat similar character, have been discussed in pt. 1 of this report (pp. 62-63, supra).

⁴⁷ See *Children Under Institutional Care, 1923*, p. 238 (U. S. Census, 1926). See also Reeves, *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls*, pp. 55-56, 408-416 (New York, 1920).

⁴⁸ These 36 institutions had a population of approximately 5,000, the number of inmates in institutions of the first group being 4,422 on January 1, 1923 (*Children Under Institutional Care, 1923*, pp. 346-355), and the number in institutions of the second being 715 on February 1, 1923 (*ibid.*, pp. 376-377).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

⁵⁰ On February 1, 1923, there were 9,555 women and girls over 15 in such institutions. *Ibid.*, p. 378. Not all of these, however, were delinquents.

⁵¹ Compare the somewhat similar situation with regard to financial statistics of public institutions of the same type, discussed in pt. 5 of this report (pp. 232-236, supra).

cities, counties, or States,⁵² but no data as to the amounts so received are available. This makes impossible any estimate of the cost of such institutions on the basis of costs per inmate for public institutions of similar type,⁵³ since this would give only *total* expenditures, not *private* expenditures. In the second place, many institutions receive both delinquent and dependent or destitute women and children, and the necessary data for segregating the cost of these classes of inmates are often lacking.⁵⁴ Hence any estimate on the basis of number of inmates and costs per inmate in similar public institutions must be confined to the very limited group of institutions which are supported entirely by private funds, and for which data as to the number of delinquent inmates is available. An estimate for these institutions indicates a probable private cost in 1930 of some \$850,000.⁵⁵ Such institutions, however, form a relatively minor group; so far as the large majority of privately administered correctional institutions are concerned, the basis for any estimate of cost is lacking.

3. *Private probation agencies.*—A certain amount of probation work, particularly for women and minors, is carried out at private expense. The expenditures of the Big Brother Movements in various cities, for example, are primarily for the purpose of assisting juvenile courts and probation departments in dealing with delinquent boys, including those actually placed on probation and others.⁵⁶

⁵² Out of 36 institutions for delinquent minors as to which the census collected data in 1923 (p. 366, supra), 15 received public funds. These 15 institutions had over 70 per cent of the inmates in all 36 institutions. (Data compiled from Children Under Institutional Care, 1923, pp. 346-355, 378.) No data are available as to the extent to which private institutions for wayward girls and for unmarried or destitute mothers receive public funds.

⁵³ See pp. 233-235, supra.

⁵⁴ These data are available for 1923 for 36 private institutions for delinquent minors, but not for 266 homes for wayward girls and unmarried or destitute mothers. See Children Under Institutional Care, 1923, p. 346-355, 378-380.

⁵⁵ This estimate is made on the basis of the 1923 delinquent population of 21 institutions receiving no public funds, and assumes (a) that the population of such institutions has increased since 1923 in direct proportion to the total population of the United States; (b) that the cost per inmate of private institutions is the same as that of similar public institutions; and (c) that the cost per inmate of all such institutions has remained on the same level since 1926-27. None of these assumptions is unassailable, but it is believed that the resulting estimate is a conservative one.

⁵⁶ During the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1931, the Big Brother Movement of Greater New York spent \$46,789.87 in such activities.

Various other religious, charitable, and social service organizations and agencies render similar services with respect to other delinquent minors, and, in a considerable number of cases, with respect to adult female delinquents.

No comprehensive figures as to the cost of private agencies of this character are available. Even if such figures were available, moreover, difficult problems would be encountered in determining what part of the cost of these agencies were properly to be considered as expenditures for protection against crime.⁵⁷ In the light of existing data, therefore, all that can be said with regard to private expenditures for probation activities is that such expenditures are undoubtedly substantial, but that no basis exists for an estimate as to their total amount.

4. *Conclusion.*—A detailed field investigation of the financial aspects of privately supported and administered penal and corrective treatment would yield much more complete data than the rather limited study which has been possible as part of the present investigation. The present study has gone far enough, however, to demonstrate that private expenditures of this character are very considerable in amount, and that privately administered correctional institutions and agencies are of substantial importance in supplementing the public machinery for the penal and corrective treatment of delinquents. The expense of such private activities is thus a definite and important element of cost related to crime and criminal justice.

⁵⁷ See p. 52, supra.

PART 8

PRIVATE LOSSES DUE TO CRIMINAL ACTS

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of study.*—This part of the report outlines and discusses the various forms of private losses due to criminal acts, and presents such data as to the amounts of such losses as have proved to be obtainable. As has already been pointed out,¹ it has not been possible to obtain comprehensive and accurate data as to the total amount of such losses, or even as to the amount of losses due to crimes against property. This has been particularly true as regards losses due to organized extortion and so-called "racketeering."² Consequently, this part, like the preceding part dealing with private expenditures for protection against crime, will be limited to a descriptive discussion supplemented by such detailed figures as it has been possible to obtain.

2. *Scope of study.*—This part of the report will describe and discuss the more important classes of private losses due to crime, dealing with them under the three general heads of (a) crimes against the person; (b) direct crimes against property, including the criminal destruction of property and the various forms of theft; and (c) crimes affecting wealth other than direct crimes against property, including commercialized fraud and racketeering. Detailed figures will be presented, however, only as to losses due to certain forms of direct crimes against property, and, to a very limited extent, as to losses due to certain forms of commercialized fraud.

The study is thus complete descriptively, but quite incomplete statistically. This statistical incompleteness is partly inherent in the subject and partly due to lack of

¹ See pt. 1 (pp. 53-59, supra).

² See pp. 406-413, infra.

time and funds for a more complete investigation. In the case of losses due to crimes against the person accurate statistical data expressed in monetary terms is in the nature of things unobtainable.⁴ In the cases of commercialized fraud and organized extortion not only are accurate figures inherently difficult to obtain, but the time, and more particularly the funds, necessary for detailed field studies which alone could have afforded the basis for even an intelligent guess at the order of magnitude of such losses have not been available.

The omission of quantitative data as to private economic losses due to crimes against the person is not believed to be very serious. Such crimes are relatively infrequent⁵ and are of more significance from an individual and social than from an economic standpoint. The omission of comprehensive figures as to commercialized fraud and as to racketeering and other forms of organized extortion is, however a serious one. These forms of crime, while they have existed in certain forms from time immemorial, have in the last decade had an almost mushroomlike growth.⁶ Any study of the economic aspects of crime—and, even more, any study of the broader aspects of crime and crime control—which omits to give detailed and comprehensive consideration to this very important problem of organized crime as a business is wholly incomplete. The only reason why this problem has not been dealt with more fully in this report is, as has been several times stated,⁷ that it has not been practicable to make the necessary comprehensive detailed investigations with the limited funds which the commission was able to devote to the study of the economic aspects of crime. The attempt will be made in this report to compensate, in part, for the omission of statistical data on losses due to racketeering and certain important aspects of commercialized fraud, by giving a descriptive account of the nature and impor-

⁴ See p. 54, supra.

⁵ For 1930, 806 American cities, having an aggregate population of 41,047,003, reported 515,276 Part I offenses known to the police. (For a definition of Part I offenses, see pp. 344-345, supra.) Of these, only 30,234 were crimes against the person—i. e., such crimes made up only 5.9 per cent of the offenses reported. (Unpublished information furnished through the courtesy of the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.)

⁶ See pp. 55-56, supra.

⁷ See pp. 12, 58, 370-371, supra.

tance of such losses; but it must be remembered, in considering this part of the report, that statistical data on the losses due to the most important forms of modern crime are unfortunately missing.

In addition to dealing with losses due to criminal acts, this part of the report will present data as to the cost of insurance against crime. Expenditures for insurance against crime occupy an intermediate position between private protective expenditures and private losses, and might well have been dealt with in a separate part of the report. They are treated in this part as a matter of convenience.

In considering the data presented in the following chapters as to private losses due to criminal acts and as to the cost of insurance against crime, it must be borne in mind that we are here dealing in most cases with immediate costs of crime, not with the ultimate cost of crime to the community.⁸ While some losses to private individuals due to crime—viz, those involving destruction or injury to person or property—are in themselves losses to the community, this is not necessarily true of other classes of losses, and is clearly not true of the cost of crime insurance. The data here presented tend to indicate how much individuals lose due to crime and criminal acts; they do not, in most instances, show what economic loss the community suffers as a result of such acts.

3. *Methods of investigation.*—In securing the material for this part of the report, four principal avenues of investigation have been followed. First, an exhaustive canvass was made of the published material dealing with the subject. This revealed three things: that material of any kind was very scanty; that no satisfactory statistical or source material existed; and that the only figures contained in the material which did exist were mere guess-estimates which could not be relied upon.⁹ The published material proved to be useful only as indicating possible avenues for further investigation. Second, a detailed analysis was made of the possible kinds of economic loss to individuals and business organizations due to criminal acts, and a wide variety of

⁸ For a discussion of the distinction between immediate and ultimate costs, see pp. 34-35, supra.

⁹ For a discussion of the published material, see Appendix A to this report (pp. 458-487, infra).

possible sources of data as to the character and order of magnitude of such losses were canvassed. The most important sources found were the statistical records of insurance companies, next to be referred to, but considerable data were obtained from other sources. Reference to these other sources and description of the material found will appear hereinafter in the course of presenting these data. Third, a special canvass was made of the information available in the files of the companies writing insurance against crime, and particularly of that in the files of the central rating bureaus maintained and used by those companies. In this way detailed figures as to insured losses due to theft, robbery, burglary, embezzlement, and known arson were obtained. Special acknowledgment is made to these organizations¹⁰ for their willing and helpful cooperation in this regard. Fourth, information as to losses due to fraudulent sales of securities was sought from the securities departments¹¹ or other analogous authorities of the various States, and data as to losses due to fraudulent use of the mails were sought from the Post Office Department.

It is believed that the investigation has been thorough so far as it has gone, although not going far enough adequately to cover losses due to commercialized fraud and racketeering.

4. *Accuracy of statistical material presented.*—The statistical material presented in this part for the most part consists of exact figures as to insured losses or as to insurance premiums paid, taken from the records of insurance companies or their rating bureaus. While, for obvious reasons, no independent check of the accuracy of these figures has been possible or regarded as desirable, it is believed that the figures may be relied upon as correct and exact. The other figures presented¹² are estimates only, and are to be regarded merely as indicating something of the general order of magnitude of particular types of losses.

The figures as to insured losses due to crime are in all cases minimum figures. There has been a considerable temptation to attempt estimates of total losses on the basis

¹⁰ The names of the organizations which have furnished data appear in connection with the presentation of that data later in this part.

¹¹ The so-called "Blue Sky" departments.

¹² For example, as to losses due to the use of the mails to defraud (p. 405, infra).

of insured losses; but this has in no case been done. Such "estimates" would be merely guesses,¹³ and it has seemed preferable to give only accurate and reliable figures, even though they are known to be less, and probably very substantially less, than the total losses.

For the same reason, no use has been made of any of the "estimates" of losses due to crime, or to particular kinds of crime, which have been made in the past.¹⁴ While some of these figures have been put forward by persons having considerable knowledge of insured losses, the fact remains that no one, no matter how well informed, can do more than guess at total losses in the existing state of available data and knowledge.

The statistical data presented here, while not complete or comprehensive, may, it is believed, be regarded as made up of either exact figures or reasonably accurate estimates.

CHAPTER II

LOSSES DUE TO CRIMES AGAINST THE PERSON

1. *Introductory.*—Crimes against the person, while relatively much less frequent than crimes affecting property or wealth,¹⁵ are by far the most dramatic of all forms of crime. They are also the most difficult for which to work out monetary estimates of losses sustained, either by victims or by the community.¹⁶

Crimes against the person may, for present purposes, be divided into three groups: (a) homicide; (b) mayhem and wounding; and (c) sex offenses. There are a considerable number of other criminal offenses against the person which will not be considered here, since no direct economic loss, either to the victim or to the community, can be regarded as resulting from them. In this class fall such offenses as simple assault, criminal libel, and violations of various statu-

¹³ The statistical experts of the organizations furnishing data as to insured losses were unanimous that no statistically sound estimates of total losses could be made on the basis of figures as to insured losses.

¹⁴ For references to various estimates of crime losses and an indication of the extent of their variation, see p. 70, *supra*, note 70.

¹⁵ See p. 371, *supra*, note 5.

¹⁶ Losses due to crimes against the person are both losses to the victims, and so part of the immediate cost of crime, and also, in most cases, losses to the community, and so part of the ultimate cost of crime. See pp. 66-67, *supra*.

tory provisions enacted to protect personal rights from invasion.¹⁷

2. *Homicide.*—Criminal homicide may take the form of murder or manslaughter in various degrees. The distinctions between murder and manslaughter and between the various degrees of each offense are highly technical and vary greatly as between the different States.¹⁸ For present purposes, however, criminal homicide may be defined with sufficient accuracy to be the killing of a human being—usually intentionally or as a result of gross negligence—under circumstances giving rise to criminal liability.

There can be no doubt that economic loss results from criminal homicide, both to the community and to the victim's dependents, if any.¹⁹ The family of the dead man, if he has one, loses a bread-winner; the community loses a human asset. In so far as the loss in any particular case can be evaluated in monetary terms, it will be measured by the potential earning power of the victim. This is, of course, different in each case, and no satisfactory average figure is available.²⁰ It would be obviously impossible to investigate each individual case, and the result is that there is no practical method of determining the aggregate loss due to homicide, whether to the community or to the families of victims.

But there is a further difficulty—viz, that there is no practicable method of determining the number of criminal homicides which occur in the United States. The most comprehensive figures now available are those as to homicides known to the police in 1930 as reported to the Department of Justice by 886 municipalities including 34.2 per cent of the population of the continental United States.²¹ These statistics show a total of 5,913 homicides reported, of which 3,229 were classified as cases of murder or nonnegligent

¹⁷ For example, violations of criminal statutes enacted to protect the right of privacy, to punish discrimination on account of color, etc.

¹⁸ For some indication of this complexity and variability of definition, see International Association of Chiefs of Police, *Uniform Crime Reporting*, pp. 217, 433 (New York, 1929) (heading "Felony Homicide").

¹⁹ The loss to the victim, while most important of all, is not an economic loss.

²⁰ Figures as to average earning power may be used to get some idea of the general order of magnitude of the loss, but not to secure a definite total figure.

²¹ See p. 371, *supra*, note 5.

manslaughter, and 2,684 as cases of manslaughter by negligence.²² It might at first appear that here were data which might be used. But, entirely aside from the question of accuracy of the figures,²³ it is quite clear that they do not give the number of criminal homicides. Included in the total for murder and nonnegligent manslaughter may be cases of killings in self-defense and other justifiable homicides. Included in the total for manslaughter by negligence may be numerous cases of deaths by automobile accidents which turn out not to have been cases of manslaughter at all. Both classes, moreover, may include cases of unexplained deaths under suspicious circumstances where it is not certain, and perhaps never will be certain, whether a criminal homicide has been committed or not. In many cases, indeed, it is impossible to tell whether there has been a criminal killing until the person responsible for the killing is brought to trial (if he ever is) and the question of his criminal liability determined by a jury.²⁴ Hence, even if data as to the average economic loss due to individual homicides were available, there would be no satisfactory basis for determining the total number of criminal homicides, and so the total loss.

However, some general estimate of the order of magnitude of such loss may be ventured. If it be assumed (a) that the homicide rate for the urban communities of the country is indicated by the figures reported to the Department of Justice;²⁵ (b) that the number of criminal homicides in rural communities may be disregarded; (c) that 75 per cent of the homicides in urban communities involve criminal liability;²⁶ (d) that the potential earning power of the average victim is the same as that of the average em-

²² Unpublished figures furnished through the cooperation of the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

²³ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 12-13, 37-39, 52-55. And see pp. 345-346, *supra*. The reported figures as to homicide are perhaps less open to criticism than the reported figures as to other Part I offenses.

²⁴ This difficulty appears to have been overlooked in a recent publication of the Department of Justice. See Uniform Crime Reports, vol. 2, No. 4, p. 5 (April, 1931).

²⁵ On this assumption the total number of reportable homicides in urban communities in 1930 would be indicated to be approximately 8,720. In view of the distribution of the reporting cities among various population groups (Uniform Crime Reports, vol. 2, No. 4, p. 2), the assumption seems a not unreasonable one.

²⁶ This assumption is purely arbitrary.

ployed person; (e) that the earning power of the average citizen is \$1,384 per year;²⁷ and (f) that the age of the average victim is 35.5 years,²⁸ the resultant figure as to the annual loss to the community due to criminal homicide works out at approximately \$127,000,000.²⁹ It must be emphasized that this figure is not an estimate of the amount of such loss for 1930 or for any other year, and that it is of use only as indicating in a very general way something as to the probable order of magnitude of that amount. In point of fact, the actual economic loss may be much less or much greater. We do not know. And, in any case, the economic-injury aspect of homicide has no substantial significance.

3. *Mayhem and wounding.*—Crime against the person may take the form of maiming or wounding the victim, either intentionally or as the result of criminal negligence. Such injuries clearly result in economic loss to the victim, who must expend money for his cure and whose earning power is in some cases impaired, and also cause loss to the community. But here again the obstacles in the way of arriving at an accurate total dollars-and-cents figure for the country as a whole are insuperable.

In the first place, the number of injuries to the person of various kinds resulting from criminal acts is unknown. Such crimes, when reported by the police to the Department of Justice, are classified as "aggravated assaults," but this class of crimes also includes such offenses as assaults with a deadly weapon where no bodily harm results,³⁰ and the figures reported neither indicate the number of such assaults resulting in injuries nor the character of such injuries, if any. In the second place, the economic damage

²⁷ See Copeland, *The National Income and Its Distribution*, in *Recent Economic Changes in the United States*, vol. 2, p. 777 (Report of the Committee on Recent Economic Changes of the President's Conference on Unemployment, 1929). The figure is for 1925, and represents average salary and wage income for all industrial employees. See p. 432, *infra*, note 50.

²⁸ This was the average age at death of all victims of violent deaths in 1920, suicide excepted. See *Mortality Rates, 1910-1920*, p. 130 (U. S. Census, 1923).

²⁹ The average expectancy for age 35.5 is 31.0 years. See *United States Life Tables, 1910*, p. 16 (U. S. Census, 1916). The present value of an annuity of \$1,384 for 31.0 years, on the basis of a 4½ per cent interest rate, is \$19,480. See *Dublin and Lotka, The Money Value of a Man*, p. 237 (New York, 1930). Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Glenn McIlugh, assistant to the president, Equitable Life Assurance Society, New York, N. Y., for assistance in developing this estimate.

³⁰ See International Association of Chiefs of Police, *Uniform Crime Reporting*, p. 198.

due to injuries due to cases of mayhem or wounding will vary enormously, both because of differences in the character of the injuries suffered and because of differences in the economic position of the persons injured. Third, the economic loss to the injured individual may or may not be lessened by civil recovery from the criminal or by insurance. These difficulties not only prevent the developing of an accurate estimate of total losses, but also make it impossible to attempt even such a rough and purely suggestive estimate of the probable order of magnitude of those losses as was attempted in the previous section with regard to criminal homicide.

4. *Sex offenses.*—The difficulty of evaluating economic loss due to crimes against the person becomes even more clearly insuperable when sex offenses are considered. In the first place, it may fairly be doubted whether many of these offenses (rape, adultery, fornication, incest, prostitution, etc.) can be regarded as involving any direct economic loss at all. The injury to the individuals involved and to the community is of quite a different character. In the second place, there is no way of evaluating the economic loss due to such offenses if it be assumed that there is such loss. In most cases there is not even the rather hypothetical yardstick of loss of earning power to be used. Perhaps some figure as to loss of productive labor might be developed to apply to cases of prostitution, but even this is doubtful. Third, there is no way whatever of determining the number and character of such offenses. The only figures reported by police departments are as to rape, and these are almost certainly incomplete.³¹ Other sex offenses are almost always concealed and appear in the records only in those cases—probably comparatively infrequent—where arrests are made. The fact is that in dealing with offenses of this class, we are no longer in a field where the law is seeking to protect economic interests, and hence economic measures of loss are basically impossible of application.

5. *Conclusion.*—There is no possibility of developing satisfactory total figures as to economic losses resulting from crimes against the person. In the case of sex offenses even the factum of economic loss may be doubtful, and in all cases that loss is impossible of accurate measurement in

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

CONTINUED

4 OF 7

monetary terms. Only in the case of homicide is it possible to develop some general idea of the order of magnitude of the loss, and even here the figure so developed can not be regarded as an accurate estimate or measure of the actual loss sustained.

The importance of crimes against the person is, of course, in no way measured by the economic loss which they cause. In dealing with matters of life and personal safety, mere economic considerations are very largely beside the point.

CHAPTER III

LOSSES DUE TO DIRECT CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

1. *Introductory.*—Two general groups of direct crimes against property may be distinguished: (a) those involving the destruction of or injury to property; and (b) those which involve the taking by the criminal of money or property and its conversion to his own use. Crimes of the first group include arson and a miscellaneous group of offenses which may be conveniently grouped under the general classification of malicious mischief. Crimes of the second group include the various forms of theft and other criminal takings of property—larceny, robbery, burglary,²² and embezzlement.

2. *Arson.*—Probably the most important crime involving actual destruction of property is arson—intentional destruction or injury of a building by fire.²³ The fact of economic loss in cases of arson is clear, and there is no inherent impossibility of measuring that loss in monetary terms. If the cause of a particular fire is definitely known to be incendiary, the problem of evaluating the amount of the loss is no more difficult than in any other case where it is necessary to determine the value of property destroyed. The principal difficulty is in identifying fires of incendiary origin as such.

The National Board of Fire Underwriters, an organization which represents stock fire insurance companies (as

²² The crime of burglary does not necessarily involve any taking of property; a breaking and entering with intent to steal is sufficient. Here we are concerned only with burglaries which involve theft.

²³ This is not a technical definition, but describes the crime of arson sufficiently for present purposes. The technical definition differs in different States.

distinguished from mutual companies) doing approximately 88 per cent of the fire underwriting business of the country, has data showing total fire losses in the United States for the past 70 years. Such losses are classified as to certain specified causes wherever possible, one of those causes being incendiary. In many cases, the cause of a fire can not be definitely determined, and hence, in addition to classified losses, the board reports a large proportion of losses as due to "unknown causes." A considerable number of these are believed by insurance experts to be of incendiary origin.³⁴ Table 1 shows the total fire losses, losses due to known incendiary, and losses due to unknown causes, paid by stock insurance companies in the United States during the 9-year period ending in 1928.³⁵

TABLE 1.—*Fire losses in the United States, 1920-1928*

Year	Total losses	Losses due to incendiary	Losses due to unknown causes
1920.....	\$358,322,951	\$1,227,450	\$144,207,527
1921.....	399,044,083	2,488,970	178,175,794
1922.....	405,232,802	2,708,328	185,250,312
1923.....	428,187,230	1,662,987	180,202,464
1924.....	439,231,563	2,368,301	180,701,041
1925.....	447,543,087	2,092,221	199,179,533
1926.....	449,584,001	2,202,492	202,309,737
1927.....	378,347,176	2,403,015	171,038,420
1928.....	371,685,082	2,460,034	170,330,314
Average.....	408,642,197	2,176,713	180,058,337

The figures in Table 1 do not show the total fire loss of the country, since they do not include (a) losses insured by mutual companies, (b) losses insured by stock companies not members of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, nor (c) uninsured losses.³⁶ Nor do they include any allowance for loss of use and occupancy of buildings destroyed or damaged by fire. Moreover, as already indicated, the losses

³⁴ It is estimated by some experts that incendiary fires account for approximately 20 per cent of all fire losses. Reported losses due to incendiary are in any event almost certainly too small, since adjusters for obvious reasons do not report a fire as incendiary unless its criminal origin can be definitely established.

³⁵ Data furnished by the National Board of Fire Underwriters, New York, N. Y. Acknowledgment is made to Messrs. A. Bruce Bielaski and F. R. Morgaridge, assistant managers of the board, for cooperation in securing these figures.

³⁶ It is estimated by the National Board of Fire Underwriters that its figures cover approximately 80 per cent of all losses.

reported as due to incendiary are minimum figures.³⁷ This absolute minimum of loss is, on the average, well over \$2,000,000 a year, and the actual loss is in all probability very many times greater.

The data available are insufficient to indicate whether incendiary fires are increasing in number and importance. The proportion of known arson losses to total fire losses showed a considerable rise in 1921 and 1922 (when it reached 0.62 per cent and 0.66 per cent, respectively) and a similar increase in 1927 and 1928 (when the proportion jumped from 0.49 per cent in 1926 to 0.64 per cent in 1927 and 0.66 per cent in 1928), but these variations may well be due to causes other than increases in the amount of incendiary.

It is impossible to estimate total arson losses on the basis of the available figures as to insured losses, since there is no way of determining either what proportion of all property is insured against fire or what proportion of insured losses are due to incendiary. All that can be said is that the economic loss due to arson is important and substantial, and in all probability very greatly exceeds the figure of approximately \$2,000,000 representing the average annual insured loss due to known incendiary.

3. *Malicious mischief*.—The general term "malicious mischief" is here used, not in its technical legal sense, which differs in different States, but as a compendious description of all kinds of criminal acts resulting in the injury or destruction of physical property other than by fire. Thus defined, it includes damage to property due to the use of explosives and all other forms of physical force. Such damage or destruction is in many cases incident to riot or civil commotion (frequently related to labor disturbances) or may be closely connected with racketeering or other forms of organized extortion,³⁸ but may also occur independently of either.

The only basis for any estimate of the amount of loss due to malicious mischief is to be found in the statistics of

³⁷ The average percentage of known incendiary losses to all losses for the period of 1920-1928 is 0.53 per cent. If the estimate referred to in note 34, supra, is relied upon, the total loss due to incendiary causes is over 37 times as great.

³⁸ This is particularly true of damage caused by the use of explosives.

losses paid by companies writing riot insurance. Table 2 shows the aggregate of such payments for the 9-year period ending in 1929.³⁹

TABLE 2.—Riot losses in the United States, 1921-1929

Year	Losses paid	Year	Losses paid
1921.....	\$2,432,403	1927.....	\$2,175,570
1922.....	2,051,828	1928.....	1,085,806
1923.....	4,820,491	1929.....	2,400,051
1924.....	3,392,076		
1925.....	3,101,128	Average.....	2,747,089
1926.....	1,760,643		

The figures in Table 2 do not, of course, show the total losses due to crimes involving malicious mischief during the 9 years ending in 1929. In the first place, those figures include some losses due to accident—for example, accidental explosions, accidents injuring property occurring in the course of civil commotion, etc.—and not to criminal acts at all. The figures therefore are too large so far as insured losses due to malicious mischief are concerned. On the other hand, the proportion of the property in the country covered by riot insurance is small, so that, so far as total losses due to malicious mischief are concerned, the figures are in all probability much too low.

However, while exact figures are not available, it can not be doubted that large economic losses due to the criminal use of explosives and other criminal damage to property occur each year. Probably the most dramatic illustrations of such losses are the bombings and dynamitings which sometimes accompany labor disturbances and which are becoming increasingly notorious in connection with racketeering activities. But these are by no means the only losses of this character. Ripping up furs and textiles, pouring acid on garments, sabotage of machinery and motor equipment—all these fall in the same class as the dynamiting of factories or residences. While the total loss due to these causes can not be definitely stated, it is undoubtedly large.

³⁹ Data from Insurance Yearbook, 1922 to 1930 (Published by The Spectator Co., New York, N. Y.).

4. *Theft*.—The most common private losses due to crime are the result of some form of theft, either simple larceny, such as pocket-picking, thefts by servants, stealing of automobiles, etc.; burglary—i. e., breaking and entering buildings to steal; or robbery—i. e., stealing from the person of the victim under threat of violence.⁴⁰ Thefts of one kind and another made up 94.6 per cent of all Part I offenses known to the police⁴¹ as reported to the Department of Justice for 1930,⁴² and represent the most common form of individual criminal offense.⁴³

There are, in general, three sources of figures as to losses due to larceny, burglary, and robbery: (a) the figures of insurance companies as to losses paid; (b) figures collected by some trade organizations as to losses sustained by their members, whether insured or not; and (c) figures reported by certain police departments as to the estimated value of the property stolen in cases where the theft is reported to the police.⁴⁴ Figures of the first class are exact and reliable, but cover only insured losses; figures of the second class are reliable and cover all losses, but are available only for a few kinds of businesses; figures of the third class can not, it is believed, be regarded as reliable.

There are three reasons for doubting the accuracy of police figures as to losses: First, they are in most cases based entirely on the unverified statements of the victims of thefts, who in many cases have no accurate idea of the value of the property stolen from them, or sometimes even as to the amounts of money they have lost. Second, the present facilities of most police departments are not such as to

⁴⁰ These definitions are descriptive only. The legal definitions of larceny, burglary, and robbery vary in different States. See International Association of Chiefs of Police, Uniform Crime Reporting, pp. 196-197, 203-214 (New York, 1929). For present purposes, it is not necessary to go into such technicalities as larceny by trick, larceny by breaking bulk, etc. As to the distinction between larceny and embezzlement, see p. 390, *infra*.

⁴¹ For a definition of Part I offenses, see pp. 344-345, *supra*.

⁴² Unpublished information for 886 cities having an aggregate population of 41,047,003, furnished through the cooperation of the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

⁴³ Embezzlements are fewer in number than thefts, although causing larger losses in the average individual case. Commercialized fraud and racketeering are organized and continuous courses of criminal conduct rather than individual criminal offenses.

⁴⁴ Information as to mail thefts and robberies is obtainable from the Post Office Department. See p. 395, *infra*. This information relates to Government losses only.

insure accuracy in the recording and reporting of statistics. Even police statistics as to numbers of known offenses are still far from being wholly reliable, although uniform machinery for their collection has been worked out,⁴⁵ and there is not even such uniform machinery for collecting figures as to the value of property stolen. Third, considerable temptation to keep figures as to value of property stolen down as low as possible is likely to exist. This will be particularly true where a particular police department is attempting to build up a record of apparent efficiency. In dealing with data as to value, which are at best only rough estimates, the total figures may be "adjusted" in almost any way desired. In view of these possible sources of serious error in the data, no figures as to losses due to theft based on police figures as to the value of stolen property will be presented in this report.

This leaves two sources of statistical data—the insurance companies and certain trade organizations. Figures from both sources have been secured. The insurance figures include quite complete data on insured losses due to thefts of goods, money, and automobiles. The figures from trade organizations include comprehensive data as to total losses, whether insured or not, sustained by banks, jewelers, and railroad companies. All these figures may, we believe, be regarded as reliable, although, of course, they are far from covering all losses due to theft. The general field of uninsured losses, with the exception of those sustained by banks, jewelers, and the railroads, is one for which no figures are available and no estimate possible. The available figures thus merely indicate minimum losses due to thefts of property.

The figures available will be presented in the following order: (a) data as to losses sustained by banks due to burglaries and holdups; (b) data as to losses sustained by jewelers due to burglaries, holdups, and sneak thefts; (c) data as to losses sustained by the railroads due to thefts of freight; (d) data as to insured losses due to automobile thefts; and (e) data as to insured losses due to burglaries,

⁴⁵ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, pp. 12, 13. See also pp. 345-346, supra.

robberies, and larcenies other than automobile thefts. Finally, though not strictly germane to the subject of private losses, data on losses to the Federal Government due to mail thefts will be presented.

(a) *Bank losses.*—The American Bankers Association⁴⁶ has for some years collected and compiled statistics on the number of burglaries and robberies suffered and amounts lost as a result of such crimes both by its members and by many nonmember banks throughout the United States. Table 3 gives these data for the 10-year period ending August 31, 1930.⁴⁷

TABLE 3.—Losses due to bank burglaries and robberies, 1921-1930

Year ¹	Burglaries		Robberies		Total loss
	Number	Loss	Number	Loss	
1921.....	220	\$287,745	136	\$936,752	\$1,224,497
1922.....	201	249,301	145	905,609	1,154,970
1923.....	150	176,038	129	469,693	630,331
1924.....	104	204,528	236	1,074,466	1,338,084
1925.....	98	244,900	225	1,076,204	1,021,170
1926.....	54	248,809	203	1,345,235	1,694,104
1927.....	92	186,500	227	2,010,707	2,196,327
1928.....	70	156,909	292	1,702,703	1,919,702
1929.....	52	134,900	327	1,538,616	1,673,676
1930.....	40	102,694	402	2,003,391	2,106,085
Average.....	114	205,226	232	1,371,340	1,576,675

¹ In each case the figures are for the 12-month period beginning on Sept. 1 of the previous calendar year.

It is interesting to note that while bank burglaries have been steadily and progressively on the decrease during the last decade, bank robberies have shown an increase. Most of the victims of both of these kinds of crime, especially robbery, are country banks in sparsely settled districts.

Figures as to insured losses due to bank burglaries and robberies are available for the years 1923 to 1929, inclusive. These data are shown by Table 4.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Approximately 72 per cent of the banks of the country, with resources amounting to approximately 85 per cent of all bank resources, are members of the association.

⁴⁷ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. James E. Baum, manager of the protective department of the American Bankers Association, for cooperation in securing the figures here presented.

⁴⁸ Compiled for the commission by the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters, New York, N. Y. See p. 391, infra, note 69.

TABLE 4.—Insured losses due to bank burglaries and robberies, 1923-1929

Year	Burglaries		Robberies		Total loss
	Number	Loss	Number	Loss	
1923.....	423	\$350,800	201	\$571,012	\$927,912
1924.....	350	306,449	270	020,528	991,977
1925.....	208	204,950	208	572,743	807,702
1926.....	221	178,907	251	004,024	1,142,991
1927.....	188	217,685	273	076,024	1,104,609
1928.....	101	143,502	284	1,065,607	1,209,009
1929.....	108	79,328	330	894,888	974,216
Average.....	250	233,836	208	810,230	1,044,072

¹ Figures subject to adjustment.

A comparison of Tables 3 and 4 shows that the number of losses due to bank burglary and robbery reported to (and, in the case of burglary, the amount of losses paid by) the burglary insurance companies of the country exceeds the number of offenses and amount of losses compiled as totals by the American Bankers Association. There appear to be two reasons for this: (a) The insurance figures include attempted burglaries and robberies, where any damage to banking property is claimed, in the total number of offenses reported, and also include the amount of indemnity paid for such damage, which is covered by the standard bank burglary and bank robbery policies, in total losses; the figures of the American Bankers Association include only burglaries and robberies actually consummated and amounts of money or negotiable securities actually stolen. (b) Most burglary and robbery policies are carried by small banks in rural districts, which in many cases are not members of the American Bankers Association.⁴⁹ The figures compiled by the association, while 98 per cent complete so far as its members are concerned, are at most 90 per cent complete as to nonmembers,⁵⁰ so that a substantial number of insured losses are in all probability not included in the association's figures.

⁴⁹ It may be noted that, while the average loss per burglary as reported to the association for the 7-year period from 1923 to 1929 was \$2,282, and per robbery \$0,057, the average insured burglary loss was \$930, and the average insured robbery loss was \$3,057. While the amount recoverable on burglary and robbery policies is limited by the insured's declaration, this in itself will hardly explain the difference in the figures.

⁵⁰ Estimate by the protective department of the American Bankers Association.

It is believed, therefore, that both sets of figures may be relied upon—those compiled by the American Bankers Association as showing losses of money and negotiable securities by members and reporting nonmembers due to actual burglary and robbery, those of the insurance companies as showing insured losses and damage of all kinds due to attempted burglary and robbery as well as losses of all kinds due to actual burglary and robbery. Whichever figures are considered, it is clear that bank burglaries and holdups cause an average loss in excess of \$1,000,000 per year.

(b) *Losses by jewelers.*—The Jewelers Security Alliance collects data as to thefts from its members⁵¹ and also as to all thefts from jewelers, whether members of the alliance or not, which are reported in trade publications.⁵²

Table 5 gives data as to the number of thefts from jewelers of various classes and the value of the property stolen for the 9-year period ending in 1929.⁵³

⁵¹ The alliance includes in its membership some 5,000 of the 20,000 jewelers in the United States. Its members do approximately 50 per cent of the jewelry business of the country, according to the alliance's estimate. The alliance is active in the detection and prosecution of criminals who attack jewelry stores, and spent in 1929 the sum of \$50,530 in this work.

⁵² The alliance estimates that about 80 per cent of all thefts from jewelers are reported in trade publications and so appear in its compilation of figures on losses.

⁵³ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Harry C. Larter, president, and Mr. James H. Noyes, secretary of the alliance, for cooperation in securing these figures.

TABLE 5.—Losses due to thefts from jewelers, 1921-1929

Year	Safe burglaries		Store burglaries		Window burglaries		Sneak thefts		Holdups		Total loss
	Number	Loss	Number	Loss	Number	Loss	Number	Loss	Number	Loss	
1921	43	\$225,446	228	\$282,190	344	\$187,704	225	\$166,097	133	\$979,118	\$1,840,575
1922	35	245,905	217	128,900	234	159,703	150	115,500	141	824,000	1,473,700
1923	48	450,000	207	175,000	293	300,000	195	250,000	117	800,000	1,975,000
1924	55	480,000	273	461,000	308	179,800	162	138,600	202	2,123,000	3,333,400
1925	30	189,495	189	339,190	295	162,240	152	162,868	205	2,304,965	3,148,758
1926	40	459,206	173	208,274	370	236,588	145	155,738	99	559,284	1,639,090
1927	33	1,212,326	127	231,447	243	146,930	185	155,945	100	576,325	3,222,973
1928	23	236,600	154	194,143	258	150,593	185	182,851	91	883,749	1,597,936
1929	30	183,520	142	142,887	253	137,895	156	271,693	77	517,579	1,253,574
Average	37	409,213	190	240,370	283	186,828	167	171,032	129	1,060,891	2,068,334

1 Estimated figures.

While the figures given in Table 5 can not be regarded as being of the same degree of accuracy as those previously given⁵⁴ as to bank losses,⁵⁵ it is believed that they give a reasonably accurate idea of the approximate amounts of loss due to thefts from jewelers. The figures indicate that such losses have averaged in excess of \$2,000,000 per year during the last decade, but have been decreasing since 1927.

(c) *Railroad losses.*—The American Railway Association collects and compiles figures as to the amount paid out by the railroads to shippers as the result of thefts of freight. Table 6 shows losses of this character for the 10-year period ending in 1929.⁵⁶

TABLE 6.—Losses due to theft of railroad freight, 1920-1929

Year	Loss	Year	Loss
1920	\$12,726,047	1920	\$1,314,501
1921	9,024,747	1927	1,151,130
1922	4,800,710	1928	928,593
1923	3,117,484	1929	797,803
1924	2,333,393	Average	3,855,374
1925	1,492,451		

Table 6 indicates that losses due to thefts of freight from railroad custody, while averaging over \$3,800,000 per annum for the past decade, and while still over \$750,000 annually, have steadily and substantially decreased each year since 1920.

(d) *Automobile thefts.*—No total figures as to losses due to automobile thefts are available, but, through the co-operation of the National Automobile Underwriters Association,⁵⁷ substantially complete data as to insured losses have been obtained.

Table 7 gives the total number of automobiles in the United States, the number and per cent insured, the number and per cent stolen, and the number and per cent stolen and recovered for the 5-year period ending in 1929.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ See Tables 3 and 4, supra.

⁵⁵ Since they are based in part on estimates of losses appearing in trade publications.

⁵⁶ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. J. C. Caviston, secretary of the protective section of the American Railway Association, for cooperation in securing these figures.

⁵⁷ The association has a Bureau of Automobile Thefts which is active in detecting and prosecuting persons who steal automobiles. In 1930 the expenditures of this bureau were \$514,006.54.

⁵⁸ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. J. Ross Moore, manager of the association, for cooperation in securing these figures.

TABLE 7.—Automobiles stolen and recovered, 1925-1929

Year	Number of automobiles	Number insured	Percent insured	Number stolen	Percent of total	Number recovered	Percent of number stolen
1925.....	19,954,347	2,838,304	14.2	45,316	0.23	28,840	63.7
1926.....	22,001,393	3,262,770	14.8	49,325	.22	31,972	64.6
1927.....	23,133,241	3,276,047	14.2	48,104	.21	35,814	74.4
1928.....	24,493,124	3,370,981	13.7	58,182	.24	46,076	79.2
1929.....	26,601,443	4,880,204	18.5	69,505	.23	51,043	87.3
Average.....	23,210,710	3,525,661	15.2	52,098	.22	38,920	74.7

Table 8 shows the number of cars stolen and not recovered, the net insured losses paid,⁵⁹ and the relation of net losses paid to total insurance for the 6-year period ending in 1930.⁶⁰

TABLE 8.—Insured losses due to automobile theft, 1925-1930

Year	Cars stolen and not recovered	Losses paid	Losses per \$1,000 insurance in force ¹
1925.....	16,476	\$10,341,251	\$6.05
1926.....	17,353	20,237,710	5.90
1927.....	12,350	16,950,118	4.92
1928.....	12,107	14,202,165	4.63
1929.....	7,562	11,548,263	2.20
1930.....	(?)	13,060,033	2.62
Average.....	13,170	15,831,425	4.07

¹ Computed on the basis of data as to total insurance in force furnished by the National Automobile Underwriters Association.

² Figure not yet available.

³ For 5 years only.

Insured losses due to automobile theft thus have averaged well over \$15,000,000 per year for the 6 years ending in 1930. Such losses seem to have been somewhat on the decline since 1926, although 1930 saw an increase over 1929. While only 15.2 per cent of all automobiles were insured, on the average, during this period, it can not be assumed that the \$15,800,000 is 15.2 per cent of the total loss due to automobile theft. Many uninsured automobiles are old or cheap cars, and such cars are least often stolen. It is probable, therefore, that much more than 15.2 per cent of all automobile thefts, both in number and value of the cars stolen, involve insured cars. It is wholly impossible to determine what proportion of cars stolen are insured, and hence no estimate of total losses on the basis of insured loss can be

⁵⁹ After deducting amounts realized on stolen cars recovered.

⁶⁰ Data from National Automobile Underwriters Association.

made. The most that can be said is that net losses due to automobile thefts averaging over \$15,000,000 per annum have been paid by insurance companies over the past 6 years, and that the aggregate loss, insured and uninsured, must be substantially in excess of this figure.

(c) *Insured losses generally.*—Figures have already been presented as to insured losses due to bank robbery and burglary and to automobile theft. We will next consider other insured losses due to various types of larceny, burglary, and robbery. Six types of theft insurance, in addition to bank burglary and robbery and automobile theft coverage, must be distinguished:⁶¹ (a) residence burglary, theft, and larceny; ⁶² (b) mercantile open stock burglary; ⁶³ (c) mercantile safe burglary; ⁶⁴ (d) office and store robbery; ⁶⁵ (e) messenger robbery; ⁶⁶ and (f) paymaster robbery.⁶⁷ Data as to net insured losses due to these types of theft⁶⁸ have been compiled for the commission by the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters⁶⁹ and are presented in

⁶¹ The classification is that made by the burglary insurance companies in their standard policies. The details of the classification given in notes 62 to 67, infra, have been furnished by the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters, New York, N. Y. See note 69, infra.

⁶² Theft, burglary, robbery or larceny of jewelry and household goods, taken either from the residence or forcibly from the person of the assured or of permanent members of his household, including attempts at burglary, robbery or larceny causing property damage.

⁶³ Burglary involving taking of merchandise, furniture and fixtures, or equipment from the assured's premises when not open for business, including attempts at burglary causing damage to such property.

⁶⁴ Burglary involving taking of property from a locked safe, including attempts at burglary resulting in damage to the safe or its contents.

⁶⁵ Robbery involving taking of property from the assured's premises, including attempts at robbery resulting in damage to property.

⁶⁶ Robbery of money or property in the custody of officers, paymasters, messengers, cashiers, clerks, or sales persons of assured taking place outside assured's premises, including attempts at robbery resulting in damage to property.

⁶⁷ Robbery of pay rolls taking place on or outside of the assured's premises or of other money and securities taking place outside those premises, from the regular custodian, including attempts at robbery resulting in damage to property. (Indemnity for pay-roll robbery is limited to 10 per cent of coverage.)

⁶⁸ Data as to bank burglary and robbery, secured from the same source, have already been presented. See p. 386, supra. Some personal hold-up insurance is also written, but no figures as to losses have been secured.

⁶⁹ A central rating bureau representing companies writing approximately 90 per cent of the burglary and robbery insurance of the country. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. Albert W. Whitney, associate general manager of the bureau, Mr. C. G. Van der Feen, statistician, and to Mr. Charles J. Haugh, actuary, for cooperation in the compilation of the figures here presented. The data supplied by the bureau contained interesting details as to losses by States and for the larger cities of the country, but lack of space has prevented the reproduction of this detailed material in this report.

Tables 9 to 14, inclusive. These tables show number of insured losses, amount of loss, and loss frequency ⁷⁰ by years for the 7-year period ending in 1929.

TABLE 9.—Insured losses due to residence burglary, theft, and larceny, 1923-1929

Year	Losses reported	Total loss	Loss frequency
1923.....	17,754	\$3,714,600	3.2
1924.....	20,778	4,395,619	3.0
1925.....	19,160	4,282,609	2.5
1926.....	18,883	3,852,800	2.3
1927.....	20,968	4,150,852	2.4
1928.....	21,103	4,408,914	2.3
1929 ¹	23,204	4,474,394	2.4
Average.....	20,275	4,184,090	2.6

¹ Subject to adjustment.

TABLE 10.—Insured losses due to mercantile open stock burglary, 1923-1929

Year	Losses reported	Total loss	Loss frequency
1923.....	2,520	\$2,040,673	1.5
1924.....	2,857	2,314,241	1.5
1925.....	2,494	2,028,583	1.2
1926.....	2,050	1,446,023	1.0
1927.....	1,971	963,014	1.0
1928.....	1,970	1,012,406	1.1
1929 ¹	2,228	1,275,490	1.3
Average.....	2,300	1,584,333	1.1

¹ Subject to adjustment.

TABLE 11.—Insured losses due to mercantile safe burglary, 1923-1929

Year	Losses reported	Total loss	Loss frequency
1923.....	2,349	\$723,830	1.3
1924.....	3,482	1,220,688	1.6
1925.....	3,068	1,042,938	1.2
1926.....	2,886	1,072,443	1.0
1927.....	2,943	937,801	.9
1928.....	3,093	960,984	1.0
1929 ¹	3,146	923,714	.9
Average.....	2,905	9,984,915	1.1

¹ Subject to adjustment.

⁷⁰ The "loss frequency" is the number of losses per \$100,000 insurance in force and affords a measure of the relative frequency of losses in different years which takes account of variations in the amount of property insured.

TABLE 12.—Insured losses due to office and store robbery, 1923-1929

Year	Losses reported	Total loss	Loss frequency
1923.....	2,097	\$604,524	1.1
1924.....	3,079	1,216,028	1.2
1925.....	2,687	1,073,868	.9
1926.....	2,080	880,109	.9
1927.....	3,187	883,321	1.0
1928.....	3,712	973,511	1.0
1929 ¹	4,474	1,077,808	1.2
Average.....	3,140	957,029	1.0

¹ Subject to adjustment.

TABLE 13.—Insured losses due to messenger robbery, 1923-1929

Year	Losses reported	Total loss	Loss frequency
1923.....	849	\$401,530	0.4
1924.....	1,307	663,926	.5
1925.....	1,059	568,893	.3
1926.....	902	353,412	.3
1927.....	923	399,536	.3
1928.....	1,110	444,036	.3
1929 ¹	1,308	593,536	.4
Average.....	1,066	459,265	.4

¹ Subject to adjustment.

TABLE 14.—Insured losses due to paymaster robbery, 1923-1929

Year	Losses reported	Total loss	Loss frequency
1923.....	99	\$194,335	0.1
1924.....	141	201,917	.1
1925.....	177	380,404	.1
1926.....	119	250,505	.1
1927.....	99	164,442	.1
1928.....	133	223,363	.1
1929 ¹	150	213,036	.1
Average.....	131	232,592	.1

¹ Subject to adjustment.

Table 15 brings together figures as to all classes of insured losses,⁷¹ including those due to insured bank burglaries and robberies and to the theft of insured automobiles, showing the total net losses of each class for the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929, inclusive.⁷²

⁷¹ Except personal hold-up insurance. See p. 391, supra, note 68.

⁷² Complete figures as to all types of insured losses due to theft (except personal hold-up losses) are available for this period.

TABLE 15.—Summary of insured losses due to theft, 1925-1929

Year	Residence burglary and theft ¹	Mercantile open stock burglary ²	Mercantile safe burglary ³	Office and store robbery ⁴	Messenger robbery ⁵	Paymaster robbery ⁶	Bank burglary and robbery ⁷	Automobile theft ⁸	Total loss
1925	\$4,282,509	\$2,028,583	\$1,042,938	\$1,073,868	\$568,898	\$380,404	\$867,702	\$19,341,251	\$29,586,153
1926	3,829,806	1,446,023	1,072,443	1,880,169	383,412	230,595	1,142,991	20,337,710	29,306,133
1927	4,159,852	1,663,914	1,837,801	883,321	399,536	164,442	1,194,609	16,689,118	25,362,593
1928	4,408,914	1,012,406	966,984	973,511	444,036	223,368	1,269,699	14,292,165	23,440,483
1929	4,474,394	1,275,400	928,714	1,077,698	563,536	213,086	972,216	11,548,263	21,053,597
Average	4,235,695	1,345,283	989,776	977,753	471,884	246,379	1,077,323	16,417,703	25,761,797

¹ From Table 9, supra.² From Table 11, supra.³ From Table 13, supra.⁷ From Table 4, supra.⁸ From Table 8, supra.⁵ From Table 14, supra.⁶ From Table 5, supra.

Insured losses due to theft have thus averaged over \$25,000,000 per annum for the 5-year period ending in 1929. As has been pointed out,⁷³ there is no satisfactory method of computing total losses on the basis of insured losses, and hence it is impossible to estimate the total loss due to various forms of theft, although it is clear that the loss exceeds (and in all probability very substantially exceeds) \$25,000,000 per year.

(f) *Losses due to mail thefts.*—Losses suffered by the United States as a result of robberies, burglaries, and other thefts of mail, while not private losses, are losses to the Federal Government in its proprietary capacity which are analogous to private losses.⁷⁴ Data as to such losses are available for the past 10 years, and are presented here for purposes of comparison with the figures given above as to private losses of similar character.

Table 16 gives the aggregate losses of the Post Office Department for the 10-year period ending June 30, 1930, due to burglary, robbery, and other thefts of mail where the loss amounted to \$5,000 or more or where an employee was killed.⁷⁵

TABLE 16.—Losses due to mail thefts, 1921-1930

Year ¹	Gross loss	Recoveries	Net loss
1921	\$0,542,007.48	\$3,852,015.87	\$2,689,781.61
1922	2,632,403.00	1,407,331.00	1,125,072.00
1923	2,600,308.00	2,366,366.00	139,842.00
1924	2,600,157.00	1,407,444.00	1,041,713.00
1925	280,709.00	125,803.00	154,906.00
1926	1,408,640.00	761,627.75	646,912.25
1927	680,287.00	254,025.21	431,361.79
1928	445,755.00	150,102.00	295,653.00
1929	303,888.00	127,305.00	181,493.00
1930	128,109.00	31,600.00	96,509.00
Average	1,734,885.35	1,054,640.08	680,344.37

¹ Fiscal year ending June 30 of the year specified.

While the figures given in the above table do not include all losses due to mail thefts, they do include all the more important losses. The average net loss per year for the last

⁷³ See p. 374, supra.⁷⁴ The question of governmental losses due to criminal acts is discussed in pt. 1 (pp. 59-60, supra); the reasons for not including a separate chapter on such losses are there stated.⁷⁵ Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Harold N. Graves, executive assistant to the Postmaster General, for cooperation in securing these figures.

10 years has been approximately \$680,000, and the average net loss for the past 5 years approximately \$330,000. Such losses are relatively small in amount, and appear to be definitely on the decrease.

5. *Embezzlement.*—Embezzlement may be defined with sufficient accuracy for present purposes as the unlawful conversion to his own use by an agent or employee of money or property entrusted to his custody. It differs from theft principally in that the original possession of the stolen property by the embezzler is entirely proper, becoming unlawful only when he commits a breach of trust by taking or using the property for his own purposes.⁷⁰

Substantially complete data as to net insured losses due to embezzlement have been compiled by the Towner Rating Bureau⁷¹ and are presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17.—*Insured losses due to embezzlement, 1925-1929*

Year	Losses paid
1925.....	\$12,916,316
1926.....	15,541,329
1927.....	16,740,103
1928.....	20,177,139
1929.....	20,026,231
Average.....	17,201,422

These figures as to insured losses due to embezzlement do not, of course, give any indication of the amount of total losses. In the first place, while fidelity insurance is becoming increasingly common,⁷² it is by no means universal, and many defalcations are not covered by insurance at all. In the second place, even where the defaulting employee is bonded, the amount of insurance carried is very frequently insufficient to cover the entire loss. There is no way of estimating total losses on the basis of insured losses, and

⁷⁰ It is unnecessary to consider for present purposes the different definitions of embezzlement in the various States, or the highly technical distinctions between certain forms of embezzlement and certain forms of larceny.

⁷¹ A central rating bureau representing companies writing approximately 95 per cent of the fidelity insurance contracts written in the United States. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. R. H. Towner, manager of the bureau, and to Mr. Martin F. Lewis, assistant manager, for cooperation in securing the statistics here presented.

⁷² Compare the steady increase in premiums paid on fidelity policies, p. 415, *infra*, Table 22.

the most than can be said, therefore, is that the average loss to private individuals and business organizations due to embezzlement is in all probability very substantially in excess of \$17,000,000 per year.

It should be noted that fidelity insurance covers all forms of defalcations by employees, including losses due to forgeries by them.⁷⁰ However, losses due to forgeries by employees are probably relatively small compared to those due to ordinary embezzlements,⁸⁰ so that the figures given in Table 17 may be used as indicating the approximate amount of insured losses due to embezzlement alone.

6. *Conclusion.*—Direct crimes against property obviously cause losses to the victims of such crimes, and there is no theoretical difficulty in evaluating those losses in monetary terms. While figures as to total losses are available only for a limited number of industries, and while it is impossible to estimate total losses on the basis of insured losses paid, the available figures show that such losses are very substantial. On the basis of the experience of the 5-year period ending in 1929, the banks of the country lose over \$1,800,000 per year due to burglary and robbery;⁸¹ jewelers lose almost \$2,000,000 per year on account of burglaries, hold-ups, and sneak-thefts;⁸² and the railroads lose on the average of over \$1,100,000 a year due to thefts of freight.⁸³

The figures as to insured losses generally are even more significant. Table 18 summarizes insured losses due to known arson, riot, automobile theft, other forms of theft, and embezzlement for the 5-year period 1925 to 1929, inclusive.

⁷⁰ See the discussion of losses due to forgery and counterfeiting, pp. 403-404, *infra*.

⁸⁰ Information furnished by the Towner Rating Bureau, New York, N. Y.

⁸¹ Computed on the basis of Table 3, *supra*.

⁸² Computed on the basis of Table 5, *supra*.

⁸³ Computed on the basis of Table 6, *supra*.

TABLE 18.—Summary of insured losses due to direct crimes against property, 1925-1929

Year	Known arson ¹	Riot ²	Automobile theft ³	Other theft ⁴	Embezzlement ⁵	Total
1925-----	\$2,062,221	\$3,101,128	\$10,341,251	\$10,244,902	\$12,916,310	\$47,665,818
1926-----	2,202,492	1,786,643	20,237,710	9,028,439	15,541,320	48,800,622
1927-----	2,403,615	2,175,579	16,650,118	8,769,475	16,746,103	46,887,890
1928-----	2,466,034	1,685,806	14,202,165	9,238,318	20,177,139	47,769,462
1929-----	(6)	2,406,951	11,548,203	9,505,334	20,026,231	-----
Average....	2,283,591	2,226,221	16,397,703	9,344,004	17,201,422	47,747,448

¹ From Table 1, supra.² From Table 2, supra.³ From Table 3, supra.⁴ Computed from Table 15, supra.⁵ From Table 17, supra.⁶ Not available.⁷ Average for 4-year period 1925-1928, inclusive.

It thus appears that insured losses due to known direct crimes against property average more than \$47,000,000 per year. The actual losses are undoubtedly much greater, since the \$47,000,000 figure does not include (a) losses not covered by insurance at all, which are unquestionably numerous and substantial; (b) the excess loss in cases where the amount of insurance carried is less than the value of the property taken or destroyed; nor (c) losses covered by insurance where the loss is due to an undetected crime, as is undoubtedly often the situation in the case of incendiary fires. There is, as has been repeatedly stated,⁶⁴ no way of estimating total losses on the basis of insured losses; the most that can be said with regard to the aggregate total loss due to direct crimes against property is that this loss is in all probability very substantially greater than the insured loss. The insured loss of \$47,000,000 due to known direct crimes against property is thus a minimum figure, and, in all likelihood, a very low minimum, so far as total losses are concerned.

CHAPTER IV

LOSSES DUE TO CRIMES AFFECTING WEALTH OTHER THAN DIRECT CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

1. *Introductory.*—Up to this point, we have been considering the economic effects upon the victims of criminal acts directed against their persons or against specific money

⁶⁴ See pp. 374, 395, supra.

or property belonging to them. We now turn to a different class of crimes—those which impair the wealth of individuals or organizations and so have the same economic effect as direct crimes against property, but which do so by causing the victims of such crimes to part with money or property by their own act, either as a result of fraud or intimidation, or, in some cases, without their being aware that they have been injured. The two principal forms of crime of this character are (a) various kinds of commercialized fraud, and (b) extortion and racketeering.⁶⁵

Both of these forms of criminal conduct involve the obtaining of money or property through the voluntary (in the sense of intentional) act of the victim. But they have another characteristic in common. They ordinarily are forms of organized crime—of crime as a definite day-to-day business. This is particularly true of such forms of commercialized fraud as stock swindles, and of almost all racketeering activities. The distinction is not a sharp one, since many direct crimes against property are committed by persons who are “in the business” and sometimes are systematically committed as a regular branch of the activities of a gang which is also engaged in racketeering proper, while many criminal frauds are perpetrated in isolated and sporadic cases; but, by and large, both commercialized fraud and organized extortion involve a greater degree of permanent organization than do the ordinary run of incendiary fires, burglaries, larcenies, and embezzlements. In this chapter, therefore, we are dealing primarily with private tribute paid to crime organized as a business.

Certain forms of losses due to crimes not directed against specific property, in addition to fraud and racketeering, might also have been dealt with in this chapter, but have been omitted because the acts involved are not universally regarded as criminal. The principal omission of this character is the loss due to gambling.⁶⁶ While gambling, at least in some forms, is a statutory misdemeanor in most

⁶⁵ Racketeering may incidentally involve crimes against the person and direct crimes against property, but its basic characteristic is the extortion of money. See p. 400, infra.⁶⁶ On gambling losses, see McLellan, Four Billions in Easy Money, North American Review, vol. 228, p. 609 (1929).

States,⁸⁷ it is by no means universally regarded as criminal. The difficulty in distinguishing between (a) losses due to forms of gambling not made criminal by statute, which clearly can not be regarded as private losses due to crime; (b) losses due to technically criminal gambling of sorts not generally regarded by the public as malum in se, which are only technically due to crime; and (c) losses due to fraudulent gambling games,⁸⁸ which clearly are due to crime, would be almost impossible as a practical matter.

For somewhat different reasons, losses due to official extortion from persons engaged in unlawful activities—as, for example, bootlegging—are not dealt with in this report. While the money so extorted is obtained in violation of the criminal law, the loss caused is different in character from ordinary losses to criminals by law-abiding citizens. For this reason, and also because of the tremendous practical difficulties involved in securing any reliable data on the subject, amounts lost by persons engaged in unlawful pursuits due to official extortion of "protection" money,⁸⁹ and losses due to the activities of other criminals (e. g., "hi-jacking," etc.) are not dealt with in this chapter, which is confined to a discussion of losses due to crime other than those suffered by persons engaged in criminal pursuits by reason of the fact that they are so engaged.

2. *Commercialized fraud.*—Crimes involving fraud are as varied as the ingenuity of the criminal mind. It is impossible in the present survey to do more than enumerate the more common forms of such crimes and discuss some of them very briefly. All of them fundamentally involve the obtaining of money or property by false pretenses, and classification must necessarily be either according to the subject matter or according to the means employed. On the basis of subject matter, we may distinguish insurance frauds, fraudulent bankruptcies, securities frauds, credit frauds, and confidence games. On the basis of means used, we may dis-

⁸⁷ Nevada is the most conspicuous example of a State where gambling is at least partially legalized.

⁸⁸ Some reference is made in the next section to forms of gambling involving actual fraud, such as bucket-shopping and certain forms of the confidence game. See p. 403, *infra*.

⁸⁹ On "protection" paid by bootleggers, see Shepherd, \$110.25 Poison Money, 78 Collier's Weekly, p. 10 (1920).

tinguish forgery and counterfeiting and the use of the mails to defraud. These classes overlap to some extent, but it will be convenient to make use of them in the discussion which follows.

(a) *Insurance frauds.*—Frauds on insurance companies are of almost as many classes as there are kinds of insurance. Life-insurance frauds are perhaps least common, but are by no means unknown. They usually involve attempts to collect insurance on living persons, but other schemes may be employed, such as impersonation of beneficiaries. No figures as to the amounts thus fraudulently obtained are available. Fire-insurance frauds are probably the most common, and are usually, although not always, associated with the crime of arson.⁹⁰ The same reasons that make it impossible to secure comprehensive figures on arson losses operate to prevent the ascertainment of losses due to frauds of this character.⁹¹ Burglary and theft insurance frauds are not infrequent (e. g., fake robberies of insured jewelry); marine-insurance frauds have a long history; and the companies writing liability insurance have constantly to be on the lookout against fraudulent claims.⁹² In no case, however, are figures as to the amount of losses available.

There is, of course, one outstanding reason why the amount of losses due to insurance frauds is indeterminable. Such frauds cause loss, generally speaking, only when not detected, and when not detected there is no way of knowing that fraud has taken place.⁹³ Consequently, even with the most complete investigation, the total losses of this character could never be determined. These losses are prob-

⁹⁰ As to arson losses, see pp. 370-381, *supra*.

⁹¹ In the case of fire-insurance frauds there is an actual loss, but the attempt is made fraudulently to collect more than the indemnity for the value of the property destroyed or damaged which is due under the insurance contract. The true loss due to fraud is measured by the excess thus collected; the loss to the insurance company due to having to pay the actual loss is not caused by fraud, but by a direct crime against property. The same principles apply in the case of marine insurance and other forms of insurance against destruction or damage to property.

⁹² Losses to public utility companies and other business establishments due to fraudulent personal injury claims are similar in character, except for the fact that they do not involve insurance frauds.

⁹³ Compare the similar state of affairs as to frauds on the revenue, discussed in pt. 1 of this report (pp. 69-80, *supra*).

ably large, especially in the case of fire-insurance frauds, but their amount is unascertainable.

(b) *Fraudulent bankruptcies.*—It is a matter of common knowledge, emphasized by the recent bankruptcy investigation in New York,⁶⁴ that losses to creditors due to fraudulent bankruptcies are very large. The average annual excess of total liabilities over total amounts paid creditors in all bankruptcy proceedings in the United States for the 5-year period ending June 30, 1929, was \$762,876,688.⁶⁵ While many bankruptcies are entirely bona fide, there is no doubt that a substantial number involve conspiracies to defraud creditors.⁶⁶ The difficulties in determining how many bankruptcy proceedings are either fraudulent in their inception or involve fraud in connection with the administration of the bankrupt estate are, however, very great; and it has not been possible to secure any definite figures as to the amount of losses due to such fraudulent acts.⁶⁷ It is certain, however, that such losses are large.

(c) *Securities frauds.*—Losses due to frauds in the sale of securities are known to be large,⁶⁸ but the exact amount of those losses is impossible of determination.⁶⁹

One great difficulty in estimating how much is lost due to stock swindles is the fact that the line between criminal fraud in transactions in securities and sharp practice or even noncriminal fraud is an extremely hard one to draw

⁶⁴ For the report of this investigation, see Administration of Bankrupt Estates (House Committee Print, 71st Cong., 3d sess., Washington, 1931). Acknowledgment is made to Hon. William J. Donovan, counsel to the investigation, for advice and assistance in studying the problem of losses due to fraudulent bankruptcies.

⁶⁵ Administration of Bankrupt Estates, p. 211.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 21, 105.

⁶⁷ The amount of losses due to the frauds by insolvent debtors whose assets are liquidated under general assignments for the benefit of creditors, equity receiverships, common-law trusteeships, and the like, is even more difficult to estimate. Many such liquidations are free from any judicial scrutiny, so that the possibilities are even greater that maladministration of assets as well as fraud of debtors will go undetected. Compare p. 403, *infra*, note 1.

⁶⁸ The head of the Bureau of Securities of the New York Attorney General's office has estimated such losses as amounting to about \$600,000,000 for the entire United States in 1930. (Unpublished report from Hon. Watson Washburn, assistant attorney general in charge of the bureau, to the attorney general of the State of New York.) Compare Anonymous, *War on the White Collar Bandits*, *Literary Digest*, vol. 88, p. 11 (1926).

⁶⁹ A canvass of the securities departments of all the States gave a clear consensus of majority opinion that no accurate estimate of such losses was possible. Out of 36 State departments responding, 27 had no figures as to losses, and most of these were very skeptical as to the possibility of developing any.

in many cases. Probably the largest losses occur in cases which are close to the line. Moreover, the practical difficulties of securing data as to losses of this type are obvious. It has not been possible in this investigation to secure the data necessary for an accurate estimate of the amount of such losses or even for determining whether any such estimate is possible. It is certain, however, that losses to investors due to fraudulent sales of securities are large.

Closely related to frauds in the sale of securities are such transactions as "bucket-shopping"—i. e., the pretended purchase or sale of securities for his customers by one purporting to be a broker. Large losses have resulted from this practice in the past, and no doubt still result; but no basis for accurately estimating those losses exists.

(d) *Credit frauds.*—Fraudulent obtaining of credit is one of the commoner forms of commercial fraud, and large estimates of the loss to creditors resulting have been made.¹ Here again, however, there is no satisfactory basis for accurate estimate, and the total loss must be set down as indeterminate.

(e) *Confidence games.*—The general class of confidence games is a catch-all classification which covers a wide variety of miscellaneous criminal frauds. The sale of "gold bricks" or of nonexistent real estate, the "fixing" of horse races or prize fights, crooked gambling games—all fall in this group, along with many other fraudulent schemes. Here again the basis for an accurate estimate of amounts lost is lacking, although such amounts are undoubtedly large.

(f) *Forgery and counterfeiting.*—The most important form of forgery is the forgery of bank checks, including the passing of bad checks as well as actual forgeries of signatures. Insurance against forgery is very uncommon, except in the case of banks,² so that reliable data as to losses are very difficult to obtain. While some very much larger estimates of such losses have been made, the protective department of the American Bankers Association estimates that

¹ See, for example, American Bankers Association, *Stepping Ahead of the Bank Crook*, p. 3 (New York, undated) (\$400,000,000 per year, including fraudulent bankruptcies).

² Information furnished by the protective department of the American Bankers Association indicates that virtually all of losses suffered by bankers due to forged checks and drafts are covered by insurance.

losses due to all kinds of forgery do not exceed \$40,000,000 annually.

Most forgery losses are borne by individuals or business organizations who honor worthless checks, either bearing forgeries of the purported maker's name or else being simply bogus. Losses to banks due to forged checks and drafts probably do not exceed \$600,000 to \$800,000 a year, while losses due to forged indorsements and raised checks are even smaller.³ The total loss to individuals and business organizations other than banks, however, although it can not be accurately ascertained, is undoubtedly substantial.

Counterfeiting involves the forgery of money and has been a particular object of governmental interest and police attention for centuries. While counterfeiting is still practiced in the United States to some extent, it is carried on under such difficulties⁴ that comparatively little counterfeit currency is circulated,⁵ and the resulting loss is not large.

(g) *Use of the mails to defraud.*—Almost any variety of fraud may be carried out through the use of the mails, so that "use of the mails to defraud" is not a separate and distinct classification, but rather one which overlaps the other forms of criminal fraud which have been discussed. Insurance frauds may, and securities and credit frauds very frequently do, involve the use of the mails. The importance of this element lies in the fact that it makes fraudulent schemes thus carried out Federal crimes, whereas otherwise they would, in the great majority of cases, be punishable only under State laws.

The Post Office Department, which is primarily charged with the duty of detecting postal frauds and bringing offenders to trial,⁶ may act against persons using the mails to defraud in either or both of two ways. If criminal liability is doubtful, or if for any reason it is not deemed best to prosecute, the Postmaster General may, after hear-

³ The annual bank loss due to forged indorsements is estimated by the protective department of the American Bankers Association at less than \$100,000, and that due to raised checks at less than \$50,000.

⁴ The Secret Service Division of the Treasury devotes substantially its entire activities to the suppression and detection of counterfeiting. See p. 73, supra.

⁵ Coining is so difficult, and the returns so small, that it has become a practically nonexistent crime.

⁶ Acting through the postal inspection service. See p. 74, supra.

ing, issue a "fraud order" against the offending individual or organization. Upon the issuance of such an order, the local post office receiving mail addressed to that individual or organization will not deliver it, but will return it to the sender (if possible), stamping the envelope "Fraudulent." As an alternative to this procedure, or in addition to it, the offender may be indicted and prosecuted in the Federal courts for violation of the postal laws.

The Post Office Department has made estimates of the amounts lost to the public through mail frauds since 1924. These estimates include only losses due to criminal schemes where the perpetrators have been indicted during the year in question, and do not include any allowance for losses in cases where fraud orders have been issued but no prosecution instituted. Table 19 gives such estimates for the years 1924 to 1930, inclusive.⁷

TABLE 19.—*Estimated losses due to use of the mails to defraud, 1924-1930*

Year	Indictments	Convictions	Estimated loss
1924	(1)	(1)	\$103,530,271
1925	637	611	56,140,627
1926	608	620	68,764,968
1927	661	480	124,770,118
1928	1,633	713	84,140,660
1929	660	628	29,597,684
1930	(1)	(1)	14,481,026
Average	1070	1612	68,634,342

¹ No data furnished.

² Average for 6-year period ending with 1929.

While the estimates given in Table 19 can not be regarded as doing more than indicating the general order of magnitude of mail-fraud losses in cases where offenders are eventually prosecuted, and while they indicate little as to total losses, they do show that losses due to the use of the mails to defraud are very substantial.

This very brief survey, while it has indicated little as to the actual dollars-and-cents magnitude of losses due to crimes involving fraud, gives some idea of the wide economic ramifications of such crimes. It must be emphasized that

⁷ Figures supplied by the Post Office Department. It should be noted that the figures for each year are not the losses for that year, but the loss for prior years due to mail frauds prosecuted during the year.

the criminal frauds which cause the largest losses are organized schemes, carried on as a regular business, and, in many of the most serious cases, masquerading as legitimate business enterprises. Such criminal schemes shade off by imperceptible degrees into enterprises which are so conducted as to avoid criminal liability although employing unethical or even illegal methods of doing business; and the line between criminal and noncriminal activity is thus frequently a rather arbitrary one. Commercialized fraud is more often business run amuck than an offshoot of ordinary crimes against property, and the typical criminal of this class is not the bandit or the recidivist, but the business man gone wrong. One of the principal reasons for the undoubtedly large losses caused by commercialized fraud, and for the difficulties encountered in preventing and punishing fraudulent schemes, lies in the fact that the intellectual level of the criminals who commit crimes of this character is substantially higher than that of the ordinary robber or burglar, and that such criminals usually have resources of money and legal counsel to fall back on. The economic losses caused by criminals of this type can only be minimized by combatting them with equal intelligence and resources on the part of the police and prosecuting officers.

3. *Extortion and racketeering.*—While various forms of extortion, notably blackmail, have been practiced from time immemorial, the particular form of organized extortion known as "racketeering" has had a large modern development. The common characteristic of all forms of criminal activity of this general character is the forcing of persons to pay voluntary tribute to the perpetrators of the crime as a result of fear for life, liberty, bodily safety, reputation, or property.⁸ The forms of extortion, like the forms of commercialized fraud, are limited only by the ingenuity of the criminal, and are varied in the extreme. The most that can be done in this survey is to consider the older forms of extortion, the outstanding features of modern racketeering, and the available data as to losses due to such criminal conduct. As has already been indicated,⁹ extortion from

⁸ Robbery by threat of force would fall within this definition. However, robbery is so closely allied with other forms of theft that it was deemed best to deal with it elsewhere (pp. 383-390, supra).

⁹ See p. 400, supra.

persons engaged in criminal pursuits, whether by corrupt law enforcement officers or by other criminals, will not be considered.

One of the oldest forms of extortion is blackmail. Here fear of reputation is the usual motivation for the victim's acquiescence in paying money to the criminal. Blackmail still flourishes, especially in the larger cities, in a wide variety of forms, and is especially difficult to suppress by criminal proceedings due to the fact that the victim is ordinarily desirous of avoiding publicity at whatever cost. In some instances, blackmail has been organized into what in effect is a regular business, and in a few cases has even enlisted the assistance of corrupt law enforcement officers.¹⁰

Extortion through kidnapping also has a long history. Here fear for life and bodily safety, either of the victim or of some member of his family, is ordinarily the force employed to secure tribute by way of ransom.

The most important form of criminal extortion at the present time, however, is racketeering. While not new,¹¹ it marks, in its present growth and importance, a remarkable development in the field of organized crime. The words "racket" and "racketeer" are recent additions to our language made necessary in order to describe types of crime and criminals which have become an increasingly important factor in the life of the country during recent years.

No comprehensive and exact definition of "racket" or "racketeer" appears possible. The criminal schemes employed are so various that any precise definition runs the risk of omitting important phases of this type of crime. In general, however, it may be said that racketeering involves the extortion of money from a group or class of the public which is induced to pay tribute by criminal acts directed toward any recalcitrant members of that group or class, or, more commonly in practice, by threats of such criminal acts. In most cases the group or class is one whose members are engaged in the same line of business or activity. Thus, we hear of the "milk racket," the "building racket," or the "laundry racket." The means

¹⁰ The Pelletier scandal in Massachusetts 10 years ago is an illustration. See *Commonwealth v. Pelletier*, 240 Mass. 264, 134 N. E. 407 (1922).

¹¹ See, for example, Asbury, *The Gangs of New York*, passim (New York, 1927), giving an account of early racketeering in New York City.

employed or threatened to be employed to keep the immediate victims of the racket in line may involve all sorts of crimes of violence, ranging from murder, arson, and dynamiting to petty malicious mischief. Many losses due to crimes against the person and direct crimes against property are thus traceable to racketeering. But the essence of the racket is not the use of violence—it is the threat of violence resulting in the payment of money. The most successful rackets are in all probability those which employ violence the least, because tribute is forthcoming without its employment.¹² While a racket could be, and occasionally is, carried on by one individual, it usually involves a considerable number of men and a considerable degree of organization. The term "racketeer" is commonly applied only to those fairly high up in the criminal organization.¹³

The extent to which racketeering has increased in the United States since the World War is difficult of exact appraisal. All informed persons agree that crime of this character is widespread, especially in the larger cities, and that it has come to pervade a substantial part of the national economic life.¹⁴ But exact and definite data are lacking. No careful and comprehensive detailed study of the extent and character of racketeering activities in the United States or even in a single large city has been made.¹⁵ One reason for this is the extraordinary elusive character of reliable information on the subject. Neither the criminals engaged in racketeering activities nor their immediate victims are

¹² This is true of fully developed rackets. A considerable amount of actual violence is almost inevitably involved in getting a racket well started.

¹³ Thus the ordinary thugs and gunmen used as actual "shock troops" are usually termed "gangsters"; the racketeer is the man higher up.

¹⁴ For general discussions of racketeering, see Gunther, *The High Cost of Hoodlums*, Harper's Magazine, vol. 150, p. 529 (1929) (discussing the situation in Chicago); Loesch, *Crime and Your Balance Sheet*, Magazine of Business, vol. 55, p. 405 (1929) (also dealing with the Chicago situation); Terrett, *Only Saps Work*, passim (New York, 1930) (a popular descriptive discussion). There have been literally hundreds of newspaper and magazine articles on the subject in the last few years.

¹⁵ The nearest approach to such a study is that of Gunther as to Chicago (op. cit. supra note 14), but this is by no means definitive even for its limited scope. See also a series of articles by Johnston on racketeering in New York City, *New York Herald Tribune*, May 17-24, 1931. Certain aspects of the matter are discussed in Landesco, *Gang Life and Organized Crime in Chicago*, Annual Reports of the American Bar Association, vol. 55, p. 579 (1930). See also *Boyle v. United States*, 40 F. (2d) 49 (1930).

likely to prove ready sources of facts. Talking out of turn by the criminal is likely to meet with swift and sudden punishment by death—the loquacious one is "taken for a ride" or "put on the spot." A lesser or even the same punishment may be visited upon the victim who talks; moreover, the immediate "victims" of the racket frequently benefit by it and may be highly reluctant to do anything which may injure it.¹⁶ Even law enforcement officers are likely to be reticent, since one of the most significant and alarming features of modern racketeering lies in its often successful attempts to build up "mutually beneficial" working relationships between organized crime and the agencies which are charged with enforcing the law. Comprehensive investigation thus is very difficult, and would, indeed, be highly dangerous to the investigator. Nevertheless, such investigation is a task which urgently needs to be carried out. There are few greater contributions which could be made to an intelligent understanding of the crime problem in the United States than a detailed and comprehensive study of the extent, causes, and ramifications of racketeering. Such an investigation would require courage, persistence, and intelligence of the highest order, and the expenditure of considerable money; but it is believed that it could be successfully carried out, granted these, and that it would be more useful and significant than any other single contribution to the study of the crime problem in this country which could be made at the present time.¹⁷

In any consideration of the economic effects of racketeering, three significant features must be especially borne in mind: (a) the economic relation between the racketeer, his immediate victim, and the ultimate consumer; (b) the relation between racketeering and legitimate business; and (c) the relation between the racketeer and law enforcement agencies and local government generally. Some understanding of these phases of the subject is an indispensable preliminary to any comprehension of the racketeering problem generally, and is especially essential to any consideration of its economic aspects.

¹⁶ See p. 410, *infra*.

¹⁷ The reasons why it was impossible to make such an investigation in connection with the present study of the economic aspects of crime have been set forth in an earlier chapter. See p. 371, *supra*.

(a) The methods of operation of an ordinary racket have been very briefly outlined in an earlier part of this report,¹⁸ but it will be desirable to consider the matter again here. The typical racket may be said to involve two groups of persons—the racketeer and his minions, and their immediate victims; and in most cases to affect a third—the purchasers of the goods or services sold by the immediate victims. The racketeer exacts tribute from his immediate victims, and in some cases the matter ends there. In such case, in the absence of monopoly conditions, the immediate victim can not pass on his loss to the purchaser of his wares or services, and it is he who is out of pocket. But many rackets do not end here. Greater sums can be realized by the racketeer and less resistance will have to be overcome by him if the racket can be made profitable, at least in some degree, to its immediate victims. This is frequently feasible, since most fully developed rackets take in an entire line of business in a given locality, so that it may well be possible for the racketeer, in return for tribute paid him, to bring about monopoly or semimonopoly conditions. When this is done, not only can the toll levied by the racketeer be passed on to the immediate victim's customers, but in some cases it may be possible for the immediate victim himself to benefit financially, provided effective price fixing can be maintained by the racketeer, so that the ultimate victims are the members of the general public who deal with the immediate "victims." The racketeer profits, his immediate "victim" in some instances may profit, and the public pays.

In this possibility of forcible suppression of competition is to be found one important reason why rackets tend to make especially rapid headway in lines of business having numerous small and actively competing units, where it is difficult to avoid so-called "cut-throat competition" which keeps all but the most efficient units at the starvation point. Open price-fixing agreements are forbidden by law, and probably would not be lived up to if made; but the racket may provide an effectively policed method of bringing about noncompetitive conditions.

(b) The relationships between racketeering and ordinary business in certain lines appear to have become very close

¹⁸ See pt. 1 (pp. 55-56, supra).

in some cases. Without seeking to trace all such relationships, mention may be made of the employment of racketeers and racketeering methods in labor disputes. Here the racketeer and his gangsters are, in some instances at least, superseding the private detective agency and its operatives as "guards" in cases of labor disturbances, and in some cases as highly efficient strike breakers. On the other side, the alliance between racketeering and the activities of certain labor unions is reputed to be close. One of the most significant and disturbing phases of the whole racketeering question is this question of the extent to which legitimate business may be permeated by the methods and influence of the racketeer.

(c) Another extremely disturbing phase of the matter is the apparently growing tendency toward amicable relationships, cemented by bribery and graft, between organized crime and public agencies charged with the duty of law enforcement. Direct bribery of law-enforcement officers, the payment of "protection" by criminals, alliances between corrupt municipal politics and organized crime, if not common, are far from being unknown. While this is not a development peculiar to racketeering, being especially acute also in connection with prohibition enforcement,¹⁹ it is an essentially important phase of racketeering as it is now developing. The economic aspects of racketeering are of importance in this connection, since it is only because of the large profits of organized crime that the funds necessary for wholesale official corruption become available.

The preceding discussion has been merely a brief and cursory survey of the general subject of racketeering, with a view to bringing out those of its features which bear on its economic effects. It will be apparent from that discussion that a complete answer to the question of how much is lost annually by private individuals due to racketeering could be arrived at only after a detailed study of the whole subject, which would ascertain what rackets existed and where, how much money they exacted and whether and to what extent their immediate victims were able to pass on this loss to their customers. As has been pointed out,²⁰ no

¹⁹ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Enforcement of the Prohibition Laws of the United States, p. 37.

²⁰ See p. 371, supra.

such study has been made, and hence the data prerequisite to any estimate of racketeering losses is nonexistent.

Some estimates of total loss have been made. Indeed, it is not uncommon to see in print estimates of total racketeering losses running into billions of dollars. These "estimates," however, are mere guesses. The fact is that in the present state of the subject no one can say with accuracy or assurance how much losses due to racketeering amount to. The most that can be said is that such losses are unquestionably very large, very probably larger than those resulting from any other form of criminal activity with the possible exception of commercialized fraud.

4. *Conclusion.*—The data presented in this chapter have been principally descriptive.²¹ Statistics as to losses due to frauds and rackets are extremely difficult to develop, and no comprehensive figures exist. The only figures available relate to losses due to mail frauds, which, on the basis of Post Office Department estimates, appear to average more than \$68,000,000 annually.²² It can be said, however, without fear of exaggeration, that the losses due to commercialized fraud and racketeering are enormous, and very probably far exceed those due to any other form of crime.

The need for further detailed studies of commercialized fraud and racketeering is obvious. Both of these forms of crime, in their more important manifestations, are examples of organized crime as a business. Both are modern in development and methods, and constitute, it is believed, by far the most serious problem with which criminal justice in present-day America must deal. It is strongly recommended that some responsible organization or organizations undertake detailed and comprehensive scientific studies, carried out by competent and properly directed staffs furnished with adequate financial resources, of (a) commercialized fraud, including methods employed, losses resulting, and all other important phases; and (b) the extent, character,

²¹ See pp. 371-372, supra.

²² The Post Office Department figures, as has been pointed out (p. 405, supra), are not estimates of total annual losses, but rather of losses in prior years due to fraudulent schemes in respect of which prosecutions have been begun during the year to which each annual estimate relates. However, it is believed that the average of these figures for the 7 years for which they are available serves as a reasonable index of the probable minimum order of magnitude of annual losses.

causes and economic effects of racketeering. Such studies are urgently needed, and should be organized immediately.

CHAPTER V

THE COST OF INSURANCE AGAINST CRIME

1. *Introductory.*—The cost of insurance against crime may be looked at from three angles. From the standpoint of the individual who purchases such insurance, the premium he pays is an immediate economic detriment which he voluntarily suffers because of the benefit he receives by obtaining the insurance company's contract of indemnity. He is out of pocket the amount of the premium, and this, to him, is a financial loss; but he suffers no added financial loss if the risk insured against occurs and he is indemnified by the insurance company for the loss of his property. From his standpoint, the insurance premium is a cost of crime—or rather a cost due to the possibility of crime. From the standpoint of all insured individuals as a group, the net loss due to crime is, of course, the amount of premiums paid less losses indemnified. Finally, from the standpoint of the community as a whole, the economic loss lies in the necessity for crime insurance at all, and is measured by the diversion of otherwise productive labor into the crime insurance business. In this chapter we are concerned only with the cost of insurance from the standpoint of the individual insured—i. e., with premiums paid on crime insurance.

There are three principal kinds of insurance against crime in common use: (a) theft insurance; (b) fidelity insurance; and (c) riot insurance. In addition, some part of the premiums paid for fire insurance are theoretically chargeable to insurance against arson, but any allocation of this character is wholly impracticable.²³ Hence only the three

²³ The difficulties of segregating fires due to arson from other fires has already been discussed. See pp. 380-381, supra. For reasons similar to those there given for not estimating how much of total fire losses were due to arson, no attempt is made here to allocate to arson any part of the total fire insurance premiums paid in the United States. (These amounted to \$730,822,426 in 1929.)

forms of insurance enumerated above will be considered.²⁴

2. *Theft insurance.*—Table 20 shows total premiums paid on account of burglary, robbery, and theft insurance (exclusive of automobile theft insurance) for the 8-year period ending in 1928.²⁵

TABLE 20.—Premiums on larceny, burglary, and robbery insurance 1921–1928

Year	Premiums paid	Year	Premiums paid
1921.....	\$11,712,872	1926.....	\$27,440,147
1922.....	13,460,178	1927.....	29,250,007
1923.....	18,935,105	1928.....	29,500,820
1924.....	23,737,798	Average.....	22,511,002
1925.....	25,062,752		

Table 21 shows total premiums paid on account of automobile theft insurance for the 6-year period ending in 1930.²⁶

TABLE 21.—Premiums on automobile theft insurance, 1925–1930

Year	Premiums paid	Year	Premiums paid
1925.....	\$36,172,700	1929.....	36,618,544
1926.....	36,009,440	1930.....	37,141,936
1927.....	37,417,868	Average.....	36,282,540
1928.....	33,044,682		

3. *Fidelity insurance.*—Table 22 shows total premiums paid on fidelity policies, insuring against embezzlement, for-

²⁴ Check forgery is omitted as negligible, since the only available records show \$33,339 in premiums paid in 1927, nothing in 1928, and \$140,172 in 1929. See Handy Chart of Casualty, Surety, and Miscellaneous Insurance Companies, 1929, p. 98; *ibid.*, 1930, p. 103. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Thomas J. Cullen, editor, The Spectator Co., New York, publishers of that volume, for cooperation in securing these figures, as well as figures as to riot insurance premiums and losses.

²⁵ Data from the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters, New York, N. Y. See p. 391, *supra*, note 69. The figures cover premiums on the following classes of policies: (a) residence burglary, robbery, theft, and larceny; (b) bank burglary; (c) bank robbery; (d) mercantile safe burglary; (e) mercantile open stock burglary; (f) office and store robbery; (g) messenger robbery; (h) paymaster robbery; and (i) personal hold-up. Compare p. 391, *supra*, notes 61–68.

²⁶ Data from the National Automobile Underwriters' Association, New York, N. Y. See p. 389, *supra*, note 57.

geries, and other defalcations by employees, for the 5-year period ending in 1929.²⁷

TABLE 22.—Premiums on fidelity insurance, 1925–1929

Year	Premiums paid
1925.....	\$33,050,587
1926.....	36,641,398
1927.....	36,782,662
1928.....	44,782,800
1929.....	45,284,139
Average.....	39,480,510

4. *Riot insurance.*—Table 23 shows total premiums paid on account of riot insurance²⁸ for the 9-year period ending in 1929.²⁹

TABLE 23.—Premiums on riot insurance, 1921–1929

Year	Premiums paid	Year	Premiums paid
1921.....	\$3,565,868	1927.....	\$2,443,899
1922.....	6,000,214	1928.....	4,348,952
1923.....	7,042,485	1929.....	6,495,284
1924.....	6,410,383	Average.....	5,252,801
1925.....	6,102,340		
1926.....	3,650,775		

5. *Conclusion.*—Table 24 summarizes total premiums paid for insurance against crime for the 4-year period ending in 1928.³⁰

TABLE 24.—Premiums on insurance against crime, 1925–1928

Year	Burglary, robbery, and larceny insurance ¹	Automobile theft insurance ²	Fidelity insurance ³	Riot insurance ⁴	Total
1925.....	\$25,062,752	\$36,172,700	\$33,050,587	\$6,102,340	\$102,104,448
1926.....	27,440,147	36,609,409	36,641,398	3,650,775	104,449,819
1927.....	29,250,007	37,417,868	36,782,662	2,443,800	105,900,496
1928.....	29,500,820	33,644,682	44,782,800	4,348,952	112,346,263
Average.....	28,050,447	35,983,702	38,040,864	4,138,744	106,222,756

¹ From Table 20, *supra*.

² From Table 21, *supra*.

³ From Table 22, *supra*.

⁴ From Table 23, *supra*.

²⁷ Figures from the Towner Rating Bureau, New York, N. Y. See p. 396, *supra*, note 77.

²⁸ For a description of the coverage effected by riot insurance, see p. 382, *supra*.

²⁹ Figures from The Insurance Yearbook 1922 to 1930, inclusive. (Published by The Spectator Co., New York, N. Y.)

³⁰ This is the only period for which complete data as to theft, fidelity, and riot insurance premiums are available.

The totals given in Table 24 do not include any allowance for fire-insurance premiums chargeable to protection against losses due to incendiary fires, and so may be regarded as representing minimum figures for the cost of insurance against crime. That minimum cost, it appears, has averaged over \$106,000,000 per annum for the 4 years ending in 1928, and has steadily increased year by year. While not a complete economic loss to the community, the amount of that cost does represent an aggregate individual cost to holders of crime insurance policies which is a direct result of the threat of crime.

CHAPTER VI

PRIVATE LOSSES INCIDENT TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *Introductory.*—In the preceding chapters of this part, we have been considering the losses to private individuals and business organizations due directly to crime³¹ or the threat of crime.³² But these are not the only private losses caused by criminal acts and by the fact that crime exists. Under our system of administration of criminal justice, individual citizens must contribute their time to such administration when required by the state. The rendering of such service may cause definite economic losses to the citizens called upon to give it. The principal examples of such enforced private aid in the administration of the criminal law are service as jurors and testimony as witnesses in criminal cases.³³

Two different aspects of the loss resulting from service as jurors and witnesses must be distinguished. In the first place, such service may cause direct private losses to the individuals concerned. Such losses, which are a part of the immediate cost of crime to those individuals, are considered in this chapter. Second, the loss of the productive labor of persons serving as jurors or witnesses is an economic injury to the community, which forms part of the ultimate

³¹ Losses due to crimes against the person and crimes affecting property or wealth. See pp. 374-413, *supra*.

³² The cost of insurance against crime. See pp. 413-416, *supra*.

³³ Service as part of a posse comitatus at the summons of the sheriff of the county is another example, but such service is now comparatively infrequent.

cost of crime. This aspect of the matter is further referred to in part 9 of this report, which treats of indirect losses to the community resulting from the existence of crime.³⁴

2. *Service as jurors in criminal cases.*—The administration of criminal justice, under our system of jurisprudence, requires the aid of members of the general public who serve as grand jurors and as petit jurors for the trial of criminal cases. While ordinarily fees are paid to jurors, such fees are in a great many cases wholly inadequate compensation for such service from an economic standpoint. Our law has proceeded on the theory that service of this character is one of the obligations of citizenship, which, like service in the armed forces, may be required to be rendered for a nominal compensation or even for no compensation at all.³⁵

In so far as compensation is paid for jury service, the amount of the fees disbursed form part of the public cost of criminal justice and have been included as such in the studies of that cost presented in earlier parts of this report.³⁶ An element of private loss is added when, as frequently, the juror is prevented by service as such from earning what he would otherwise earn, and when, in addition, the fee for jury service does not reimburse him for this loss. This element of loss is the greatest in the case of busy men who make the best jurors,³⁷ and it can hardly be doubted that the aggregate net loss of this character is substantial.

The practical difficulties of measuring such losses are, however, insurmountable as a practical matter. The mere physical difficulty of assembling data as to the number of man-days of jury service for the country as a whole in criminal, as distinguished from civil, cases quite insuperable without very large expenditure of time and money for investigation. Even the ascertainment of the total amount of jurors' fees paid in criminal cases would be a large task. Finally, it would be quite impossible to determine how many individual jurors suffered losses over and above the

³⁴ See p. 434, *infra*.

³⁵ An analogy to this aspect of jury service is to be found in the gratuitous labor on the roads which is required of all able-bodied male citizens in certain rural districts.

³⁶ See pp. 115, 297-304, *supra*.

³⁷ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Prosecution, pp. 35-36.

amount of the fees received by them or what those losses were.³⁸ All that can be done here, therefore, is to point out the fact that such private losses occur without attempting any estimate of their aggregate magnitude.

3. *Attendance in court as witnesses.*—Attendance in court or before grand juries in criminal cases, like jury service, is an obligation of citizenship for which no compensation can be claimed as of right.³⁹ The discussion of private losses due to jury service in the preceding section applies also to losses suffered by witnesses, with the added consideration that in the case of witnesses, no compensation (as distinguished from reimbursement for expenses) is ordinarily provided for by law, and none paid in fact except in the case of expert witnesses.⁴⁰ In the case of attendance as witnesses, as in the case of jury service, there are undoubtedly substantial private losses,⁴¹ but there is no practical way of ascertaining their amount.

4. *Conclusion.*—While no definite data as to the amount of private economic losses due to service as jurors or witnesses in criminal cases are available, such losses are believed to be of peculiar importance. They come definitely home to the individual citizen, and may affect in some cases his whole attitude toward the administration of public justice. Effective administration of the criminal law requires good juries and willing witnesses. If jury service and testimony in court impose unreasonable burdens on the citizen, the administration of justice is bound to suffer.

It is believed that these considerations point to four conclusions. (a) The number of jurors required in criminal cases should be reduced to the minimum necessary to efficient enforcement of the law in a way consistent with our tradi-

³⁸ Some jurors may suffer no loss at all, since the fees they receive may equal or exceed what they could earn if otherwise employed. Indeed, to some, the jury may be a "haven for the unemployed." See *Criminal Justice in Cleveland*, p. 352 (Cleveland, 1922). Others may continue to receive their regular pay while rendering jury service. Many, however, will be economically worse off, either in loss in wages, loss of business, or loss of professional employment. To strike an accurate balance giving the total net economic loss would be quite impracticable.

³⁹ Compare Wigmore, *Evidence*, 2 ed., vol. 4, pp. 670-680 (Boston, 1923).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 674-685.

⁴¹ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Prosecution*, pp. 35-36.

tions. The modification of the requirement of the use of the grand jury in many classes of cases, and the permitting of waiver of juries in criminal cases, recommended by the commission in another connection,⁴² would be steps to this end. (b) Unnecessary attendance of witnesses in court should be done away with. The lessened use of the grand jury will be a step in this direction;⁴³ but even more important, it is believed, is better organization of the business of the courts, especially in the larger cities, in such a way as to avoid present unnecessary delays in the trial of cases and unnecessary presence of witnesses in court.⁴⁴ (c) Consideration should be given to the desirability of adequate compensation for jurors. The present system of gratuitous or substantially gratuitous service grew up at a time when the country was largely rural, when jury service or attendance in court as a witness was not so much a duty as a sought-after privilege,⁴⁵ and when no serious economic burden was, in the ordinary case, imposed on the individual citizen by such service. Conditions are very different to-day, especially in large cities. If the jury system is to survive as an efficient instrumentality for administering criminal justice, account must be taken of these changed conditions in determining what policy should be followed as regards compensation of jurors. (d) Consideration should be given to the desirability of adequate reimbursement of expenses to witnesses, and their protection from loss of employment as a result of the necessity of attendance in court under subpoena, and to the question of whether, in order to secure efficient administration of criminal justice in urban communities, it may not ultimately be necessary to provide for public compensation of all witnesses in criminal cases, whether called by prosecution or defense, on an adequate scale.⁴⁶

⁴² Report on Prosecution, pp. 24, 37.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

⁴⁴ See *The Cleveland System of Assigning Cases*, American Bar Association Journal, vol 10, p. 805 (1930).

⁴⁵ Cf. Pound, *The Spirit of the Common Law*, p. 124 (Boston, 1921).

⁴⁶ No opinion is expressed as to this; it is merely desired to indicate a possibility which is believed to deserve study.

PART 9

INDIRECT LOSSES TO THE COMMUNITY DUE TO
THE EXISTENCE OF CRIME

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Direct and indirect losses.*—In the preceding parts of this report, consideration has been given primarily to expenditures by governmental units or private persons for the prevention and suppression of crime (parts 2 to 7, inclusive) and to specific losses due to criminal acts (part 8). These expenditures and losses are for the most part transfers, and so form part of the immediate cost of crime but not part of the ultimate cost to the community,¹ although losses due to crimes against the person and crimes involving the destruction of or injury to property which do form a part of ultimate cost.² All these costs of crime, whether immediate only or both immediate and ultimate, may conveniently be characterized as direct costs.³

The community as a whole, however, suffers a loss as a result of the existence of crime quite different in kind from these direct costs, as a result of the diversion into criminal channels of potential productive labor which might be employed in adding to the wealth and income of the community. The criminal causes an indirect loss to the community because he is not a producer, as well as causing direct loss when he kills or injures his human victims or destroys property. Moreover, the fact that criminals exist causes a secondary indirect loss—viz, the loss of the productive labor of persons employed in combating crime and in

¹ For the distinction between immediate and ultimate cost, see pp. 34-35, supra.

² See pp. 66-67, supra.

³ The term "direct" is here used as referring to expenditures made directly by, and losses directly affecting, private persons or governmental units.

protecting the community against its consequences. Finally, another secondary indirect loss results from the confinement of convicted criminals in penal and correctional institutions. This loss is perhaps not in theory a necessary result of crime, since it is conceivable that all prisoners might be so employed as to be of as much value to the community as if they were free,⁴ but in practice this is impossible. Hence the loss of potential productive labor of prisoners must be added to the loss of the wealth-producing power of persons engaged in crime and in combating crime in considering the indirect cost of crime to the community.

2. *Scope of study.*—It is obvious from the nature of the problem that any study of indirect losses to the community due to the existence of crime must be somewhat general in character. The problem does not readily yield to exact statistical treatment, especially since the loss is not represented by actual money expended or stolen or actual property destroyed or converted, but is wholly hypothetical in amount, although real enough in fact. Consequently, no accurate determination of a definite total figure for indirect losses can be expected;⁵ the most that is possible is an analysis of the character of such losses and perhaps some estimate of their probable order of magnitude.

This part of the report is in the main merely a statement in connected form of matters of common knowledge. It is to be regarded as a descriptive outline of the more important forms of indirect losses to the community due to crime, with some suggestions as to how the order of magnitude of certain of them may be very roughly estimated, rather than as a definitive treatment of the subject. Both the intrinsic difficulty of the subject itself and the lack of adequate time and means for study may be looked to for the reasons why such a definitive treatment is not presented here.

This part will deal mainly with the diminution of national wealth and income due to (a) the loss of productive labor of criminals; (b) the loss of productive labor of prisoners; and (c) the loss of productive labor of persons en-

⁴ This assumes, however, that prison labor (i. e., forced labor) can be made as efficient as free labor. The past experience of the race with forced labor of various kinds is against the validity of this assumption.

⁵ See the discussion of this point in pt. 1 (pp. 60-64, supra).

gaged in law enforcement activities. Brief consideration will also be given to losses of productive labor of other persons who are employed in work which would not be necessary except for the existence of crime. After discussing these elements of indirect loss and attempting estimates of the order of magnitude of some of them, consideration will be given to the problem of determining the ultimate cost of crime to the community in the light of all the data developed in this and the preceding parts of the report.

CHAPTER II

LOSS OF PRODUCTIVE LABOR OF CRIMINALS

1. *Introductory.*—A primary indirect loss to the community, which is unquestionably large, results from the fact that members of the community who might be contributing to its wealth engage in activities which are economically either useless or injurious.⁶ The difficulty lies in determining how many persons are engaged in such activities and what they would contribute to the wealth of the community if they were engaged in lawful productive work. We will next consider each of these aspects of the matter in turn.

2. *Number of criminals.*—The total number of criminals in the United States is unknown and quite unascertainable. Indeed, the very conception of "number of criminals" implies a potentially ascertainable figure which does not exist in fact. Only in certain cases is a man a criminal in the sense that another man is a machinist or a doctor or a farmer. A particular individual may be a criminal for a day or an hour, and a law-abiding citizen for the rest of his life. Indeed, very few criminals, except those engaged in certain forms of commercialized fraud and racketeering, are consistently engaged in criminal acts. Quite aside from the fact that there is no way of taking a census of criminals, a mere count of those persons who committed crimes during

⁶ Criminal activities involving homicide, personal injury, or damage to property are clearly economically injurious to the community. Other criminal activities are, in practically all cases, at least economically useless, although there may be rare exceptions, as where an economically useful activity has been made criminal for other reasons. The violation of medieval laws prohibiting all taking of interest may serve as an example of the possibility of such economically useful "crime."

a given year would be of little value in determining how much potential productive labor was lost.

The problem may, however, be narrowed somewhat on further analysis. In attempting to determine the extent to which potential man-power is diverted from useful channels by crime, what we really want to know is how many men are not working productively because they can live as a result of criminal activities, and how much of the time they are for that reason not working productively. This eliminates those persons regularly employed in productive work who may commit criminal acts, and makes it clear that we are concerned not with crime as such, but with crime as a substitute for useful work.

But even in this aspect the problem is insoluble. While the inquiry is more definite, it is from a practical standpoint as impossible to determine the total number of persons who are not engaged in productive work because they can support themselves by criminal acts as to determine the total number of persons who commit crimes. Some estimates have been attempted,⁷ but it is not believed that they can be relied upon; and no satisfactory or significant estimate appears possible in the present state of criminological knowledge.

3. *Earning power of criminals.*—The fact that no reliable estimate can be made as to the number of persons in the United States who support themselves by crime makes it unnecessary to consider in detail the question of how much such persons could contribute to the national wealth and income if they were not criminals. It may be pointed out, however, in so far as the question is of interest, that the discussion of the potential earning power of useful labor of imprisoned criminals⁸ is applicable also to criminals at large.⁹

⁷ See, for example, Anonymous, *United States Crime Costs Billions Yearly According to Recent Figures*, *Popular Mechanics*, vol. 42, p. 553 (1924); Bower, *The Economic Waste of Sin*, p. 54 (New York, 1924); Prentiss, *The Economic Consequences of Crime*, Reference Shelf, vol. 6, p. 43, (1929).

⁸ See pp. 425-426, *infra*.

⁹ A rather fine distinction might be made on the assumption that imprisoned criminals, having been caught, were less intelligent and presumably had less potential earning power on the average than those at large, but this seems a refinement without substantial significance.

4. *Amount of loss unascertainable.*—The discussion in the two preceding sections makes it clear, it is believed, that no accurate or significant estimate of the loss of earning power of criminals generally is possible. All that can be said is that this loss is undoubtedly substantial but that its amount is not ascertainable.

CHAPTER III

LOSS OF PRODUCTIVE LABOR OF PRISONERS

1. *Introductory.*—Economic loss unquestionably results from the fact that persons imprisoned for crime could on the average contribute more to the economic welfare of the community if they were not in prison.¹⁰ The problem is one of measurement, and, involves two factors: (a) How many prisoners are there? (b) What could they contribute to the national income if they were not in prison and were engaged in productive labor?

2. *Number of prisoners.*—The problem of estimating with reasonable accuracy the number of persons in prison for crime is not a difficult one. The significant total figure is the average daily prison population of all institutions for adults.¹¹ This information is available for all Federal institutions, and indicates, for the census year 1928,¹² an average daily prison population for all such institutions of 108,071 persons.¹³ Detailed figures as to persons confined in county and municipal penal and correctional institutions are not available,¹⁴ but an estimate may be made. The last general census of prisoners was taken in 1923.¹⁵ On January 1 of that year, 76.2 per cent of all adult prisoners in the United States were confined in State and Federal institutions, and

¹⁰ As has been pointed out above, this is a practical fact, rather than a theoretical necessity. See p. 421, supra.

¹¹ Juvenile delinquents should in most cases be in school rather than engaged in productive labor. Hence, juvenile delinquents confined in institutions are not included as prisoners for present purposes.

¹² As to the "census year," see p. 192, supra.

¹³ The average number of prisoners in State institutions was 100,167. (See p. 225, supra). The number in Federal prisons was 7,004. (Information from unpublished figures of the Bureau of the Census, supplemented by data from the Department of Justice.)

¹⁴ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Criminal Statistics, p. 85.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-78.

23.8 per cent in county and municipal institutions.¹⁶ If this proportion be assumed to continue approximately unchanged throughout 1928,¹⁷ a total average daily prison population for 1928 of approximately 141,800 persons for all prisons in the United States is indicated. If it be further assumed that the prison population has increased from 1928 to 1930 proportionately to the increase in the general population,¹⁸ the average daily prison population of institutions for adults works out as in the neighborhood of 145,000 persons. It is believed that this figure may be regarded as a reasonable estimate.

3. *Earning power of prisoners.*—The problem of determining how much the adult prisoners in the penal and correctional institutions of the country could contribute to the national income if not in prison is impossible of exact solution. Aptitudes and abilities vary among prisoners in institutions much as they do among persons outside. An exact result would require the individual determination of the potential contribution of each individual prisoner to the economic welfare of the community—an obviously impossible task. Moreover, the problem of making due allowance for the value of prison labor is a difficult one. Prison employment is not universal,¹⁹ and frequently where it exists is part-time only; and it may perhaps be assumed that in any case the majority of prisoners could contribute more to the national wealth if employed at other work than provided by prison industries.²⁰ Nevertheless, a substantial deduction from the gross value of the potential productive

¹⁶ See *Prisoners, 1923*, pp. 190-193 (U. S. Census, 1926).

¹⁷ There is no reason to assume that any extreme change has taken place. While the 1923 census related to prison population on a specified day, rather than to average daily prison population, this should not be a source of serious error.

¹⁸ The increase in population in 1930 over the census estimate for 1928 was 2.43 per cent.

¹⁹ No employment whatever is provided for prisoners in most jails and similar institutions.

²⁰ This assumption is perhaps doubtful in so far as full-time prison employment is provided. The average imprisoned criminal is not a very skilled or industrious individual, and it may very well be that he contributes as much to the economic welfare of the community by making shoes or brooms in prison or by road work in prison camps, as he could contribute if he were engaged at honest work outside. This is, of course, not true where prison labor is employed for tasks better done by machinery—breaking rock, for example.

labor of persons in prison must unquestionably be made to take account of the value of prison labor.

In order to make any estimate of the order of magnitude of the loss due to diversion from productive channels of the labor of imprisoned criminals, we must start with some assumption as to the average economic usefulness of such persons. Any assumption will be arbitrary; but the most reasonable available would appear to be that the average potential contribution of such persons to the national income is equal to the average earning power of all wage workers out of prison attached to various industries, including agriculture—i. e., the average wage income of labor. The most recent reliable estimate made for the year 1927 indicates that the average labor income per wage worker in the United States was \$1,205.²¹

4. *Order of magnitude of loss.*—It is now possible to attempt an estimate of the general order of magnitude of the economic injury to the community due to the loss of productive labor of persons imprisoned for crime. We start with the approximate figure of 145,000 for the average daily prison population in 1930, and with the assumption that the average potential contribution of each prisoner to the national income was \$1,205 per year.²² This gives us a gross loss of \$174,725,000.

But this figure is certainly too large, since it makes no allowance whatever for the value of prison labor. An estimate of this value is much more difficult, and can not, in the state of the available data on prison receipts,²³ be much better than a guess. However, in view of the fact that modern prison policies involve keeping prisoners at productive work wherever possible, and in view of the further

²¹ See King, *The National Income and Its Purchasing Power*, p. 146 (New York, 1930). This figure is adopted in preference to that of \$1,384 for 1925 developed by Copeland, *The National Income and Its Distribution, in Recent Economic Changes in the United States*, vol. 2, p. 777 (New York, 1929), for three reasons: (a) it takes account of the unemployment factor in determining average earnings; (b) it does not include salary income; and (c) it is the more recent estimate. It is believed that conservatism requires that an estimate taking account of the unemployment factor be used, and that the prison population has a much larger proportion of wage workers to salaried employees than does industry generally.

²² This figure is for 1927, as has been stated, but in making a rough estimate like the present one this is not a material difference.

²³ See the discussion of the available financial statistics as to prison receipts in pt. 3 (pp. 180-182, supra).

fact that most penitentiaries and reformatories having adequate records show a substantial value for the products of prison industries,²⁴ it would seem essential to deduct at least 50 per cent from the gross earning power of prisoners to arrive at a figure which in any way indicates the probable net loss of productive labor-power.²⁵

The resulting figure of approximately \$87,000,000 per year gives some rough idea of the probable order of magnitude of the indirect economic injury to the community due to the loss of productive labor of imprisoned criminals. The figure is substantial, and, we believe, significant; but it must be remembered that it is not put forward as even a rough estimate of the actual loss. It merely indicates something as to what the magnitude of that loss may be.

CHAPTER IV

LOSS OF PRODUCTIVE LABOR OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

1. *Introductory.*—If there were no crime and no criminals, most of our policemen could be dispensed with, our prosecuting officers could be eliminated, our criminal courts closed, and our penal and correctional institutions turned to other uses. The man-power now devoted to the task of preventing and suppressing crime would thus be released for work of direct economic benefit to the community. This would, of course, be true of privately employed protective agencies and services as well as of publicly employed officers. Moreover, materials and supplies now used by criminal justice agencies could be used for productive purposes, and a substantial capital investment would cease to be necessary.

²⁴ This is indicated by an examination of the annual reports of 57 State penal institutions for adults. See p. 207, supra, note 17.

²⁵ This deduction is necessarily somewhat arbitrary, but is believed to be supported by the following considerations: (a) Some 23.8 per cent of all prisoners are in county and municipal institutions, many of which provide no employment for prisoners and most of the remainder only very limited employment. (b) Due to present congestion in most State penal institutions, even those institutions having facilities for affording full-time employment to their inmates under normal conditions are unable to do so. (c) Prison labor is believed to be substantially less efficient than would be the labor of the same individuals outside. (Cf. p. 421, supra, note 4.) These considerations, it is believed, indicate that the deduction made on account of the value of prison labor should not exceed 50 per cent. On the other hand, the considerations referred to in the text indicate that at least this much of a deduction must be made.

The problem of estimating the amount of the loss to the community due to the diversion of man-power from directly productive work to the fighting of crime is no different in principle from that of estimating the loss of productive labor of criminals; we must consider the number of persons involved and their potential value as productive workers. Logically, in a discussion of indirect costs to the community, the losses due to the diversion to nonproductive uses of materials and supplies, and due to unnecessary capital investments, should be dealt with, but these are of smaller magnitude and less importance and will be omitted. In considering the loss of productive labor involved, the problem of credits against potential earning power which arises in the case of prisoners is non-existent; so far as law enforcement officers are engaged only in criminal work, their potential productive capacity is not utilized at all.

2. *Number of law enforcement officers.*—The number of persons employed in the administration of public criminal justice by the Federal Government and by the States and their municipal subdivisions can be estimated with reasonable accuracy. The principal difficulty encountered results from the fact that most such officers and employees have some civil and administrative duties,²⁶ but reasonable allowance for this factor can, it is believed, be made.

(a) According to the 1920 census, 82,120 persons were publicly employed on the census date²⁷ as policemen, 6,897 as marshals and constables, 10,688 as sheriffs, and 11,955 as detectives, a total of 111,655.²⁸ On the assumption that the proportion of the population so employed has remained constant, this would indicate that approximately 128,000 persons were thus employed in 1930.²⁹

Such police employees have in almost all cases some administrative duties. Data collected in connection with another investigation dealt with in part 6 of this report³⁰ indicate that in the case of municipal police, which make

²⁶ See pp. 157-158, *supra*.

²⁷ Jan. 1, 1920.

²⁸ See Abstract of the Fourteenth Census, 1920, p. 493.

²⁹ This is an increase of 14.9 per cent, the same as the increase in total population. See Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, vol. 1, p. 10.

³⁰ See pp. 244-348, *supra*.

up much the largest of the total number of such employees, such administrative functions account for from 5 to 20 per cent of total police costs.³¹ In the case of sheriffs, constables and marshals, the percentage of administrative activity is considerably higher, while on the other hand, detectives in most cases have no administrative duties. It is believed, therefore, that a conservative estimate of the time of police generally devoted to crime prevention and criminal law enforcement is 85 per cent. This means that the equivalent of some 108,000 persons were engaged in criminal police work at public expense during 1930.

(b) There were in 1927 a total of 8,218 employees of Federal and State prisons and reformatories, or one to every 10.2 prisoners.³² Assuming that this ratio holds for county and municipal institutions, and that the estimate of total adult prison population in 1930 made in the preceding chapter³³ may be relied upon, this indicates a total of 14,300 persons employed by penal institutions for adults in 1930.

The problem of determining the number of persons employed in institutions for juvenile delinquents is a more difficult one. The institutional census of 1923 did not gather data as to the administrative staff of such institutions,³⁴ and the data as to teachers and assistants employed in such institutions published by the Office of Education³⁵ does not give the total administrative staff. However, certain of the institutions covered by the statistics of the Office of Education are also covered by the census study of State and Federal penitentiaries and reformatories, which does give the total administrative staff,³⁶ so that a rough estimate of the total number of employees per inmate can be worked out on the assumption that the relation between total em-

³¹ Based on a study of detailed reports of police costs covering 300 of the 365 cities of the country over 25,000 in population. The percentage falls as the population of the cities considered decreases.

³² See Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927, p. 118 (U. S. Census, 1931).

³³ See p. 425, *supra*.

³⁴ See Children Under Institutional Care, 1923 (U. S. Census, 1926).

³⁵ See Industrial Schools for Delinquents, 1926-27, pp. 1, 3, 12-17 (U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1928, No. 10).

³⁶ See Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927, pp. 118-123. Out of the 158 institutions included in the Office of Education figures, 14 are also included in the census figures.

ployees and teachers and assistants is the same for institutions for juvenile delinquents as for reformatories for adult delinquents. Such an estimate indicates that there were some 7,390 employees in 1926-27,³⁷ which would indicate approximately 8,500 persons so employed in 1930.

Some of the time of the persons employed in some correctional institutions is undoubtedly taken up with the care of noncriminals and nondelinquents,³⁸ but that amount is believed to be small. Any error introduced into the present estimates by failure to allow for this factor will, it is believed, be more than compensated for by the fact that these estimates are based on data as to institutional population which are not entirely complete.³⁹

In 1920 there were 2,679 persons employed as probation and truant officers,⁴⁰ which would indicate that some 3,000 persons were so employed in 1930. No separate figures as to parole officers are available, but such are included in most cases in the totals for penal and correctional institution employees. No data are available which make possible an accurate allocation of the work of these probation and truant officers between civil and criminal functions. In order to insure conservatism in the final estimate, therefore, it is arbitrarily assumed that only one-third of the time of all such officers is devoted to criminal work. On this basis there were in 1930 the equivalent of 1,000 full-time probation officers dealing with criminal cases.

³⁷ Excluding employees of institutions included in the totals for institutions for adults. The average number of employees per inmate of 57 institutions for delinquent girls covered by a report made in 1921 and 1922 was 4.8. Reeves, *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls*, p. 420 (New York, 1920). The number of juvenile delinquents in institutions in 1923 was 27,238. See *Children Under Institutional Care, 1923*, p. 201. This indicates some 29,500 inmates in 1927. On the basis of a ratio of inmates to employees of 4.8, this would indicate 6,146 employees in 1927 as against 7,390 as indicated in the text. The census figures for 1923, however, omit numerous delinquent minors in homes for unmarried mothers and wayward girls, including all inmates of the Houses of Good Shepherd (*ibid.*, p. 203), which in 1927 had an aggregate average population of 1,593 delinquent girls (*Industrial Schools for Delinquents, 1926-27*, pp. 12-17), and also omits some other delinquent minors in private institutions. It is believed, therefore, that the figure given in the text may be regarded as a reasonable estimate.

³⁸ See p. 368, *supra*.

³⁹ See *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories, 1927*, pp. 118-123; *Industrial Schools for Delinquents, 1926-27*, p. 1.

⁴⁰ See *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census, 1920*, p. 493.

Penal and corrective treatment of criminals and delinquents, therefore, may be estimated to have absorbed in 1930 the full-time energies of some 23,800 persons.

(c) No published figures are available as to the number of prosecuting officers and court employees, but a rough estimate is possible on the basis of unpublished data collected in connection with another investigation of the cost of criminal justice in the cities of the United States over 25,000 in population previously referred to.⁴¹ That investigation indicates that, on the average, expenditures for prosecution and criminal courts amount to 14.4 per cent of police expenditures chargeable to criminal functions. The major part of police, prosecution and court costs is salaries and wages,⁴² so that the number of employees in each of these branches of the law enforcement organization may, without serious error, be taken to be proportional to total expenditures.⁴³ On this basis it may be estimated that there were employed in the work of prosecuting, trying and sentencing criminals in 1930 the equivalent of 18,400 full-time workers.

(d) The estimates given above of the number of persons publicly employed in law enforcement activities, while not exact, are believed to indicate reasonably well the amount of man-power devoted to the public administration of criminal justice. When we come to private employees engaged in law enforcement activities, however, estimate becomes very difficult. Taking up first private protective agencies, some data are available as to the number of railroad police, as to the industrial police of Pennsylvania,⁴⁴ and as to the number of watchmen.⁴⁵ It is impossible, however, to make any reasonably accurate allowance in these cases for time spent on noncriminal matters, and it would obviously be improper to use the total figures without making such allowance.⁴⁶ Data as to employees of protective services are

⁴¹ See p. 428, *supra*.

⁴² In all these cases, pay-roll expenditures average well over 90 per cent of all operating charges.

⁴³ This may be a slightly erroneous assumption, since it may be expected that the average compensation of prosecuting and court officers will exceed that of policemen, but this simply introduces a weighting factor which tends to increase the accuracy of the estimate later to be made of the value of the time lost by all law enforcement employees.

⁴⁴ See pt. 7 (pp. 352-353, *supra*).

⁴⁵ See *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census, 1920*, p. 493.

⁴⁶ See pt. 7 (pp. 354, 356, *supra*).

available in part, but again no basis for allocation exists, while data as to number of operatives of detective agencies and employees of investigation departments having detective activities are not available at all.⁴⁷ What data there is as to number of employees of private correctional institutions has been taken into account in considering the number of persons employed by institutions for juvenile delinquents;⁴⁸ there are no data available as to number of persons employed by private probation agencies.⁴⁹ Hence, while, logically, account should be taken of the loss of productive labor of private persons employed for protection against crime and in the rehabilitation of criminals and delinquents, it is impossible to do so as a practical matter except to the limited extent that the data as to number of employees of correctional institutions for minors include employees of private institutions.

3. *Earning power of law enforcement officers.*—The exact determination of what the persons now employed in law enforcement could contribute to the national economy if they were engaged in productive labor is, of course, impossible. However, it seems proper to assume that they could contribute at least as much on the average as the average employees in industry generally, including both wage earners and salaried employees. According to a recent estimate, such employees may be regarded as earning on the average \$1,384 annually.⁵⁰ This figure is probably too low, since the average ability of a group of policemen, prosecuting officials, judges and court employees, parole and probation officers, and penal institution employees might be expected to be somewhat higher than that of the average for agricultural and industrial employees generally. There would appear

⁴⁷ See pt. 7 (pp. 364-366, supra).

⁴⁸ See pp. 429-431, supra.

⁴⁹ See pp. 308-309, supra.

⁵⁰ See Copeland, *The National Income and Its Distribution, in Recent Economic Changes in the United States*, vol. 2, p. 777 (New York, 1920). This figure is used in preference to that of \$1,205 for average earnings of wage workers in 1927 developed in King, *The National Income and Its Purchasing Power*, p. 146 (New York, 1930), and used in this report in estimating the cost of nonproductive employment of prisoners (p. 426, supra), because it is believed that the larger figure is more fairly applicable in the case of law enforcement officers. Cf. p. 426, supra, note 21. The figure here used is for 1925, but this is not the reason for the difference, since the King figure for 1925 (op. cit.) is \$1,176.

to be no basis, however, for adopting any specific higher figure; so that it seems desirable in the interests of conservatism to use the figure stated.

4. *Order of magnitude of loss.*—On the basis of approximately 170,000 persons employed full-time in law enforcement activities, and an assumed average earning power of \$1,384 per person, the annual loss of productive labor of such persons works out as approximately \$235,000,000. This figure, like that worked out in discussing loss of productive labor of prisoners,⁵¹ is not, it must be emphasized, an estimate of the actual loss, but merely affords some measure of the order of magnitude of that loss. The actual loss is quite impossible of determination or accurate estimate.

CHAPTER V

OTHER LOSSES OF PRODUCTIVE LABOR

1. *Class of losses.*—Criminals, prisoners and law enforcement officers are not the only persons whose labor is diverted from productive channels as a result of crime. Among the other classes of persons whose energies are so diverted may be enumerated (a) criminal lawyers; (b) persons engaged in furnishing bail bonds for criminals; (c) jurors and witnesses in criminal cases; (d) persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of devices to protect against crime; and (e) persons engaged in the business of providing insurance against criminal acts. No data are available as to the number of persons engaged in these activities, and no attempt will be made to estimate the amount of loss of productive labor involved, but very brief descriptive references will be made to each of the groups which have been enumerated.

2. *Criminal lawyers.*—The loss to the community as a result of the necessity for and activities of criminal lawyers has two aspects. In the first place, there is the loss of productive labor involved. If the criminal bar were not needed, its members might be doing directly productive work of some other sort. This loss exists in the case of all the criminal work of the bar. Second, there is the additional and affirmative loss caused by the activities of dis-

⁵¹ See p. 427, supra.

reputable lawyers of the "professional defender" type,⁵² which impede the efficient administration of criminal justice, increase the cost of enforcing the criminal law, add to the loss to the community resulting from the diversion from productive channels of the labor of law enforcement officers, and, most important, add to the number of criminals at large to prey on the community.

3. *Professional bondsmen.*—The activities of persons engaged in the business of furnishing bail bonds to persons accused of crime are of no economic value to the community. Moreover, there are disreputable "professional" bondsmen whose activities are actively pernicious.⁵³ They, like the disreputable criminal lawyer, are harmful parasites on the economic life of the community.

4. *Jurors and witnesses in criminal cases.*—Consideration has already been given to the economic loss frequently suffered by persons required to serve as jurors or testify as witnesses in criminal cases.⁵⁴ Such direct private losses are, however, only one aspect of the matter. Those losses might, at least in theory, be avoided by paying adequate compensation to jurors and witnesses in criminal cases, but ultimate loss to the community can not be avoided so long as its members must from time to time be taken from productive work to aid in the administration of criminal justice. The suggestions made in another connection⁵⁵ as to the desirability of reducing the amount of time required of jurors and witnesses to the minimum consistent with the efficient and impartial administration of justice are equally in point here.

5. *Employees of companies providing crime insurance.*—In a community which had no criminals, no useful purpose would be served by insurance against burglary, embezzlement and other forms of crime. The fact that such insurance exists, serving a useful social purpose in distributing losses due to crime over a large number of individuals, is thus a cause of indirect economic loss to the community, just as is the fact that policemen exist. Consideration has been

⁵² See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Prosecution, pp. 27-30.

⁵³ See Beeley, *The Bail System in Chicago*, pp. 30-46 (Chicago, 1927). See also National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on Prosecution, p. 90.

⁵⁴ See pp. 410-419, supra.

⁵⁵ See pp. 418-419, supra.

given in the preceding part of this report⁵⁶ to the cost of insurance to individual insured persons; here we are concerned rather with the fact that the employees of insurance companies providing insurance against crime could, if there were no crime, be contributing directly to the economic welfare of the community.

It is impossible, however, to estimate the amount of this indirect loss. Most companies which write crime insurance also write other insurance, and almost all salesmen who sell crime insurance sell other kinds of policies also. The problem of determining how much man-power is devoted to the providing of insurance against crime would be very difficult of practical solution; it is not attempted here.

6. *Persons employed in manufacturing and selling protective devices.*—If there were no crime, no burglar alarms, safes, armored cars, or other protective devices would be necessary except in so far as some such devices (e. g., safes) were desired for protection against fire or other noncriminal protection. This would release for economically productive activities a substantial number of persons now employed in making, advertising, selling, and repairing such devices, would render unnecessary the use of raw materials of economic value in their manufacture, and would permit substantial investments in machinery to be converted to other uses of direct economic benefit. The same difficulties that made impossible an estimate of the total cost of protective devices,⁵⁷ however, make an estimate of the amount of this indirect loss impracticable.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

1. *Summary.*—The aggregate loss of productive labor due to crime is undoubtedly great. No figure whatever can be developed as to the probable amount of the economic loss of this sort chargeable to the diversion from productive

⁵⁶ See pp. 413-416, supra.

⁵⁷ See pp. 358-361, supra. The most serious difficulties are (a) the very large number of scattered manufacturers of burglar alarms and certain other protective devices, and (b) the impossibility of determining how much of the labor of constructing certain devices, such as safes, for example, is chargeable to protection against crime.

channels of the potential man-power of criminals, although the amount is unquestionably large. Neither can any such figure be developed as to the loss of labor incident to the defense of criminals in court, to the service of jurors and witnesses in criminal cases, or to the business of insuring against crime; nor can the loss of labor and materials used in manufacturing crime-protective devices be measured in any practical manner. In the cases of prisoners and law enforcement officers, however, some idea of the order of magnitude of the loss can be worked out, indicating an aggregate loss to the community due to crime which, at a minimum, should be of the order of magnitude of approximately \$300,000,000. As has been repeatedly emphasized, however, this figure is not an estimate of the actual loss;⁵⁸ the amount of that loss is unknown and is not susceptible of accurate ascertainment.

2. *The ultimate cost of crime.*—As was pointed out in part 1 of this report, the only theoretically accurate way of determining the ultimate cost of crime to the community would be to ascertain what the annual national income would be if there were no crime, and to deduct therefrom the actual national income, and this, it was seen, is impossible as a practical matter.⁵⁹ The only other method of arriving at the ultimate cost of crime would be to analyze it into its constituent elements, determine each element separately, and add them. We have seen that three major kinds of losses related to crime are closely connected with ultimate cost—viz, losses of life and injuries due to crimes against the person, damage to property, and loss of productive labor due to crime.⁶⁰ It will be apparent in retrospect, however, that (even if we can assume that these are all, in their entirety, parts of the ultimate cost of crime to the community, and that they include all the elements of such cost) it is impossible to arrive at the total ultimate cost by determining these factors separately and then adding them together. The economic loss due to homicide can be

⁵⁸ See pp. 427, 433, supra. The figure given above, which is approximately the sum of the figures previously derived in discussing prisoners and law enforcement officers, respectively, is no more to be regarded as an estimate of actual loss than those figures.

⁵⁹ See p. 34, supra.

⁶⁰ A less important element of ultimate loss is the use of materials in connection with crime or protection against crime.

only roughly guessed at; the loss due to personal injuries resulting from crime can not even be guessed; only inadequate minimum figures can be developed as to property damage; and, in the case of loss of productive labor, only rough estimates of order of magnitude are possible in any case, while not even that is possible in what is probably the most important case—viz, loss of productive labor of criminals. Consequently, we are brought back to the conclusion reached at the outset, that no accurate or usable estimate of the total ultimate cost to the community due to crime can be developed.⁶¹

The impossibility of working out such a total figure is not, however, a matter of practical consequence. It is clear as a matter of common observation and knowledge, on the basis of considerations which have been summarily outlined in this part of this report, that the ultimate economic loss due to crime, although it can not be reduced to a single sum dollars-and-cents figure, is enormous, and that, from a purely economic standpoint, effective and adequate crime control is of the utmost importance.

⁶¹ See p. 60, supra.

PART 10

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By GOLDTHWAITE H. DORR and SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

CHAPTER I

SUMMARY

1. *Introductory.*—The preceding parts of this report have analyzed the elements of cost and loss to the community due to crime and have set forth the results of detailed studies of various of those elements. In this chapter we will summarize the data thus developed as to various classes of costs related to crime.

2. *The public cost of administration of criminal justice.*—Our studies of the public cost of criminal justice have covered the Federal Government;¹ State police forces;² State penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies;³ and over 80 per cent of the cities of the United States over 25,000 in population.⁴ They have not covered the cost of State prosecuting agencies and criminal courts except in so far as State expenditures for these purposes are included, in part, in municipal costs,⁵ nor have they covered the cost of criminal justice in cities under 25,000 and in rural areas,⁶ except in so far as State police and penal expenditures are concerned. Since city and county expenditures make up by far the most important part of the cost of criminal justice for the country as a whole,⁷ the unavailability of data as to

¹ Part 2 (pp. 71-152, supra).

² Part 4 (pp. 192-204, supra).

³ Part 5 (pp. 205-243, supra).

⁴ Part 6 (pp. 244-348, supra).

⁵ See the discussion in pt. 6 (pp. 246-247, supra).

⁶ As to the lack of available data, see pt. 3 (pp. 153-191, supra).

⁷ As illustrative of this fact, it may be noted that the total cost of city and county criminal justice for 272 of the 365 cities of the country over 25,000 in population is over four times as much as the total Federal cost for the entire country, and over four times as much as total State expenditures for State police forces, penal and correctional institutions, and parole agencies.

such expenditures in rural areas and in urban communities of less than 25,000 population detracts considerably from the completeness of this report. However, since per capita costs of municipal criminal justice show a definite tendency to decrease with decreasing population,⁸ it is believed that the omitted costs for the smaller communities and rural areas, while undoubtedly substantial, are not as large a factor in the total cost of criminal justice for the country as a whole as are the costs in the larger cities, so that the data presented are somewhat more complete than might at first appear.

The total Federal cost of criminal justice is approximately \$52,786,000 annually. Sixty-six per cent of this cost is incurred in connection with prohibition enforcement and an aggregate of more than 76.8 per cent is incurred in connection with the enforcement of three Federal statutes—the prohibition law, the antinarcotic law and the national motor vehicle theft act.⁹ The criminal work of regularly organized State police forces, which are charged with the duty of rural police protection in 11 States, involves a total annual expenditure of over \$2,660,000.¹⁰ State penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies involve an expenditure of approximately \$51,720,000 annually.¹¹ The average per capita cost of administering the criminal law in American cities over 25,000 in population is approximately \$5.39 per year; and the total expenditure for approximately 75 per cent of the 265 cities of this size, including 63.5 per cent of the urban population of the country, is over \$247,700,000 per year.¹² The total annual cost of criminal justice in the United States is thus very considerably in excess of \$350,000,000 per year.

3. *Private expenditures for protection against crime.*—Large amounts are expended in this country annually by private individuals for protection against crime and in con-

⁸ See p. 334, supra, Table 14. The data which indicate this tendency relate only to cities over 25,000 in population, but there is no reason to believe that the same tendency does not exist in the case of smaller cities and villages.

⁹ See p. 145, supra, Table 42. The figures are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

¹⁰ See p. 200, supra, Table 2. The figures are for the census year 1928.

¹¹ See p. 241, supra, Table 12. The figures are for the census year 1928.

¹² See p. 333, supra, Table 13.

nection with the attempted rehabilitation of criminals and delinquents.¹³ As illustrating the substantial amounts involved, it may be noted that the cost of private industrial police in Pennsylvania is probably over \$1,260,000 annually and that over \$10,000,000 is paid each year for private protective services in the larger cities.¹⁴ Only an indeterminate part of these expenditures for private police and protective services, however, is chargeable to crime.¹⁵ Approximately \$3,900,000 a year is paid to companies providing armored-car service for the transportation of money and valuables.¹⁶ Satisfactory figures can not be worked out as to amounts expended for watchmen, protective devices against crime, and private detective agencies, but the aggregate amount thus expended is known to be considerable.¹⁷

The amount contributed by private persons and agencies to the correctional treatment of criminals exceeds \$850,000 per year, probably by a very considerable amount.¹⁸

4. *Losses due to criminal acts.*—Direct losses to the Federal Government and the States and their municipal subdivisions due to crimes affecting public property and frauds on the revenue are undoubtedly quite large, but the exact amount of such losses can not be readily ascertained.¹⁹ Losses to private individuals and organizations due to criminal acts are much larger, and form an important element of the immediate economic cost of crime.

Crimes against the person, such as murder and mayhem, cause very real losses both to the individual victims and to the community, but the dollars-and-cents loss due to such crimes can not be accurately ascertained.²⁰

Direct crimes against property, such as arson, malicious mischief, embezzlement and the various forms of theft—burglary, robbery, and larceny—cause very large losses. While the exact amount of such losses can not be computed or even intelligently estimated, the total insured losses due to known crimes of this character, which are far from in-

¹³ See pt. 7 (pp. 349-360, supra).

¹⁴ See pp. 353, 363 (Table 4), supra.

¹⁵ See pp. 354, 363, supra.

¹⁶ See p. 363, supra.

¹⁷ See pp. 355-356, 358-361, 364-366, supra.

¹⁸ See p. 368, supra.

¹⁹ See pt. 1 (pp. 50-60, supra).

²⁰ See pt. 8 (pp. 374-379, supra).

cluding all losses due to known crimes or even all insured losses due to crimes, average more than \$47,000,000 annually.²¹ The total loss is undoubtedly greatly in excess of this amount.

The amounts lost by private individuals due to crimes indirectly affecting wealth, particularly commercialized fraud and organized extortion and racketeering, are undoubtedly very large. The Post Office Department estimates, for example, that over \$68,000,000 per year has on the average been lost due to the fraudulent use of the mails during the last 10 years.²² However, the total amount of the aggregate annual loss due to crimes of this character can not even be estimated, at least without much more elaborate field investigation than we have been able to make. The undoubted magnitude of the losses which result from these types of crime clearly indicates, we think, the need for further study of the subjects of commercialized fraud and racketeering and organized extortion.²³

In addition to these losses due to criminal acts, there may be substantial private economic losses to persons called upon to serve as jurors and witnesses in criminal cases.²⁴

5. *The cost of insurance against crime.*—The full cost of insurance against crime can not be determined, since there is no way of ascertaining what proportion of the premiums paid on fire insurance policies are chargeable to insurance against arson. The total cost of insurance against other types of crime—burglary, robbery, automobile theft, embezzlement and malicious mischief—is, however, in excess of \$106,000,000 annually.²⁵ While this does not represent a net loss to the insured individuals as a group, it does represent an aggregate cost to those persons as individuals which results from the threat of crime.

6. *Indirect losses to the community due to the existence of crime.*—Substantial economic losses to the community as a whole result from the fact that crime diverts large amounts of potentially productive labor into nonproductive channels. This loss of productive labor occurs not only in

²¹ See p. 398, supra, Table 18.

²² See p. 405, supra, Table 10.

²³ See pp. 412-413, supra.

²⁴ See pp. 410-419, supra.

²⁵ See p. 415, supra, Table 24.

the case of criminals and persons imprisoned for crime, but also in the case of public officers employed in law enforcement activities, private persons employed in protection against crime, and such persons as criminal lawyers and bondsmen, jurors and witnesses in criminal cases, and employees of crime insurance companies and of manufacturers of protective devices against crime.²⁰

There is no way of estimating the total loss of productive labor due to crime, but some rough estimates of the order of magnitude of that loss may be made in the case of prisoners and law enforcement officers, which indicate that it may well be as great as \$300,000,000 per year for these two classes alone.²¹ The total for all classes of such losses is undoubtedly much greater.

7. *The total cost of crime.*—It is wholly impossible to make an accurate estimate of the total economic cost of crime to the United States. This is true whether we look at the immediate cost of crime to the tax-paying and property-owning public and the individuals composing it, or whether we consider the net ultimate cost to the community as a whole.²² Many "estimates" of total cost have been made, but they, in our opinion, have only been guesses; and we do not feel that any useful purpose would be served by still another guess.

It does not seem to us, however, that the total annual cost of crime to the country in dollars and cents is a matter of great importance. The data which can be accurately ascertained clearly indicate that the toll levied upon the community by the criminal, directly and indirectly, is a very large one, and one which imposes a serious economic burden on the public and the individuals who make up the public. It is a matter of common knowledge that the economic loss due to crime is enormous, that it is desirable that it be reduced, and that it can be reduced by reducing crime and by diverting the man power now devoted to criminal activities into legitimate and productive channels. It seems to us, therefore, that the desirability of adequate crime control from an economic standpoint is so obvious that it

²⁰ See pt. 9 (pp. 420-437, supra).

²¹ See p. 430, supra.

²² See pt. 1 (pp. 67-70, supra) and pt. 9 (pp. 430-437, supra).

should not require the reenforcement of specific figures as to aggregate dollars-and-cents losses to rouse the public to the interest and activity necessary to deal adequately with the problem.

CHAPTER II

CERTAIN CONCLUSIONS

1. *Introductory.*—The purpose of the investigations of the cost of crime and criminal justice which have resulted in this report has been the securing of data as to the character and amount of the economic losses to the country resulting from crime and criminal acts, not as to the causes of such losses. The basic cause of economic loss due to crime is, of course, the fact of crime, and the basic method of reducing that loss is the reduction of crime. The difficult problem of the causes of crime has been the subject of detailed investigation and study by the commission, and forms the subject matter of one of the commission's reports.²³ Our study has not been concerned with causative factors in criminality, but rather with the ways in which criminality causes economic loss. The methods of dealing with crime have also been the subject of detailed studies by the commission, which have covered the important fields of police,²⁴ prosecution,²⁵ the courts,²⁶ penal and corrective institutions and agencies,²⁷ and juvenile delinquency.²⁸ Our study has only incidentally been concerned with these matters.

Under these circumstances it would be highly inappropriate for this report to discuss either the basic causes of the economic loss due to crime or possible methods of reducing that loss by reducing crime. There are, however, certain general conclusions deducible from the facts relating to the cost of crime and criminal justice presented in this report which will be set forth here.

²³ Report on the Causes of Crime (Report No. 13). See also Report on Crime and the Foreign Born (Report No. 10).

²⁴ Report on Police (Report No. 14).

²⁵ Report on Prosecution (Report No. 4).

²⁶ Report on Criminal Procedure (Report No. 8).

²⁷ Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole (Report No. 9).

²⁸ Report on the Child Offender in the Federal System of Justice (Report No. 6).

2. *Relative expenditures for criminal justice agencies.*—The studies of Federal, State and municipal costs of criminal justice presented in this report, while incomplete,⁶⁵ give an approximately accurate idea of the relative amounts spent by the Federal Government and the States on the five principal types of law enforcement agencies—police, prosecution, criminal courts, penal and correctional institutions, and probation and parole agencies. In the case of the Federal Government, the largest expenditure is for police, which accounts for 68.1 per cent of the total Federal cost of criminal justice. Federal penal and correctional institutions account for 16.1 per cent, Federal criminal courts for 12 per cent, and Federal prosecution for 3.7 per cent. Federal probation and parole expenditures have been negligible prior to the present fiscal year.

In the case of the States, the largest direct expenditure is for penal and correctional institutions, although some States have substantial police expenditures. State expenditures for parole agencies are very small in relation to penal expenditures, being on the average less than 2 per cent of State expenditures for penal and correctional institutions for adults.

Data as to municipal costs, which include appropriate allowances for State costs of prosecution and courts, are available for 63.5 per cent of the urban population of the country. These data show that much the largest element in municipal costs of criminal justice is the cost of police, which averages 78.3 per cent of the total for the cities for which data are available. Penal and correctional institutions come next, with 8.3 per cent; then the criminal courts, with 8.1 per cent; then prosecution, with 3.5 per cent; and, last, probation, with 1.8 per cent of the total.

Three conclusions are suggested by these facts. First, the preponderant share of the total funds used for criminal justice purposes which is expended for police emphasizes the desirability of active measures to increase police efficiency to a level commensurate with the very large expend-

⁶⁵ See pp. 438-439, *supra*.

itures involved.⁶⁶ From the standpoint of the burden imposed on the taxpaying public, the police are the most important part of the machinery for criminal justice, and the one where high standards of efficiency and economy in administration are most needed. Second, the relatively large amounts of public funds disbursed for the support of penal institutions, as compared with the relatively small amounts expended for probation, call for investigation from the standpoint of economy in administration. If such investigation should indicate that probation might desirably be employed in the case of some criminals now dealt with by institutional confinement, the possibility of substantial economies would be disclosed.⁶⁷ But the figures in themselves throw no light whatever on the vital problem of whether too much or too little is being spent or whether what is spent is being spent to best advantage in preventive or curative measures for the apprehended violator of the law. It should not require reinforcement from cost figures to emphasize the vital need of repeatedly attacking and re-attacking our failure in dealing with the convicted criminal, and the still more vital need of steady pressure on the causes that produce the human wreckage with which it seems so insolubly difficult to deal. Third, the relatively small part of the total cost of criminal law enforcement represented by expenditures for prosecution gives rise to the query whether enough is being spent on prosecuting agencies in view of the very large importance of efficient prosecution in securing adequate law enforcement.⁶⁸

The foregoing conclusions are all as to desirable directions for further study of the functioning of our criminal justice machinery. They indicate possible ways of increasing the

⁶⁶ The necessity for increasing the general efficiency of municipal police forces in the United States can not be doubted. See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Police*, pp. 1-10. And see the illuminating discussion by Smith, *Municipal Police Administration*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 140, p. 1 (1929).

⁶⁷ Not only does probation cost substantially less than institutional treatment, but probationers contribute actively to the economic welfare of the community by productive labor, while there is a substantial loss to the community due to failure adequately to utilize the potential productive labor of persons in prison. See pt. 9 (pp. 424-427, *supra*).

⁶⁸ See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Prosecution*, pp. 37, 104, 105.

efficiency of that machinery, so as to get the maximum benefit out of the community's expenditures for administering the criminal law, which should be investigated.

3. *Relative importance of cost of administering criminal justice and of losses due to crime.*—No total figures can be worked out either for the aggregate cost of criminal justice or for aggregate losses resulting from criminal activity, either directly to governmental units and private persons as a result of criminal acts or to the community as a whole due to the existence of crime.³⁹ We believe, however, from our study of the general subject of crime costs, that the cost of administering criminal justice is relatively small in comparison with other economic losses to individuals and to the community resulting from crime. It is easier to identify the \$5.70 per year chargeable to each inhabitant of Chicago on account of municipal police expenditures⁴⁰ than it is to ascertain each such person's share of the amount annually extorted from the public of Chicago by racketeers; but the latter cost is in fact probably more than the former.⁴¹

Our studies thus clearly indicate that it is more important, from an economic standpoint, to increase the efficiency of the administration of criminal justice than to decrease its cost. In considering possible changes and improvements in our present machinery for preventing and suppressing crime, emphasis should be on efficiency, and on economy only as an aid to and index of efficiency, not as an end in itself. From an economic as from a social standpoint, to fail to improve our machinery for enforcing the criminal law because this may increase the cost of enforcement is to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

4. *Possible reductions of the cost of criminal justice.*—While, as we have indicated in the previous section, the basic consideration, from a purely economic standpoint, in dealing with criminal justice administration should be efficiency in keeping down crime rather than low direct cost, this does not mean that all expenditures now made for criminal justice purposes are necessary or desirable, nor that such expenditures may not be advantageously reduced in many

³⁹ See pp. 67-68, supra.

⁴⁰ See pt. 6, Table 6 (p. 284, supra).

⁴¹ See pp. 407-412, supra.

instances. There can be little doubt that a substantial part of the public funds appropriated for criminal justice purposes is not wisely and economically expended, due to inefficient organization and administration, and in some instances to political influence and corruption.⁴² These leaks obviously should be stopped and the money thus saved either returned to the public treasury or, as would probably be preferable in most cases, devoted to the improvement of the administration of criminal justice.

The data presented in this report are insufficient to show in what communities inefficient and wasteful criminal justice machinery exists.⁴³ We believe, however, that the carrying out of our plan for the analysis of comparative costs of municipal criminal justice⁴⁴ should throw valuable light on this important matter. If it is possible by this analysis to indicate which of the larger communities of the country are not getting their money's worth for their expenditures for criminal justice, substantial service will have been rendered to those communities.

There is another possible way of reducing the cost of criminal justice—viz, by limiting the extent to which social control by means of the criminal law is attempted. A part of the money now required to be expended in the administration of criminal justice is spent in the enforcement by criminal proceedings of statutes applying to conduct with which it is a matter of debate whether the police and the criminal courts are intrinsically fitted to deal, and which must in some cases, at least, be regarded as outside the limits of effective legal action by means of the criminal law.⁴⁵ A thorough overhauling of our criminal codes with a view to appraising the social advantage of such statutes and comparing that advantage, if any, with the cost of their administration would appear to be highly desirable from an economic standpoint.

⁴² See National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Enforcement of the Prohibition Laws of the United States, p. 44, and Report on Prosecution, pp. 14-15. Compare Merriam, *The Police, Crime, and Politics*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 115 (1920).

⁴³ See pt. 6 (pp. 330-341, supra).

⁴⁴ See pp. 346-347, supra.

⁴⁵ See Pound, *The Limits of Effective Legal Action*, *American Bar Association Journal*, vol. 3, p. 55 (1917).

It is clear, we think, that the cost of enforcing the criminal law would be less if it did not attempt to forbid and punish acts participated in by large numbers of otherwise law-abiding citizens who do not regard such prohibited acts as "criminal" except in a technical sense. However, the desirability of thus reducing the burden imposed on the taxpaying public by expenditures for criminal justice will undoubtedly be determined in the light of views as to social considerations with which we are not concerned in this report.

5. *Summary of conclusions.*—With regard to the question of whether and to what extent the cost of administration of criminal justice can and should be reduced, our investigation thus indicates:

(a) That expenditures for criminal justice are of less economic importance than loss due to criminal acts and to the existence of crime, so that such expenditures should not be reduced if this will result in lessened efficiency of the machinery for dealing with crime;

(b) That it may well be desirable in many instances materially to increase such expenditures in order to secure increased efficiency and in order to deal adequately with new types of crime and criminals;

(c) That there is a considerable amount of wasteful expenditure which should be eliminated, and the money saved devoted, so far as necessary and practicable, to improving the efficiency of enforcement of the criminal law;

(d) That the cost of administering criminal justice might be substantially reduced by a thorough overhauling of the criminal law which would result in the elimination from our penal codes of legislation of doubtful social utility or obvious unenforceability.

The reduction of the cost of criminal justice is obviously desirable in so far as it means the elimination of unnecessary and wasteful expenditure; it is highly undesirable in so far as it reduces efficiency and permits the increase of losses due to crime. It is of the utmost importance that expenditures for the administration of criminal justice should be *wise*; it is much less important that they should be kept small; and it may well be in many instances that wise expenditure will involve an increased direct cost.

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Introductory.*—As has been pointed out in the previous chapter, questions as to how the economic loss to the country resulting from crime may be reduced by more adequate crime control are within the province of other phases of the labors of the commission, and it would not be appropriate for us to make any recommendations with regard thereto. There are, however, certain recommendations which we feel that it is appropriate to make. These recommendations have been set forth in detail in the prior parts of this report, and are here assembled and adopted as our recommendations to the commission.

2. *Improvement of financial statistics.*—Recommendations for the improvement of existing financial statistics relating to the administration of criminal justice may be considered under the heads of Federal administration and State administration, including in the latter class the administration of criminal justice by the municipal subdivisions of the States. It is desirable that improvements in both classes of statistics be correlated and coordinated as far as possible.⁴⁶

(a) *Federal statistics.*—Desirable improvements in Federal financial statistics as to the administration of criminal justice have been outlined in part 2 of this report.⁴⁷ These recommendations contemplate that the present financial records of the Department of Justice relating to the police agencies of the department (including the United States marshals), to the United States attorneys, to the Federal courts, and to Federal penal and corrective institutions and treatment, be revised and amplified so as to make possible the division of costs as between civil and criminal functions and as between the more important kinds of criminal functions; that data be compiled currently by the Department of Justice as to criminal justice costs; that Federal police agencies outside of the Department of Justice report similar data to an appropriate Federal bureau; and that regular reports on the cost of Federal criminal justice, made up on the

⁴⁶ See p. 190, *supra*, note 55, as to the desirability of coordinated improvement of Federal and State institutional statistics.

⁴⁷ See pp. 151-152, *supra*.

basis of the data thus compiled and reported, be prepared and published annually.

The major part of these recommendations can be put into effect without legislation, although statutory provision for reporting of criminal police costs by the executive departments and agencies other than the Department of Justice exercising police functions may be necessary to carry them out completely. We adopt these recommendations, which are set forth in detail in part 2 of this report, and urge that they be carried into effect.

(b) *State and municipal statistics.*—The defects of the existing statistical material on State and municipal expenditures with the administration of criminal justice have been discussed in detail in part 3 of this report.⁴⁸ We adopt the recommendations there made that an adequate and uniform system of State, county and municipal accounting for criminal justice costs be worked out; that each State adopt this uniform system, require reports in accordance therewith from its municipal subdivisions, and compile complete annual figures for itself and its municipal subdivisions; and that the Bureau of the Census collect and consolidate such State reports, and publish annually, on the basis thereof, a complete report on the cost of administration of criminal justice by the several States and their municipal subdivisions. It might well be desirable to include in this report the data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government which we recommend be compiled by an appropriate Federal bureau.

If these recommendations are carried into effect, accurate and comprehensive data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States will for the first time be made available on a regular annual basis.⁴⁹ We believe that such data will be of large value to students of criminology and public administration.

3. *Completion of study of municipal costs.*—We believe that the data on municipal costs of criminal justice pre-

⁴⁸ See pp. 153-191, supra.

⁴⁹ The present report supplies a considerable amount of such data, but only for part of the entire machinery of criminal justice of the country and only for a single year. Regular annual reports would be much more valuable, and could be made more detailed, more accurate, and much more complete.

sented in part 6 of this report⁵⁰ are of very large potential value, and that the plan for their analysis outlined in this report is sound and should be carried out.⁵¹ We therefore recommend that the study which we have begun be continued by some responsible agency which is financially able to carry out the necessary detailed statistical analysis and to arrange for the printing of a final report.

One of the serious difficulties in the way of improving our machinery for administering criminal justice is the lack of objective standards for judging the comparative efficiency and economy of administration of the criminal law in different communities. We believe that the completion of the comparative study of the cost of criminal justice in American cities, for which the data collected under our supervision in 300 representative communities is now available, may be expected to produce valuable results in providing such standards.

4. *Study of commercialized fraud.*—The importance of the economic losses caused by various forms of commercialized fraud has been discussed in some detail in this report. As has been pointed out,⁵² limitations of time and funds did not permit a comprehensive study of losses due to crime of this character. We believe that the whole subject of commercialized fraud urgently calls for careful and comprehensive scientific study, and we recommend that such a study be undertaken by some responsible organization which has or can secure the necessary funds and personnel.

5. *Study of racketeering and organized extortion.*—As has been indicated in part 8 of this report,⁵³ the problem of organized crime in the form of extortion and racketeering has become an extremely serious one. While we have not been able, due to limitations of funds, to make a field investigation of this subject even so far as its purely economic aspects are concerned, we have gone far enough with our study of the matter to be led to believe that this problem of racketeering is of vital importance in America to-day. Careful and scientific study of the problem is essential if it is to be adequately dealt with.

⁵⁰ See pp. 281-330, supra.

⁵¹ See pp. 330-348, supra.

⁵² See p. 371, supra.

⁵³ See pp. 371, 407-413, supra.

We recommend that some responsible agency which has or can secure the necessary funds should undertake a study of racketeering, organized extortion, and related forms of crime on a broad scale, with expert and scientific direction and competent and courageous personnel. This study should not be limited to the economic aspects of these types of crime, but should go into all phases of the matter, should endeavor to ascertain the extent and character and probe out the causes of racketeering in this country, and should consider what measures of social control can be applied to the situation.

6. *Study of how to reduce the economic burden on jurors and witnesses in criminal cases.*—The importance of the economic burden now imposed on jurors and witnesses in criminal cases has been discussed in part 8 of this report,⁵⁴ and the importance of this burden as affecting the efficient administration of the criminal law has been referred to. We make four recommendations in this connection:

(a) that the requirement of presentment by grand jury be modified as to many classes of offenses;⁵⁵

(b) that waivers of jury trials in criminal cases be permitted and encouraged;⁵⁶

(c) that delays in the trial of criminal cases resulting in the unnecessary loss of time of jurors and witnesses be minimized by a more efficient organization of docket procedure in the criminal courts; and

(d) that a study be made of the question of whether more adequate compensation to jurors and reimbursement to witnesses may not be desirable.

It is our opinion that there is a substantial possibility of increasing the efficiency of our system of criminal trials by appropriate action along these lines.⁵⁷

7. *Summary of recommendations.*—To sum up, we recommend:

(a) that appropriate steps be taken to develop accurate and annual comprehensive statistics as to the cost of ad-

⁵⁴ See pp. 416-419, supra.

⁵⁵ This recommendation accords with that already made by the commission primarily on other grounds. See Report on Prosecution, p. 24.

⁵⁶ This recommendation also accords with one already made by the commission on other grounds. Ibid., p. 37.

⁵⁷ See pp. 418-419, supra.

ministration of criminal justice by the Federal Government and by the several States and their municipal subdivisions;

(b) that the comparative study of municipal costs of criminal justice undertaken and partially completed by us be finished;

(c) that a scientific study of commercialized fraud in all its aspects be made;

(d) that a similar study be made of racketeering and organized extortion; and

(e) that measures be taken to reduce, so far as practicable, the economic burden now imposed on jurors and witnesses in criminal cases.

We believe that the carrying into effect of these recommendations, in addition to supplying important data as to the economic aspects of crime, will produce results of substantial value in dealing with important problems of law observance and enforcement. Of course, such recommendations merely touch the edge of the problem. The heart of it is in the human engineering required in fighting the development of the criminal and in aggressively seeking his rehabilitation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY *

I

INTRODUCTION

1. *Purpose of bibliography.*—This appendix to the report seeks to provide a comprehensive bibliography of the available published material on the cost of crime. The location and examination of this material was the first task undertaken as part of the present study, and this appendix, together with part 3 of the report,¹ which discusses critically the published statistical material relating to State and municipal costs of the administration of criminal justice, set forth the results of that investigation.

2. *Scope of bibliographical investigation.*—In preparing this bibliography, the attempt was made to locate all books, pamphlets, reports, and articles in periodicals, printed in the English language, which discuss the cost of crime and criminal justice in any of its aspects. Efforts were also made to locate any unpublished studies of the subject, with the result that some material of this character which has proved to be quite valuable was discovered.

In the field of statistical material, the attempt was made to locate all printed reports of recent date containing data on the cost of crime and criminal justice in the United States. It was found that the only reports containing such data were those which included statistics relating to various aspects of the cost of administration of criminal justice. In making the investigation of this material, unofficial re-

* Prepared under the supervision of the writers of this report by Miss Mary Daugherty, research assistant. The writers of this report are responsible for the discussion of the value of the published secondary material (pp. 464-467, *infra*) and for the comments on the available material as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States (pp. 469-470, *infra*).

¹ See pp. 153-191, *supra*.

ports, reports not regularly issued, and reports printed only in newspapers were ignored.²

It is believed that this bibliography is substantially complete, as far as discussions of the cost of crime and criminal justice printed in English and current official reports containing statistical data relating to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States are concerned.

3. *Arrangement of material.*—Examination of the available material which proved to be relevant to the subject of the cost of crime showed that it fell into two distinct classes: (a) books, articles, and other secondary material on the cost of crime and criminal justice, including discussions of the cost of administration of criminal justice, of private expenditures for protection against crime, and of losses due to criminal acts, as well as estimates and discussions of the total cost of crime; and (b) statistical reports and other basic data on the cost of administration of criminal justice.

These two classes of materials are fundamentally different in character. This bibliography has, therefore, been divided into two parts: (a) that containing references to general secondary material on the cost of crime; and (b) that containing references to reports containing statistical data on the cost of administration of criminal justice. In each case the general character of the material and its method of collection is stated, followed by a list of references. The list of secondary material gives brief abstracts of each item, and a general estimate of the value of this material is included. The character and value of the statistical material have been discussed in an earlier part of this report,³ so that only a check-list of that material is included here.

II

BOOKS, ARTICLES AND OTHER SECONDARY MATERIAL ON THE COST OF CRIME

1. *Material included.*—This part of the bibliography deals with books, pamphlets, articles in periodicals, theses, and other secondary material relating to the cost of crime or

² See p. 154, supra.

³ See pt. 3 (pp. 153-191, supra).

particular aspects thereof. All this material is in the English language, and substantially all of it is printed.⁴ Basic statistical reports are not here included.

2. *How material was collected.*—The references in this chapter were assembled as the result of a careful bibliographical investigation, which included the examination of the catalogues of the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library, of the available bibliographies on crime and criminology, of indexes to current periodicals, and of special indexes such as the Public Affairs Information Service. Several references to unpublished theses and other unpublished material were obtained by correspondence.

All the references located were examined in their original form, and digests were prepared of those items which were found to be relevant. These digests have formed the basis for the brief abstracts which follow each reference.

The bibliographical study, including the examination of references and the preparation of digests of relevant items, was carried out by Mr. J. W. Coatsworth, working in the Library of Congress, and by Miss Mary Daugherty, working in the New York Public Library.

3. *List of material.*—The following list of secondary material on the cost of crime is arranged alphabetically by authors:

Adams, Lynn G., *The State Police*, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 34 (1920). Gives comparison of salaries paid by State police forces in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey and West Virginia.

Anderson, V. V., *The State Program for Mental Hygiene*, 1 Journal of Social Forces, 92 (1923). Gives estimates of the daily cost of crime in the United States and of the cost of convicting criminals.

Andrews, A. B., *Per Capita Cost of Courts* (Richmond, Va., 1922). Gives list of salaries paid to Federal judges and judges of highest State courts in 1921 (pp. 4, 5).

Anonymous, *The Cost in Penitentiary Punishment*, Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy, vol. 4, p. 112 (1849). Discusses the comparative cost of various methods of penal treatment.

Anonymous, *Crime as a Business Proposition*, Literary Digest, vol. 101, p. 30 (1929). Quotes figures to show that crime is not profitable to the average criminal.

⁴ Material not published in print is described as "unpublished" in the list of references.

- Anonymous, Debt Three Billions a Year to Crooks, Current Opinion, vol. 77, p. 510 (1924). Gives estimates of the total cost of crime to the country and of losses to individuals resulting from various types of criminal activity.
- Anonymous, Financial Survey of the State Penal and Correctional Institutions, Prison Journal of Philadelphia, vol. 3, p. 4 (1923). Discusses the cost of Pennsylvania penal and correctional institutions in 1921.
- Anonymous, How Our Greatest City Spends Its Money, Literary Digest, vol. 84, p. 84 (1925). Gives figures as to the proportion of the New York City budget expended for crime prevention, detection and punishment.
- Anonymous, Our Biggest Tax—The Cost of Crime, Literary Digest, vol. 84, p. 84 (1924). Gives estimates of the total cost of crime, including losses to individuals due to criminal acts and the cost of administration of criminal justice. (Reprinted in Annual Report of New York Prison Association, 1924, p. 64.)
- Anonymous, United States Crime Costs Billions Yearly According to Recent Figures, Popular Mechanics, vol. 42, p. 553 (1924). Contains an estimate of the total cost of crime which includes a figure for the loss of productive labor of criminals.
- Anonymous, War on the White Collar Bandits, Literary Digest, vol. 88, p. 11 (1926). Contains an estimate of money lost through stock swindles.
- Anonymous, What the Criminal Costs and What to do About It, American Review of Reviews, vol. 75, p. 431 (1927). Gives various estimates of losses to individuals due to crime, and quotes figures on police salaries.
- Beyer, William C., The Hire of Firemen and Policemen, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 113, p. 235 (1924). Gives data for 18 of the 21 largest cities in the United States as to rates of pay, clothing allowances, sick leaves, vacations, and pensions.
- Beyer, William C., and Toerring, Helen C., The Policeman's Hire, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 135 (1929). Covers 8 State police forces for the year 1929, 36 municipal police forces for 1928, and 42 municipal forces for 1929. Gives data as to pay, clothing, maintenance, allowances, sick leaves, vacations, pension funds, and stability of employment.
- Blackmar, Frank W., and Gilin, John L., Outlines of Sociology (New York, 1924). Refers to estimates of the direct and indirect cost of crime in the United States made by others (pp. 522-523).
- Bond, Nathaniel B., The Treatment of the Dependent Defective and Delinquent Classes in Mississippi (New Orleans, 1924). Discusses the investment in jails (p. 77) and the cost of maintaining prison farms (p. 81) in the State of Mississippi.
- Bower, Lahman F., The Economic Waste of Sin (New York, 1924). Discusses economic losses due to crime, war, disease, poverty, alcohol, prostitution, narcotic drugs, etc. Chapter I (pp. 33-98)

- deals with various costs relating to crime, and contains an estimate of the total annual cost of crime to the United States (p. 97).
- Brooks, Lee M., The Administrative Cost of Crime in Durham County (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1926). (Unpublished master's thesis prepared for the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences of the University of North Carolina.) An analysis and discussion of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Durham County, N. C., in 1924.
- Chamberlin, Henry B., The Cost of Crime in Chicago (Chicago, 1924). Pamphlet outlining the work of the Chicago Crime Commission. Contains estimates of the cost of crime in the United States and in the city of Chicago.
- Child, Richard Washburn, The Great American Scandal, Saturday Evening Post, vol. 108, Aug. 1 and Oct. 10, 1925. Gives estimates of the total cost of crime (Aug. 1, p. 150) and of money losses to individuals due to crime in the United States in 1924 (Oct. 10, p. 26). [Quoted in Literary Digest, vol. 86, p. 5 (1925).]
- Conover, Milton, State Police, American Political Science Review, vol. 15, p. 82 (1921). Reviews recent legislation relating to State police and gives salaries of State police officers.
- Conover, Milton, State Police Developments, 1921-1924, American Political Science Review, vol. 18, p. 773 (1924). Gives pay of State police officers in New Jersey (p. 775).
- Daken, Edward, When Crime Becomes an Industry, Commerce and Finance, vol. 15, p. 629 (1926). Contains estimates of losses to individuals due to embezzlement and forgery, an estimate of the total cost of administration of criminal justice, and a discussion of burglary insurance rates.
- Dixon, A. L., The English Police System, Annals of the American Academy, vol. 146, p. 177 (1929). Gives figures on salaries and pensions for some typical English police forces.
- Duffy, J. C., Reducing Costs of Criminal Prosecutions in Kentucky, Kentucky State Bar Association Proceedings, 1916, p. 259. Gives figures as to the costs of prosecution in Kentucky for 1914, and discusses the cost of detention of prisoners awaiting trial.
- Enright, Richard D., Our Biggest Business—Crime, North American Review, vol. 228, p. 385 (1929). Gives various estimates of the total cost of crime to the country.
- Fosdick, Raymond B., European Police Systems (New York, 1915). Gives annual salaries and additional perquisites of police commissioners (pp. 177-180) and the uniformed force (pp. 237-254) in the principal European cities; appendices (pp. 389-400) include police department budgets.
- Garner, James W., Crime and Judicial Inefficiency (Philadelphia, 1907). Discusses the cost of juries in criminal cases (p. 106).
- Getz, Carl H., Economic Toll of Crime, Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, vol. 14, p. 318 (1923). (Abstract.) Gives estimates of losses to individuals due to theft, embezzlement, etc.

- Gillin, John L., *Crime is Our Most Expensive Luxury*, *Journal of Applied Sociology*, vol. 10, p. 213 (1926). Contains estimates of the cost of crime in 1922 to the United States as a whole and to the State of Wisconsin, and figures as to the value of the property used by penal institutions in the United States.
- Gillin, John L., *Criminology and Penology* (New York, 1926). Refers to estimates by others of the money cost of crime, and states that only general statements can be made as to that cost (pp. 29, 30).
- Gillin, John L., *Pauperism and Crime in Wisconsin*, *Journal of Social Forces*, vol. 2, p. 73 (1923). Gives figures as to the cost of charitable and penal institutions in Wisconsin in 1921.
- Graper, Elmer D., *American Police Administration* (New York, 1921). Gives figures as to police salaries in 1915 (p. 306).
- Gunther, John, *The High Cost of Hoodlums*, *Harper's Magazine*, vol. 150, p. 529 (1929). Discusses racketeering in Chicago, and estimates the annual per capita cost of racketeering to the residents of that city.
- Haines, Thomas H., *The Increased Cost of Crime in Ohio* (Publication No. 10 of the Ohio Board of Administration, Columbus, Ohio, 1915). A careful study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Ohio, exclusive of the maintenance costs of courthouses and jails, giving comparative figures for 1906 and 1914.
- Haydon, Arthur L., *Riders of the Plains* (London, 1918). Gives pay of police officers of the Canadian Northwest Mounted Police in 1905 (p. 279).
- Haydon, Arthur L., *The Trooper Police of Australia* (London, 1911). Gives pay of police of New South Wales (p. 225), Victoria (pp. 245-246), South Australia (p. 266), Western Australia (p. 329), Queensland (pp. 382-383), and the trackers with these various forces (p. 409).
- Institute of Law of the Johns Hopkins University, *Expenditures of Public Money for the Administration of Justice in Ohio in 1929* (Baltimore, 1931). (Tentative draft; mimeographed.) A study of the cost of administration of justice in the State of Ohio in 1929. The study covers the cost of both civil and criminal justice, and no segregation of these is attempted.
- Keene, Katherine, *The Money Cost of Crime in Wisconsin* (Madison, Wis., 1923). (Unpublished baccalaureate thesis, University of Wisconsin.) A study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Wisconsin in the year 1921. Does not include estimates of losses resulting from criminal acts.
- Kuhlman, August F., *Guide to Material on Crime and Criminal Justice* (New York, 1929). Includes some references on the cost of crime (pp. 60-61).⁵
- Langeluttig, Albert, *Federal Police*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 41 (1929). Gives salaries for a number of police organizations of the Federal Government.
- Loesch, Frank J., *Crime and Your Balance Sheet*, *Magazine of Business*, vol. 55, p. 405 (1929). Discusses the direct and indirect costs of racketeering in Chicago.
- Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living, *Report* (Boston, 1910). Gives figures for the cost of jails, houses of correction, and State penal institutions in Massachusetts for 1909 (pp. 714-715).
- McLellan, Howard, *Four Billions in Easy Money*, *North American Review*, vol. 228, p. 609 (1929). Gives an estimate of the amount of money lost annually in the United States through various forms of gambling, including bucket-shop losses.
- Mead, Bennett, *Police Statistics*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 74. Discusses cost of city police work (pp. 89-91) and of State police work (pp. 91-94).
- Prentiss, Mark O., *The Economic Consequences of Crime*, *Reference Shelf*, vol. 6, p. 43 (1929). Contains an estimate of the total cost of crime, which is regarded as including all losses to individuals and the loss of productive labor of criminals, prisoners, and law-enforcement officers reduced to a monetary basis. (Reprinted in *Manufacturers Record*, Feb. 24, 1927.)
- Reeves, Margaret, *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls* (New York, 1929). A study made for the Russell Sage Foundation covering public institutions and a few private institutions supported by public funds. There is a discussion of salaries (Ch. IV), of investment in building and equipment (Ch. VI), of current expenses (Ch. VIII), and of expenditures per inmate.
- Reinsch, P. S., *Readings on American State Government* (Boston-New York, 1911). Chapter entitled "The Pennsylvania Constabulary" (pp. 217-221) gives salaries and allowances for police officers of the Pennsylvania State police.
- Royal Irish Constabulary, *Committee of Inquiry, 1901* (Dublin, 1902). Report of an inquiry into pay, allowances, and pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary.
- Savill, Stanley, *The Police Service of England and Wales* (London, 1923). Gives scale of pay and allowance for policemen (pp. 55-58) and for policewomen (pp. 81-82), discusses police finances (pp. 103-172), and summarizes the English law as to police pensions (pp. 128-153).
- Shalloo, Jeremiah P., *The Private Police of Pennsylvania*, *Annals of the American Academy*, vol. 146, p. 55 (1929). Gives salaries of Pennsylvania railroad police and industrial police.
- Shepherd, William G., *\$119.25 Poison Money*, *Collier's Weekly*, vol. 73, p. 10 (1926). Discusses the amount of profits realized on the sale of beer in violation of the prohibition law, and the distribution of such profits.

⁵ All these references are included in this bibliography with the exception of a few which, upon examination, were not found to contain relevant material.

- Smith, Bruce, *The State Police* (New York, 1925). Contains data as to salaries paid State police officers in various States (pp. 234-241).
- Smith, Eugene, *The Cost of Crime* (Washington, 1901). (Report prepared for the International Prison Commission.) A study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States in 1900.
- Spaulding, Warren F., *The Cost of Crime*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 1, p. 80 (1910). A study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Massachusetts in 1908. There is a discussion of the difficulty of obtaining data on the direct cost of crime, as well as the difficulty of obtaining such data on indirect costs. The amount of capital investment in jails and penal institutions is considered.
- Stafford, P. H., *Police Finance* (London, 1921). An epitome of the acts and regulations governing scales of pay and pensions of police in England and Wales and in Scotland.
- Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (Philadelphia, 1924). Refers to various estimates of losses to individuals (p. 65), of amounts paid for burglary insurance, and of the total financial cost of crime (p. 68), but states that little reliance can be placed on such estimates.
- Terrett, Courtenay, *Only Saps Work* (New York, 1930). A popular discussion of racketeering, with special reference to New York City. An estimate of the annual cost of rackets to the United States is included (p. 15), as are estimates of the cost to the residents of New York City of rackets generally (p. 78) and of specific types of rackets (pp. 140, 177, 186).
- Weir, Hugh C., *The Menace of the Police: I. Three Millions Dollars a Day for Crime*, *World Today*, vol. 18, p. 52 (1910). Gives an estimate of the annual cost of crime to New York City.
- Wiehl, Dorothy G., *Annual Cost in Wisconsin of Protecting Society from the Criminal* (Madison, Wis., 1917). (Unpublished baccalaureate thesis, University of Wisconsin.) A study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Wisconsin in the year 1915.

4. *Value of material.*—The published secondary material on the cost of crime is of very uneven value. The only really satisfactory studies are those of Brooks,⁶ Haines,⁷ and Wiehl,⁸ all of which deal with the cost of administration of

⁶ *The Administrative Cost of Crime in Durham County.* (Deals with costs in Durham County, N. C., in 1924.)

⁷ *The Increasing Cost of Crime in Ohio.* (Deals with costs in the State of Ohio in 1908 and 1914.)

⁸ *Annual Cost in Wisconsin of Protecting Society from the Criminal.* (Deals with costs in the State of Wisconsin in 1915.)

criminal justice.⁹ Only one of these has been published.¹⁰ There is a large amount of useful material in the very recent study by the Institute of Law of the Johns Hopkins University of the cost of public justice in Ohio,¹¹ but this study makes no segregation of cost as between civil and criminal justice, and the report of the study is now available only in tentative mimeographed form.

The remainder of the material is made up of three classes of books and articles: (a) those which incidentally compile figures as to salaries of enforcement officers,¹² or as to other particular elements of the cost of administration of criminal justice;¹³ (b) those which give estimates of losses due to criminal acts;¹⁴ and (c) those which contain esti-

⁹ Studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice prior to 1910 now have only an historical value. See Smith, *The Cost of Crime* (cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States in 1900); Spaulding, *The Cost of Crime*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 1, p. 80 (cost of administration of criminal justice in Massachusetts in 1908).

¹⁰ The study by Haines, *supra*, note 7.

¹¹ *Expenditures of Public Money for the Administration of Justice in Ohio in 1929.*

¹² See, for example, Andrews, *Per Capita Cost of Courts*, pp. 4-5 (judges' salaries); Graper, *American Police Administration*, p. 306 (police salaries); Smith, *The State Police*, pp. 234-241 (State police salaries).

¹³ See, for example, Anonymous, *Financial Survey of the State Penal and Correctional Institutions*, *Prison Journal of Philadelphia*, vol. 3, p. 4 (cost of Pennsylvania penal institutions); Bond, *The Treatment of the Dependent, Defective and Delinquent Classes in Mississippi*, p. 81 (cost of prison farms in Mississippi); Duffy, *Reducing Costs of Criminal Prosecution in Kentucky*, *Kentucky State Bar Association Proceedings*, 1916, p. 259 (prosecution costs in Kentucky); Garner, *Crime and Judicial Inefficiency*, p. 166 (cost of juries in criminal cases); Gillin, *Pauperism and Crime in Wisconsin*, *Journal of Social Forces*, vol. 2, p. 73 (cost of penal institutions in Wisconsin); Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living, *Report*, pp. 714-715 (cost of penal institutions in Massachusetts); Reeves, *Training Schools For Delinquent Girls*, pp. 01-111, 164-176.

¹⁴ See, for example, Anonymous, *War on the White Collar Bandits*, *Literary Digest*, vol. 88, p. 11 (losses due to stock swindles); Daken, *When Crime Becomes an Industry, Commerce and Finance*, vol. 15, p. 620 (losses due to embezzlement and forgery); burglary insurance rates); Getz, *Economic Toll of Crime*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 14, p. 318 (losses due to theft and embezzlement); Gunther, *The High Cost of Hoodlums*, *Harper's Magazine*, vol. 150, p. 529 (losses due to racketeering in Chicago); Loesch, *Crime and Your Balance Sheet*, *Magazine of Business*, vol. 55, p. 405 (losses due to racketeering in Chicago); McClellan, *Four Billions in Easy Money*, *North American Review*, vol. 228, p. 609 (bucket-shop losses).

mates of the total cost of crime, either for the country as a whole or for particular localities.¹⁵

The data as to salaries of enforcement officers contained in books and articles of the first class are frequently useful, but are not comprehensive; the same data may in most cases be obtained from official statistical reports. These publications are valuable primarily as convenient compilations.

The data as to losses due to criminal acts contained in articles of the second class is of very uneven value. While there are a number of useful discussions, particularly of losses due to racketeering,¹⁶ many of the articles simply contain unsubstantiated estimates of losses which can not be regarded as more than guesses.

The estimates of the aggregate cost of crime contained in books and articles of the third class are even less satisfactory. The estimates vary enormously,¹⁷ and appear in most cases to be either mere guesses, or else simply repetitions of estimates made by others which, in turn, were guesses. In no case is there any thorough analysis of the elements of the cost of crime, and there is a considerable tendency to add together all sorts of costs related to crime without considering whether such procedure is permissible.¹⁸ As Sutherland says,¹⁹ little reliance can be placed on such estimates.

The published secondary material which is of definite value is thus very scanty, and is practically confined to a few monographs, the majority of them unpublished, dealing

¹⁵ See, for example, Anderson, *The State Program for Mental Hygiene, Journal of Social Forces*, vol. 1, p. 92; Anonymous, *Debit Three Billions a Year to Crooks, Current Opinion*, vol. 77, p. 510; Anonymous, *Our Biggest Tax—The Cost of Crime, Literary Digest*, vol. 82, p. 34; Bower, *The Economic Waste of Sin*, pp. 33-98; Child, *The Great American Scandal, Saturday Evening Post*, vol. 198, Aug. 1, 1925, p. 6, Oct. 10, 1925, p. 23; Gillin, *Crime is Our Most Expensive Luxury, Journal of Applied Sociology*, vol. 10, p. 213; Prentiss, *The Economic Consequences of Crime, Reference Shelf*, vol. 6, p. 43; Weir, *The Menace of the Police: I. Three Million Dollars a Day for Crime, World To-day*, vol. 18, p. 52.

¹⁶ Notably Gunther, *The High Cost of Hoodlums, Harper's Magazine*, vol. 159, p. 529, and Loesch, *Crime and Your Balance Sheet, Magazine of Business*, vol. 55, p. 405. These articles, although of a popular character, contain valuable data.

¹⁷ See p. 70, *supra*, note 70, for a collection of references on this point, showing that estimates of the cost of crime to the United States as a whole have varied all the way from \$912,500,000 to \$18,000,000,000 per year.

¹⁸ For a detailed analysis of this question, see p. 66, *supra*.

¹⁹ *Criminology*, p. 68 (Philadelphia, 1924). See also Gillin, *Criminology and Penology*, p. 29 (New York, 1923).

with certain phases of the cost of administration of criminal justice. There is no satisfactory discussion of the principles involved in determining the cost of crime, and the estimates of that cost which have been published can not be regarded as accurate. In consequence, any investigator of the problem must break new ground; he can not rely on the very scanty literature on the subject.

III

REPORTS CONTAINING STATISTICAL DATA ON THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *Material included.*—This part of the bibliography is concerned with published reports and other documents containing statistical data having a bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice, including police costs, prosecution costs, court costs, and costs of penal institutions, probation and parole. All the material dealt with is printed, and all of it relates to the United States.

2. *How material was collected.*—The references listed in this chapter were assembled from four principal sources: (a) An examination was made of all the material on State and municipal costs of police, prosecution, courts, penal institutions, probation and parole available in the Library of Congress. In many instances series of reports containing such data were found which appeared to end some years ago. In such cases letters were written to the appropriate State or municipal officials to find out whether such reports were still being issued, and to secure copies of the reports of most recent date. (b) A similar examination was made of the material in the New York Public Library. (c) An examination was made of all the material assembled for the commission at the Harvard law library by Prof. Sam B. Warner in the course of his study of criminal statistics other than financial.²⁰ (d) An examination was made of all the publications of the Federal Government bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice, whether Federal, State, or municipal. In addition to these general bibli-

²⁰ For the method of collecting this material, see National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Criminal Statistics*, pp. 30-31.

ographical investigations, special studies were made of the published statistical material relating to State police forces, State penal institutions and parole agencies, and the administration of criminal justice by the Federal Government.

All reports of recent date which were found to contain relevant data were carefully examined and the material extracted and tabulated for study. The results of that study appear elsewhere in this report.²¹

The examination of the material in the Library of Congress was made by Mr. J. W. Coatsworth; that of the material in the New York Public Library by Miss Mary Daugherty; and that of the material collected by Professor Warner by Messrs. J. W. Mulligan, jr., and D. B. Stookey. Mr. Coatsworth also examined the material published by the Federal Government, including the publications of the Bureau of the Census and the reports of the various executive departments. Reports were prepared by these investigators discussing and summarizing the material examined. These reports were then consolidated by Mr. John H. Libby and a consolidated list of references prepared. This consolidated list has formed the basis for the check-list of State and municipal reports on the cost of administration of criminal justice which appears in this appendix.²²

3. *List of Federal publications.*—The following publications of the Federal Government contain material bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice in the continental United States:

Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States (Washington, 1930). The last published report is for the fiscal year 1929-30.

Annual Report, Federal Penal and Correctional Institutions (Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1930). The last published report is for the fiscal year 1929-30.

Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 30,000. (U. S. Census Bureau.) The latest edition gives figures for the census year 1928.

Financial Statistics of States. (U. S. Census Bureau.) The latest edition gives figures for the census year 1928.

Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories. (U. S. Census Bureau.) The latest edition gives figures for the census year 1927.

²¹ See pt. 3 (pp. 153-191, supra).

²² See pp. 470-483, infra.

The material contained in these publications is discussed elsewhere in this report.²³ All of the publications listed are published by the Government Printing Office.

The following publications contain material bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.²⁴

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Annual report of the Governor of Alaska. Contains data on the amount spent in the enforcement of prohibition. The last published report is for the year 1930.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Annual Report of the Governor of Hawaii. Contains data as to cost of protection to persons and property, as to the cost of the supreme court, and as to the cost of the territorial prison. The last published report is for the year 1930.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal. Contains lump-sum figures for cost of police and prisons, district court, district attorney, marshal, and magistrates' courts. The last published report is for the year 1930.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Annual Report of the Attorney General of the Philippine Islands. Contains data as to cost of bureau of justice, courts of first instance, and justice of the peace courts. The last published report is for the year 1927.

Annual Report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands. Contains data as to the cost of the Philippine Constabulary. The last published report is for the year 1928.

PORTO RICO

Annual Report of the Attorney General of Porto Rico. Contains data as to cost of maintaining penal institutions and cost of justice of the peace courts. The last published report is for the year 1930.

²³ In so far as this material relates to the Federal cost of administration of criminal justice, it is discussed in part 2 of this report (pp. 71-152, supra); in so far as it relates to State and municipal costs, it is discussed in part 3 (pp. 153-191, supra).

²⁴ The available material on the cost of administration of criminal justice in the District of Columbia is listed with State and municipal publications (p. 472, infra). No published material has been found as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the Virgin Islands of the United States.

Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico. Contains some data as to police and court costs. The cost of prosecution and penal institutions is included as part of a lump-sum figure for the expenditures of the attorney general's office. The last published report is for the year 1929.

The details of these reports are not discussed elsewhere in this report, since the part of the report dealing with the cost of administration of justice by the Federal Government is limited to a discussion of costs in the continental United States.²³ In general, it may be said that the published statistical material on the cost of administration of criminal justice in the Territories and insular possessions is wholly insufficient to make possible any satisfactory study of that subject for any of those jurisdictions. Such a study would require a field investigation in each case.

4. *List of State and municipal publications.*—The following publications of States, counties, cities and other municipal subdivisions contain material bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice:²⁴

Character of report ¹	Title of report	Last year covered ²
ALABAMA		
State reports.....	Annual report of the auditor.....	1926
	Annual report of the treasurer.....	1926
	Quadrennial report, board of administration.....	1926
	Report of State prison inspector.....	1928
	Report of superintendent, Boys' Industrial School.....	1928
City reports:		
Birmingham.....	Financial report.....	1920
Mobile.....	Report of board of commissioners.....	1928
ARIZONA		
State reports.....	Annual report of State auditor.....	1920
	Blue Book.....	1930
	Budget.....	1927
County report: Pinal.....	Report of superintendent, Industrial School.....	1929
	Report of clerk of board of supervisors.....	1928
ARKANSAS		
State reports.....	Budget.....	1920
	Report of Boys' Industrial School.....	1928
	Report of comptroller.....	1931
	Report of State penitentiary.....	1928
	Report of Training School for Girls.....	1928
City reports:		
Little Rock.....	Annual city report.....	1928

¹ Whether State, county, or municipal.

² This is the last year covered by the most recent report which was available on Oct. 1, 1930. Where the fiscal year of the reporting unit does not coincide with the calendar year, the calendar year in which the fiscal year ends is given.

²³ See p. 71, supra.

²⁴ The arrangement is alphabetically by States. Within each State, State reports are given first; then county reports are listed alphabetically by the name of the county; then municipal reports are listed alphabetically by the name of the city, town or village.

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
CALIFORNIA		
State reports.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
	Annual report, financial transactions of municipalities and counties.....	1928
	Biennial report of the attorney general.....	1928
	Budget.....	1931
	Report of State bureau of criminal identification and investigation.....	1928
County reports:		
Alpine.....	Department budget requests.....	1930
Calaveras.....	Statistical report.....	1928
El Dorado.....	California statistical report.....	1928
Glenn.....	Statistical report.....	1928
Humboldt.....	Annual report of the supervisors.....	1928
Los Angeles.....	Annual report of board of supervisors.....	1920
Do.....	Report of county probation commission.....	1929
Do.....	County budget.....	1930
Do.....	Salary ordinance No. 1835, N. S.....	1930
Do.....	Taxpayers' Guide.....	1930
Orange.....	Statistical report.....	1929
San Joaquin.....	Annual report.....	1929
San Mateo.....	Statistical report.....	1928
Santa Barbara.....	Annual financial report.....	1929
Santa Clara.....	Annual statement.....	1928
Santa Cruz.....	Annual statement and financial report.....	1929
Shasta.....	do.....	1929
Stanislaus.....	Preliminary budget.....	1930
Tehama.....	do.....	1930
City reports:		
Berkeley.....	Report of the city manager.....	1928
Long Beach.....	Annual report of the city auditor.....	1930
Los Angeles.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of police department.....	1928
Do.....	Budget.....	1930
Do.....	Annual report of board of pension commissioners.....	1930
Napa.....	Report of financial proceedings.....	1928
Oakland.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1927
Palo Alto.....	Annual report.....	1928
Pasadena.....	Annual report of comptroller of accounts.....	1928
Pomona.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1929
Redlands.....	Report of city clerk.....	1929
Richmond.....	City auditor's annual report.....	1929
Riverside.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1927
San Diego.....	Annual report of police department.....	1926
San Francisco.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
San Jose.....	Report of city auditor.....	1928
San Mateo.....	Annual report.....	1928
Santa Barbara.....	do.....	1928
Stockton.....	Annual report of police department.....	1927
COLORADO		
State reports.....	Biennial report of auditor.....	1926
	Biennial report of board of control.....	1929
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1928
	Budget.....	1926
	Report of board of correction.....	1928
	Report of board of corrections and warden of Colorado State Reformatory.....	1928
City reports:		
Colorado Springs.....	Annual city reports.....	1928
Denver.....	Annual report of city auditor.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of police department.....	1928
Pueblo.....	City comptroller's annual statement.....	1928
CONNECTICUT		
State reports.....	Biennial report of farm for women.....	1928
	Budget.....	1931
	Report of the comptroller.....	1929
	Report of directors of State prison.....	1928
	Report of directors of State reformatory.....	1928
	Report of State police department.....	1928
	Returns of county commissioners.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
CONNECTICUT—continued		
City reports:		
Ansonia.....	Annual report of city of Ansonia.....	1928
Bethany.....	Annual city reports.....	1927
Branford.....	Annual report of selectmen.....	1928
Bridgeport.....	City of Bridgeport.....	1929
Bristol.....	Annual report, city of Bristol.....	1928
Danielson.....	Annual report of borough.....	1929
Derby.....	Report of city of Derby.....	1928
East Hartford.....	Annual report of town.....	1929
Enfield.....	do.....	1929
Fairfield.....	Yearbook of town.....	1928
Hamden.....	Annual report of town of Hamden.....	1928
Hartford.....	Budget.....	1928
Killingly.....	Reports of officers and committees.....	1929
Manchester.....	Annual reports of selectmen and town officers.....	1929
Moridon.....	Municipal register.....	1929
Middletown.....	Annual message of mayor.....	1928
Millford.....	Yearbook of town.....	1928
New Haven.....	Annual report of department service.....	1928
Putnam.....	Municipal register.....	1929
Rockville.....	do.....	1928
Rocky Hill.....	Annual city reports.....	1928
Seymour.....	Seymour town report.....	1929
Southington.....	Annual report.....	1929
Stafford Springs Borough.....	Annual report of court of burgesses.....	1928
Stamford.....	Annual report.....	1928
Stratford.....	do.....	1929
Waterbury.....	Annual report of police department.....	1928
West Hartford.....	Reports of town officials.....	1928
Willimantic.....	Annual statement of mayor.....	1928
Winchester and Winsted.....	Annual reports of officers.....	1929
DELAWARE		
State reports.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1929
	Annual report of State highway department.....	1928
	Budget.....	1927
	Report of Industrial School for Girls.....	1928
County report: Newcastle.....	Biennial report.....	1928
City report: Wilmington.....	Annual report of superintendent of public safety.....	1928
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
District reports.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
	Appropriation bill.....	1929
	Report of board of public welfare.....	1929
	Report of major and superintendent of metropolitan police.....	1929
FLORIDA		
State reports.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
	Annual report of treasurer.....	1929
	Biennial report of attorney general.....	1928
	Biennial report, Industrial School for Boys.....	1928
	Eighth annual reports.....	1928
City report: Miami.....	First annual report, department of public safety.....	1929
GEORGIA		
State reports.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
	Annual report of treasurer.....	1929
	Biennial report of Training School for Boys.....	1929
	Second biennial report of prison commission.....	1928
City reports:		
Atlanta.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
Augusta.....	Yearbook of city council.....	1928
Decatur.....	Annual report of city.....	1928
Tifton.....	Manager's report.....	1929
IDAHO		
State reports.....	Budget.....	1930
County reports:		
Cassia.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1930
Franklin.....	Annual financial report.....	1928
Freemont.....	do.....	1929

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
ILLINOIS		
State reports.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
	Annual report, department of public welfare.....	1928
	Budget.....	1928
County reports:		
Cook.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1927
Winnebago.....	Auditor's report.....	1928
City reports:		
Centralia.....	Proceedings of city council.....	1929
Chicago.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of municipal court.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of treasurer.....	1929
Do.....	Annual report of police department.....	1928
Do.....	Council proceedings.....	1928
Decatur.....	Proceedings, city council.....	1929
Do.....	Report of auditor.....	1929
Dixon.....	Annual report.....	1929
Elgin.....	Annual appropriation bill.....	1928
Forest Park.....	Annual report.....	1929
Kewanee.....	Annual reports.....	1929
Paris.....	do.....	1929
Peoria.....	Reports of comptroller and treasurer.....	1928
Princeton.....	Annual report of city officers.....	1928
Do.....	Auditor's report.....	1929
Quincy.....	Annual report.....	1928
Rockford.....	Annual reports.....	1928
Waukegan.....	Report of accounts.....	1929
INDIANA		
State reports.....	Annual report of the auditor.....	1928
	Annual report, boy's school.....	1928
	Annual report, reformatory.....	1928
	Annual report, State farm.....	1928
	Annual report, State prison.....	1928
	Annual report, woman's prison.....	1928
	Budget report.....	1929
	Statistical report.....	1928
City reports:		
Evansville.....	Annual report.....	1929
do.....	do.....	1928
Huntington.....	Annual report of city clerk.....	1928
Indianapolis.....	Annual report of the department of finance.....	1928
Kokomo.....	City clerk's annual report.....	1928
Lafayette.....	Annual report.....	1928
Mishawaka.....	do.....	1928
Richmond.....	Annual report of controller.....	1929
South Bend.....	Annual report.....	1928
Terra Haute.....	Proceedings of the common council.....	1928
IOWA		
State reports.....	Biennial report of board of control of State institutions.....	1928
	Report of the auditor.....	1928
County reports:		
Benton.....	Financial report.....	1928
Boone.....	do.....	1928
Buchanan.....	do.....	1928
Butler.....	do.....	1928
Case.....	do.....	1928
Cedar.....	do.....	1928
Decatur.....	do.....	1928
Delaware.....	do.....	1928
Keokuk.....	do.....	1928
Mahaska.....	do.....	1928
Muscatine.....	do.....	1928
Pago.....	do.....	1928
Palo Alto.....	do.....	1928
Poweshiek.....	do.....	1928
Scott.....	do.....	1929
Story.....	do.....	1928
Winnebago.....	do.....	1928
Winneshek.....	do.....	1928
Woodbury.....	do.....	1928
Worth.....	do.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
IOWA--continued		
City reports:		
Boone.....	Annual report.....	1929
Davenport.....	do.....	1929
Des Moines.....	Annual city reports.....	1926
Do.....	Auditor's report.....	1929
Dubuque.....	Budget.....	1929
Fort Dodge.....	Annual report.....	1929
Keokuk.....	do.....	1929
Mason City.....	do.....	1929
Rock Rapids.....	do.....	1929
KANSAS		
State reports.....	Auditor's biennial report.....	1926
	Biennial report of attorney general.....	1929
	Biennial report of board of administration.....	1928
	Budget.....	1928
City reports:		
Atchison.....	Annual report.....	1928
Great Bend.....	do.....	1928
Kansas City.....	Annual report of finance commissioner.....	1928
McPherson.....	Annual report.....	1928
Salina.....	Annual report of city clerk.....	1928
KENTUCKY		
State reports.....	Biennial report of auditor.....	1927
	Biennial report, State board of charities and corrections.....	1929
City reports:		
Bellevue.....	Report of city officers.....	1928
Louisville.....	Report of police department.....	1928
LOUISIANA		
State reports.....	Auditor's biennial report.....	1927
	Report of supervisor of public accounts.....	1926
City reports:		
Monroe.....	Auditor's report.....	1929
Shreveport.....	Biennial report.....	1926
MAINE		
State reports.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1926
	Attorney general's report.....	1928
County reports:		
Androscoggin.....	Statement of the financial condition.....	1928
Aroostook.....	Annual report.....	1928
Do.....	Statement of the financial condition.....	1928
Hancock.....	Annual report.....	1928
Do.....	Statement of the financial condition.....	1928
Kennebec.....	do.....	1928
Knox.....	do.....	1928
Penobscot.....	do.....	1928
Piscataquis.....	do.....	1928
Somerset.....	do.....	1928
Washington.....	do.....	1928
City reports:		
Auburn.....	Annual report.....	1928
Augusta.....	do.....	1928
Bangor.....	do.....	1927
Bath.....	do.....	1928
Biddeford.....	do.....	1928
Brewer.....	do.....	1928
Brunswick.....	do.....	1928
Eastport.....	do.....	1928
Ellsworth.....	do.....	1928
Farmington.....	do.....	1928
Gardner.....	do.....	1928
Lewiston.....	do.....	1928
Portland.....	do.....	1928
Rockland.....	do.....	1928
Saco.....	do.....	1928
Sanford.....	Annual city reports.....	1926
Sangerville.....	do.....	1926

CONTINUED

5 OF 7

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
MAINE—continued		
City reports—Continued.		
South Paris Village.....	Annual report.....	1927
South Portland.....	do.....	1928
Waterville.....	do.....	1928
Westbrook.....	do.....	1928
Winslow.....	Annual city reports.....	1926
MARYLAND		
State reports.....	Annual report of board of welfare.....	1920
	Attorney general's report.....	1928
	Budget.....	1931
	Report of comptroller of currency.....	1926
	Training school for boys.....	1928
County reports:		
Caroline.....	Auditor's report.....	1928
Frederick.....	do.....	1927
City reports:		
Baltimore.....	Annual appropriation.....	1920
Do.....	Annual report.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1926
Do.....	Annual report of visitors to city jail.....	1928
Do.....	Mayor's message.....	1927
Do.....	Municipal journal.....	1928
Do.....	Report of police commissioner.....	1920
Cumberland.....	Financial report.....	1928
MASSACHUSETTS		
State reports.....	Annual report of commissioner of public safety.....	1927
	Annual report of trustees of training school.....	1928
	Annual report on statistics of county finances.....	1927
	Annual report on statistics of municipal finances.....	1927
	Budget recommendations.....	1929
	Report of attorney general.....	1928
County reports:		
Barnstable.....	Treasurer's and county commissioner's report.....	1928
Berkshire.....	do.....	1928
Bristol.....	do.....	1928
Dukes.....	do.....	1928
Essex.....	do.....	1928
Franklin.....	do.....	1928
Hampton.....	do.....	1928
Hampshire.....	do.....	1928
Middlesex.....	do.....	1928
Norfolk.....	do.....	1928
Plymouth.....	do.....	1928
Worcester.....	do.....	1928
City reports:		
Abington.....	Annual report.....	1928
Adams.....	do.....	1928
Agawam.....	do.....	1927
Amesbury.....	do.....	1928
Amherst.....	do.....	1928
Andover.....	do.....	1928
Arlington.....	do.....	1928
Athol.....	do.....	1927
Attleboro.....	do.....	1928
Barnstable.....	do.....	1928
Belmont.....	do.....	1928
Do.....	do.....	1926
Bernardston.....	do.....	1928
Beverly.....	do.....	1928
Boston.....	Annual report of penal institutions department.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of police commissioner.....	1927
Do.....	City documents.....	1927
Brookton.....	Annual report.....	1920
Brookline.....	do.....	1928
Cambridge.....	Annual documents.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of treasurer.....	1928
Chelmsford.....	Annual report.....	1928
Chelsea.....	do.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
MASSACHUSETTS—continued		
City reports—Continued.		
Chicopee.....	City documents.....	1923
Do.....	Report of the chief of police.....	1923
Olliston.....	Annual report.....	1923
Concord.....	do.....	1923
Cohasset.....	do.....	1923
Danvers.....	do.....	1923
Dedham.....	do.....	1923
Easthampton.....	do.....	1923
Easton.....	do.....	1923
Edgarton.....	do.....	1923
Fairhaven.....	do.....	1923
Fall River.....	do.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1923
Fitchburg.....	Annual report.....	1923
Frammingham.....	do.....	1923
Franklin.....	do.....	1923
Gardner.....	do.....	1923
Gloucester.....	do.....	1923
Grafton.....	do.....	1923
Great Barrington.....	do.....	1923
Greenfield.....	do.....	1923
Haverhill.....	City documents.....	1923
Do.....	Report of city marshal.....	1923
Holyoke.....	Annual report.....	1927
Hopedale.....	do.....	1923
Hudson.....	do.....	1923
Lancaster.....	do.....	1920
Lawrence.....	Report of director of finance.....	1923
Leominster.....	do.....	1923
Lexington.....	do.....	1923
Lowell.....	City documents.....	1923
Ludlow.....	Annual report.....	1923
Lynn.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1923
Do.....	Annual report of chief of police.....	1923
Malden.....	Annual report.....	1923
Manchester.....	do.....	1923
Mansfield.....	do.....	1923
Marblehead.....	do.....	1923
Maynard.....	do.....	1923
Medfield.....	do.....	1923
Medford.....	do.....	1923
Melrose.....	do.....	1923
Mathuen.....	do.....	1923
Middleboro.....	do.....	1923
Millford.....	do.....	1927
Millbury.....	do.....	1923
Montague.....	do.....	1923
Natick.....	do.....	1923
Needham.....	do.....	1923
New Bedford.....	do.....	1927
Do.....	City documents.....	1920
Newburyport.....	Annual report.....	1923
Newton.....	Annual report of comptroller of accounts.....	1923
North Adams.....	Annual report.....	1923
Northampton.....	do.....	1923
North Andover.....	do.....	1923
Norwood.....	do.....	1923
Orange.....	do.....	1923
Palmer.....	do.....	1923
Pittsfield.....	do.....	1920
Plymouth.....	do.....	1923
Quincy.....	do.....	1923
Reading.....	do.....	1923
Revere.....	Report of city auditor.....	1923
Rockland.....	Annual report.....	1923
Salem.....	do.....	1923
Snugus.....	do.....	1923
Shrewsbury.....	do.....	1920
Somerville.....	do.....	1923
Southbridge.....	do.....	1923
South Hadley.....	do.....	1923

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
MASSACHUSETTS—continued		
City reports—Continued.		
Springfield.....	Annual report.....	1920
Do.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of treasurer.....	1927
Do.....	Budget.....	1927
Do.....	City documents.....	1920
Stoneham.....	do.....	1923
Stoughton.....	do.....	1923
Swarthscott.....	do.....	1923
Uxbridge.....	do.....	1923
Wakfield.....	do.....	1920
Wales.....	do.....	1923
Walpole.....	do.....	1926
Waltham.....	do.....	1923
Ware.....	do.....	1927
Wartown.....	do.....	1923
Webster.....	do.....	1923
Wellesley.....	do.....	1923
Westboro.....	do.....	1923
Westfield.....	do.....	1923
Westminster.....	do.....	1923
West Springfield.....	do.....	1923
Weymouth.....	do.....	1923
Whitman.....	do.....	1923
Winchendon.....	do.....	1923
Winchester.....	do.....	1927
Winthrop.....	do.....	1923
Woburn.....	do.....	1923
Worcester.....	do.....	1920
MICHIGAN		
State reports.....	Annual report of auditor general.....	1923
	Budget.....	1931
County reports: Marquette.....	Report of board of supervisors.....	1923
City reports:		
Detroit.....	Annual report.....	1923
Do.....	Journal of common council.....	1923
Grand Rapids.....	Annual report.....	1923
Ironwood.....	do.....	1923
Kalamazoo.....	do.....	1923
Manistee.....	Annual report of police and fire commissioners.....	1923
Marquette.....	Annual report.....	1920
Monroe.....	do.....	1923
Mount Clemens.....	Manual.....	1923
Plymouth.....	Annual report.....	1923
Pontiac.....	do.....	1927
Port Huron.....	Financial report.....	1927
Traverse City.....	Annual report.....	1923
MINNESOTA		
State reports.....	Biennial budget.....	1920
	Biennial report, State board of control.....	1923
	Biennial report, State prison.....	1923
	Biennial report, superintendent, Training School for Boys and Home for Girls.....	1923
City reports:		
Duluth.....	Annual report of police department.....	1923
Minneapolis.....	Annual report of chief of police.....	1927
Do.....	Council proceedings.....	1923
Oak Bluffs.....	Annual financial report.....	1927
St. Paul.....	Annual city reports.....	1923
MISSISSIPPI		
State reports.....	Biennial report of auditor of public accounts.....	1927
	Biennial report of board of trustees, Industrial and Training School.....	1927
	Biennial report of board of trustees, State penitentiary.....	1927
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1927
City reports:		
Greenwood.....	Auditor's annual report.....	1923
Jackson.....	Annual report of the city auditor.....	1920
Meridian.....	Financial statement for July, August, and September.....	1923

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
MISSOURI		
State reports.....	Biennial report, department of penal institutions.....	1923
	Report of State auditor.....	1920
City reports:		
Hannibal.....	Auditor's annual report.....	1928
Kansas City.....	Annual report of director of finance.....	1928
Maplewood.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1920
St. Louis.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of police commissioners.....	1920
MONTANA		
State reports.....	Biennial report, State prison.....	1928
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1926
	Report of executive board, State Industrial School.....	1920
NEBRASKA		
State reports.....	Biennial report of auditor of public accounts.....	1926
	Biennial report, board of control.....	1927
County reports: Douglas.....	Annual report of county clerk.....	1928
City reports:		
Allamore.....	City manager's report.....	1928
Lincoln.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
NEVADA		
State reports.....	Annual report of treasurer.....	1928
	Biennial report of superintendent of State police.....	1928
County report: Lyon.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
State reports.....	Annual report of treasurer.....	1927
	Attorney general's report.....	1926
	County report.....	1928
	Reports of officers of the State prison.....	1926
	Report of purchasing agent for State institutions.....	1928
County report: Belknap.....	Annual report.....	1927
City reports:		
Berlin.....	do.....	1929
Clarendon.....	Annual report of selectmen.....	1928
Concord.....	Annual report.....	1928
Derry.....	do.....	1929
Dover.....	do.....	1929
Franklin.....	do.....	1928
Hancock.....	do.....	1927
Hanover.....	do.....	1929
Keene.....	do.....	1928
Lancaster.....	do.....	1929
Lebanon.....	do.....	1929
Lee.....	do.....	1927
Manchester.....	do.....	1928
Mason.....	do.....	1927
Nashua.....	do.....	1928
Newport.....	do.....	1928
Pembroke.....	do.....	1929
Plymouth.....	do.....	1929
Portsmouth.....	do.....	1927
Rochester.....	do.....	1928
Unity.....	do.....	1927
NEW JERSEY		
State reports.....	Annual report, board of managers of State reformatory.....	1927
	Annual report, department of State police.....	1929
	Budget message.....	1930
	Report of State treasurer.....	1926
City reports:		
Atlantic City.....	Comptroller's department.....	1928
Bayonne.....	Manual of board of commissioners.....	1928
Belleville.....	Annual report of board of commissioners.....	1927
Camden.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1929
East Orange.....	Annual report.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
NEW JERSEY—continued		
City reports—Continued.		
Elizabeth.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of police department.....	1926
Irvington.....	Annual report of the municipal accounts.....	1928
Millville.....	Annual report.....	1928
Newark.....	Annual city reports.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
New Brunswick.....	Annual report of officers.....	1928
Paterson.....	Annual report of chief of police.....	1927
Plainfield.....	Annual report.....	1928
Summit.....	do.....	1928
Trenton.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
NEW MEXICO		
State reports.....	Report of auditor.....	1928
	Report of board of commissioners and superintendent of State penitentiaries.....	1929
	State budget for biennial period.....	1931
NEW YORK		
State reports.....	Annual report, Albion State Training School.....	1929
	Annual report, board of visitors of State Agricultural and Industrial School.....	1928
	Annual report, department of audit and control.....	1928
	Annual report, superintendent of State prisons.....	1926
	Annual report of treasurer.....	1926
	Executive budget.....	1930
	Report of municipal accounts.....	1928
County reports:		
Albany.....	Journal of the board of supervisors.....	1928
Allegany.....	Proceedings of the board of supervisors.....	1928
Broome.....	do.....	1929
Cattaraugus.....	do.....	1927
Chemung.....	do.....	1928
Chenango.....	do.....	1926
Clinton.....	do.....	1928
Columbia.....	do.....	1928
Cortland.....	Supervisors' journal.....	1928
Delaware.....	Proceedings of the board of supervisors.....	1928
Dutchess.....	do.....	1928
Eric.....	Annual report, commissioners of charities and correction.....	1928
Fulton.....	Proceedings of the board of supervisors.....	1928
Herkimer.....	do.....	1928
Madison.....	Supervisors' journal.....	1928
Monroe.....	Proceedings of the board of supervisors.....	1929
Nassau.....	do.....	1928
Niagara.....	do.....	1928
Oneida.....	do.....	1928
Onondaga.....	Journal of the board of supervisors.....	1928
Ontario.....	Proceedings of the board of supervisors.....	1928
Orango.....	do.....	1928
Ostego.....	do.....	1928
Schoenectady.....	do.....	1928
Scholarie.....	do.....	1928
Schuyler.....	do.....	1928
Stauben.....	do.....	1928
Suffolk.....	do.....	1928
Ulster.....	do.....	1928
Washington.....	do.....	1928
Wayne.....	do.....	1928
Westchester.....	do.....	1928
Wyoming.....	do.....	1928
Yates.....	do.....	1928
City reports:		
Albany.....	Annual report of commissioners, department of public safety.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
Do.....	Budget.....	1926
Amsterdam.....	Annual city reports.....	1928
Do.....	Proceedings of the common council.....	1928
Auburn.....	Council proceedings.....	1928
Binghamton.....	Proceedings of the common council.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
NEW YORK—continued		
City reports—Continued.	Report of the president.....	1927
Brooklyn.....	Annual report, department of audit and control.....	1928
Buffalo.....	Common council.....	1928
Elmira.....	Annual reports.....	1927
Newburgh.....	Budget.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
New Rochelle.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
Do.....	do.....	1928
New York.....	Annual report of law department.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report, police department.....	1928
Do.....	Budget.....	1928
Do.....	City record.....	1929
Do.....	Proceedings of board of aldermen.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report, city manager and city auditor.....	1928
Niagara Falls.....	Proceedings of the city council.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of chamberlain.....	1928
Oneonta.....	Mayor's annual report.....	1928
Oswego.....	Annual report of city government.....	1928
Poughkeepsie.....	Annual report of president.....	1926
Richmond.....	Annual report, department of public safety.....	1928
Rochester.....	Annual report of police bureau.....	1930
Do.....	Budget.....	1928
Do.....	Proceedings of common council.....	1927
Do.....	Proceedings of estimates and apportionments.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report.....	1926
Searsdale.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
Schenectady.....	Proceedings of the common council.....	1926
Do.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1928
Syracuse.....	Minutes of the common council.....	1928
Troy.....	Report of the comptroller.....	1929
Utica.....	Annual report, commissioner of finance.....	1927
White Plains.....		
NORTH CAROLINA		
State reports.....	Annual report of the auditor.....	1929
	Biennial report, Eastern Carolina Industrial Training School for Boys.....	1928
	Biennial report, Morrison Training School.....	1928
	Biennial report, State Home and Industrial School for Girls.....	1928
	Biennial report, State's prison.....	1928
	Biennial report, Stonewall Jackson Manual Training and Industrial School.....	1928
	Biennial report of the treasurer.....	1926
	Budget.....	1931
City reports:		
Durham.....	Annual report.....	1928
Wilmington.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1926
NORTH DAKOTA		
State reports.....	Annual report of the board of administration.....	1928
	Annual report of treasurer.....	1928
	Biennial report of auditor.....	1928
OHIO		
State reports.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
	Annual report, department of public welfare.....	1928
	Comparative statistics of counties.....	1927
	Executive budget.....	1930
	Treasurer's report.....	1926
City reports:		
Cincinnati.....	Annual report.....	1928
Cleveland.....	City record.....	1927
Columbus.....	Annual report city departments, supplement to city bulletin.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report, department of public safety.....	1928
Do.....	Annual report of city auditor.....	1928
Conneaut.....	Annual report.....	1928
East Cleveland.....	Annual report of city auditor.....	1928
Lima.....	Annual report.....	1928
Painesville.....	do.....	1928
Springfield.....	do.....	1928
Van Wert.....	City auditor's report.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
OKLAHOMA		
State reports.....	Annual report, commissioner of charities and correction.....	1928
	Budget requests.....	1929
City reports: Oklahoma City.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1927
OREGON		
State reports.....	Biennial report, State board of control.....	1928
	Budget.....	1930
	Report of secretary of state.....	1927
City reports:		
Oregon City.....	Annual report.....	1928
Portland.....	do.....	1927
PENNSYLVANIA		
State reports.....	Annual report, board of managers Glen Mill Schools.....	1927
	Biennial report of auditor general.....	1928
	Biennial report, secretary of welfare.....	1928
	Biennial report, State police.....	1928
	Budget.....	1931
County reports:		
Allagany.....	Annual report county workhouse.....	1928
Berks.....	Controller's annual report.....	1928
Cambria.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1929
Dauphin.....	Controller's annual report.....	1928
Do.....	do.....	1928
Montgomery.....	do.....	1928
Washington.....	do.....	1928
Westmoreland.....	do.....	1928
City reports:		
Allentown.....	Report of the superintendent of public accounts.....	1928
Altoona.....	Report of the superintendent of accounts and finances.....	1927
Bethlehem.....	Annual report.....	1928
Bradford.....	Report of superintendent of accounts and finances.....	1928
Bristol.....	Annual report.....	1928
Butler.....	Report of superintendent of accounts and finances.....	1928
Carlisle.....	Annual report of borough managers.....	1928
Conshohocken.....	Annual report of board of managers.....	1927
Corry.....	Annual reports.....	1928
Dickson City.....	Comptroller's report.....	1927
Easton.....	Annual report.....	1928
Erie.....	Report of superintendent of department of finance.....	1928
Franklin.....	Report of superintendent of department of finance and accounts.....	1928
Greenburg.....	Financial report.....	1928
Harrisburg.....	Annual report.....	1928
Johnstown.....	Report of superintendent of accounts and finance.....	1928
Lancaster.....	Journal.....	1927
Lock Haven.....	Superintendent of accounts and finance.....	1928
McKeesport.....	Annual report of controller.....	1927
Meadville.....	Annual report of departments.....	1928
Media.....	Report of burgess and town council.....	1928
Monessen.....	Report of superintendent of accounts and finance.....	1928
New Castle.....	Annual report of departments.....	1928
Oil City.....	Annual city reports.....	1927
Philadelphia.....	Annual report of the auditor.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of the city controller.....	1927
Pittsburgh.....	Annual report of controller.....	1927
Reading.....	Annual city reports.....	1927
Do.....	Departmental reports.....	1927
Do.....	Journal of the council (appendix).....	1927
Seranton.....	Annual report of the controller.....	1927
Washington.....	Annual report.....	1928
Waynesboro.....	Annual report of the borough manager.....	1928
RHODE ISLAND		
State reports.....	Annual appropriation bill.....	1928
	Annual report of the auditor.....	1926
	Annual report of general treasurer.....	1927
	Annual report of State public welfare commission.....	1929
	Report of State commissioner of finance.....	1928

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
RHODE ISLAND—continued		
City reports:		
Central Falls.....	Annual report of city officers.....	1928
Cranston.....	Annual report of treasurer.....	1928
North Providence.....	do.....	1927
Pawtucket.....	Annual report of chief of police.....	1928
Do.....	Annual reports.....	1927
Providence.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1928
SOUTH CAROLINA		
State reports.....	Annual report of board of directors and superintendent of penitentiary.....	1928
	Annual report, board of public welfare.....	1926
	Report of the comptroller general.....	1926
	State budget.....	1928
SOUTH DAKOTA		
State reports.....	Annual report of department of finance.....	1928
	Annual report of State auditor (county statistics included).....	1928
	Annual report of State sheriff.....	1928
	Biennial report, board of charities and corrections.....	1928
	Budget.....	1931
TENNESSEE		
State reports.....	Biennial report, comptroller of treasury (and county statistics).....	1926
	Biennial report, department of institutions.....	1928
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1926
	Miscellaneous and general appropriation bills.....	1927
City report: Chattanooga.....	Auditor's report.....	1928
TEXAS		
State reports.....	Annual report, comptroller of public accounts.....	1927
	Annual report, prison board.....	1928
	Appropriation budget.....	1931
	Biennial report of the attorney general.....	1928
	Report of the treasurer.....	1928
City reports:		
Dallas.....	Budget.....	1930
Houston.....	Annual report of police department.....	1928
UTAH		
State reports.....	Biennial report, attorney general.....	1928
	Biennial report of auditor.....	1928
	Biennial report, secretary of juvenile court commission.....	1928
	Biennial report, State Industrial School.....	1928
	Biennial report, State prison.....	1928
	Budget.....	1931
City reports:		
Ogden city.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1926
Salt Lake City.....	Annual report of auditor.....	1926
Do.....	Annual report of police department.....	1928
VERMONT		
State reports.....	Biennial budget report.....	1929
	Biennial report, department of public welfare.....	1928
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1926
City reports:		
Barre.....	Annual report.....	1928
Montpelier.....	Annual report of the officers.....	1929
Sandgate.....	Annual city reports.....	1926
St. Johnsbury.....	Auditor's report and exhibit of finances.....	1928
Springfield.....	Annual report of village corporation.....	1929

Character of report	Title of report	Last year covered
VIRGINIA		
State reports.....	Annual report, auditor public accounts.....	1927
	Annual report, board of directors of the penitentiary.....	1929
	Annual report, Industrial School for Colored Girls.....	1928
	Annual report, State accountant.....	1926
	Budget.....	1930
City reports:		
Danville.....	Finances.....	1928
Fredericksburg.....	Annual report.....	1928
Lynchburg.....	do.....	1928
Newport News.....	Finances.....	1928
Norfolk.....	Budget appropriations.....	1929
Do.....	Finances, reports, and statements.....	1927
Portsmouth.....	Municipal reports.....	1928
Richmond.....	Annual report, department of public safety.....	1926
Roanoke.....	Annual reports.....	1928
Staunton.....	do.....	1929
WASHINGTON		
State reports.....	Biennial report of auditor.....	1929
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1928
	Budget.....	1929
County reports:		
Grant.....	Auditor's annual report.....	1929
Kings.....	Annual financial report.....	1929
Pond Oreille.....	Annual report and distribution of expenditures.....	1928
Yakima.....	Auditor's annual report.....	1928
City reports:		
Everett.....	City clerk's annual report.....	1928
Seattle.....	Annual report of comptroller.....	1927
Do.....	Budget.....	1926
Spokane.....	Annual city reports.....	1927
Do.....	Annual report of city auditor.....	1929
Do.....	Annual report of city controller.....	1929
Tacoma.....	do.....	1929
Yakima.....	Annual report.....	1929
WEST VIRGINIA		
State reports.....	Annual report of audit of finance.....	1927
	Biennial report, department of public safety.....	1928
	Biennial report of treasurer.....	1928
	Board of control.....	1927
	Budget and budget bill.....	1929
City reports:		
Bluefield.....	Annual report.....	1928
Clarksburg.....	Annual report of city manager.....	1926
WISCONSIN		
State reports.....	Biennial report, secretary of state.....	1928
	Biennial report of State prison.....	1928
	Budget.....	1929
	Report of treasurer.....	1928
County reports:		
Milwaukee.....	Annual report of district and municipal courts.....	1929
Do.....	Annual report of inspector, house of correction.....	1928
Racine.....	Official Journal of proceedings, board of supervisors.....	1928
City reports:		
Beloit.....	Proceedings of common council.....	1929
do.....	do.....	1929
Marquette.....	do.....	1929
Milwaukee.....	Budget.....	1929
Do.....	Municipal government and activities.....	1928
Do.....	Proceedings of the common council.....	1928

APPENDIX B

PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR
FIELD INVESTIGATIONS OF MUNICIPAL COSTS
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Acknowledgment is made to the following individuals and organizations who made or assisted in making for the commission studies of municipal costs of administration of criminal justice in 300 of the 365 cities of the United States over 25,000 in population.

ALABAMA

Studies for *Birmingham*, *Mobile*, and *Montgomery* were made by Mr. Wendell M. Adamson, statistician of the School of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Alabama, University, Ala. Acknowledgment is made to President George H. Denny of the University of Alabama and to Dean Lee Bidgood of the School of Commerce and Business Administration for their cooperation in making available Mr. Adamson's services.

The studies for Alabama cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

ARIZONA

A study for *Tucson* was made by Dr. R. M. Howard, professor of accounting at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz., assisted by Dr. George F. Herrick, associate professor of business administration, Dr. Fred A. Conrad, associate professor of sociology, and Mr. James W. Crotty. Acknowledgment is made to President Homer L. Shantz, of the University of Arizona, and Prof. E. J. Brown, head of the department of economics, sociology, and business administration, for cooperation in arranging for the study.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study of *Phoenix*, the only other city in the State over 25,000 in population.

ARKANSAS

Studies for *Little Rock* and *Fort Smith* were made by Dr. A. W. Jamison, professor of economics and sociology at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., and Mr. Donald Poe, of the Arkansas bar, Little Rock, Ark. Acknowledgment is made to President J. C. Futrall of the University of Arkansas and to Dean John Clark Jordan of the Graduate School of the University for cooperation in arranging these studies.

The studies for Arkansas cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

CALIFORNIA

Studies for *Alameda*, *Berkeley*, *Fresno*, *Oakland*, *Sacramento*, *San Francisco*, and *Stockton* were made by Mr. Richard Graves, under the supervision of Prof. Samuel C. May, director of the Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. Acknowledgment is made to Professor May for arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Alhambra*, *Glendale*, *Long Beach*, *Los Angeles*, *Pasadena*, and *Santa Monica* were made by Dr. Lewis A. Maverick, lecturer in economics at the University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Ernest C. Moore, director of the University of California at Los Angeles, for his cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *San Diego* was made, under the general supervision of Doctor Maverick, by Dr. Constantine Panunzio, professor of sociology, assisted by Mr. Spencer L. Rogers, instructor in anthropology, San Diego State Teachers College, San Diego, Calif.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other cities of the State over 25,000 in population—viz, *Bakersfield*, *Riverside*, *San Bernardino*, *San Jose*, *Santa Ana*, and *Santa Barbara*.

COLORADO

Studies for *Colorado Springs*, *Denver*, and *Pueblo* were made by Dr. Don C. Sowers, secretary, and Mr. Edison H.

Cramer, assistant secretary, Bureau of Business and Government Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. Acknowledgment is made to Doctor Sowers for arranging to have these studies made.

The studies for Colorado cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

CONNECTICUT

A study for *Bridgeport*, and a study for *New Haven* covering police costs only, were made by Miss Helen D. Pigeon, under the supervision of Prof. Milton Conover of the department of economics, sociology, and government, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. E. S. Furniss, dean of the Graduate School of Yale University, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Hartford* and *New Britain* were made by Mr. Harold W. Gale, under the general supervision of the department of history and political science, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. Acknowledgment is made to President R. E. Ogilby of Trinity College for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *Meriden* was made by Mr. C. Sumner Katz, assisted by Mr. William W. Bailey, under the general supervision of Dr. Elmer E. Schattschneider, assistant professor of government, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. Acknowledgment is made to President James L. McConaughy of Wesleyan University and to Prof. C. O. Fisher, head of the department of economics and social science, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *New London*, covering police and other direct city costs, was made by Prof. M. R. Cobbledick, of the department of economics and sociology, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.

Studies for *Norwalk* and *Stamford* were made by Mr. Sydney Waldecker, of the New York bar, New York, N. Y., under the general supervision of the director of the study.

A study for *Waterbury* was made by Mr. David Wolff, New York, N. Y., under the general supervision of the director of the study.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other Connecticut cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Bristol* and *Torrington*.

DELAWARE

A study for *Wilmington*, the only city in the State over 25,000 in population, was made by the Taxpayers' Research League of Delaware, Wilmington, Del. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Russell Ramsey, director of the league, for his cooperation in arranging for and supervising this study.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A study for the city of *Washington*, which is coextensive with the District of Columbia, was made by Dr. Laurence F. Schmeckebier, of the Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, and to Dr. W. F. Willoughby, director of the Institute for Government Research, for cooperation in making this study possible.

FLORIDA

Studies for *Jacksonville*, *Pensacola* and *Orlando*, covering police and other direct city costs only, were made by Mr. Jerome Connor, under the supervision of Prof. L. M. Bristol, head of the department of sociology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla. Acknowledgment is made to President John J. Taggart of the University of Florida for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Miami* was made by Mr. John A. Bouvier, jr., of the Florida bar, Miami, Fla., assisted by Mr. Frank Worrall. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. Bouvier for his public-spirited cooperation. Acknowledgment is also made to Miss Dorothy Christiance, of the Dade County Welfare Board, Miami, Fla., for assistance in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other Florida cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *St. Petersburg*, *Tampa* and *West Palm Beach*.

GEORGIA

Studies for *Atlanta*, *Augusta*, *Columbus*, *Macon* and *Savannah* were made by Dr. George A. Hutchinson, professor of sociology, Peabody School of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. Acknowledgment is made to Chancellor Charles M. Snelling of the University of Georgia and to Dr. T. J. Woofter, dean of the Peabody School of Education, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The studies for Georgia cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

ILLINOIS

Studies for *Alton*, *Belleville*, *Danville*, *Decatur*, *East St. Louis*, *Granite City*, *Peoria* and *Springfield* were made by Mr. Alvin W. Kunke, Urbana, Ill., under the general supervision of Prof. J. W. Garner, head of the department of political science, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. Special acknowledgment is made to Professor Garner for cooperation in arranging for these studies, and to the president and board of trustees of the University of Illinois for making them possible.

Studies for *Aurora*, *Elgin*, *Joliet* and *Waukegan* were made by Mr. William Klevs, of Chicago, Ill., and for *Berwyn*, *Chicago*, *Cicero*, *Evanston*, *Maywood* and *Oak Park* by Mr. Max J. Crocker, of Chicago, Ill. Both these investigators worked under the direction of Mr. Elbridge Bancroft Pierce, of the Illinois bar, Chicago, Ill., to whom special acknowledgment is made for his public-spirited service. (Mr. Pierce also supervised the studies of East Chicago, Gary and Hammond, Ind. See p. 489, *infra*.) Acknowledgment is also made to Prof. Donald Slesinger, chairman of the social research science committee, and Prof. Simeon D. Leland, of the social science department, of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., for assistance in arranging for and carrying out these studies.

A study for *Bloomington* covering police and municipal prosecution costs was made by Mr. George W. Withey, under the supervision of Dr. S. C. Ratcliffe, professor of sociology,

Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. Acknowledgment is made to President William J. Davidson of Illinois Wesleyan University for his cooperation in arranging this study.

A study for *Galesburg* was made by Misses Helen Surey and Adelaide Tuckey and Messrs. Aaron Shaver, James Rose, Donald Fairbairn and Linden Mulford, under the supervision of Dr. J. Howell Atwood, professor of sociology, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. Acknowledgment is made to President Albert Britt of Knox College and to Prof. James L. Conger, head of the department of history and political science, for their cooperation in arranging this study.

A study for *Moline* was made by Mr. William D. Moreland, and for *Rock Island* by Mr. E. Maxwell Benton, under the general supervision of Prof. Benjamin F. Shambaugh, head of the department of political science, The State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. Acknowledgment is made to Professor Shambaugh for his cooperation in arranging these studies as well as studies for certain Iowa cities. (See p. 491, *infra*.)

A study of *Rockford* was made by Mr. Glenn S. Taylor, under the supervision of Prof. Lloyd V. Ballard, head of the department of economics and sociology, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. Acknowledgment is made to President Irving Maurer of Beloit College for cooperation in arranging this study.

The Illinois studies cover all the cities of the State over 25,000 in population.

INDIANA

Studies for *East Chicago*, *Gary* and *Hammond* were made by Mr. Samuel Herman, of Chicago, Ill., under the direction of Mr. Elbridge Bancroft Pierce, Chicago, Ill. (See p. 488, *supra*.)

Studies for *Elkhart*, *Mishawaka* and *South Bend* were made by Messrs. John Paul Hickey and Leonard Horan, under the supervision of Rev. Raymond A. Murray, head of the department of sociology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind. Acknowledgment is made to President

C. L. O'Donnell of the University of Notre Dame for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies were made for *Evansville* by Mr. Bernard A. Frick and for *Fort Wayne* by Mr. A. LeRoy Wiltrout, under the supervision of Prof. James J. Robinson, of the Indiana University School of Law, Bloomington, Ind. Acknowledgment is made to Professor Robinson and to Prof. Frank G. Bates, of the department of political science, Indiana University, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Indianapolis* was made by the department of civic affairs of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. William H. Book, director of the department, for his cooperation in arranging for and directing this study.

A study for *Michigan City* was made by a committee consisting of Hon. Harry L. Crumpacker, judge of the superior court, Michigan City, Ind., chairman; Mr. Alex Sychalski, clerk of the superior court; Prof. M. C. Murray, superintendent of public schools of Michigan City; Hon. Robert E. Glascott, city judge of Michigan City; Mr. Wesley R. Kibby, chief of police of Michigan City; Mr. Robert Baker, assistant prosecuting attorney of Michigan City; Rev. F. Arthur Stewart, probation officer, LaPorte, Ind.; Mr. Tom McDonald, sheriff of LaPorte County, LaPorte, Ind.; Mr. Paul Krueger, of the Indiana bar; Mr. Walter H. Daly, warden of the Indiana State Prison; Mr. A. R. Couder, city comptroller of Michigan City; and Mr. Nate Rosenberg, secretary of the Michigan City Chamber of Commerce. Acknowledgment is made to the Michigan City Chamber of Commerce for organizing this committee and arranging for the study.

A study for *Muncie*, covering police and other direct city costs, was made by Mr. Clarence Arthur Millsbaugh, of the department of social science, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind. Acknowledgment is made to President L. A. Pittenger of Ball State Teachers College for cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other Indiana cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Anderson, Kokomo, Lafayette, New Albany, Richmond* and *Terre Haute*.

IOWA

A study for *Burlington* was made by Prof. Clarence W. Tow and Prof. John Albert Vieg, of the department of social science, Burlington High School and Junior College, Burlington, Iowa. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. Benjamin F. Shambaugh for cooperation in arranging for this study. (See p. 489, supra.)

A study for *Cedar Rapids* was made by Dr. J. M. Henry, professor of commerce and finance, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, assisted by Misses Marian Hutton, Helen Paine, Mary Elizabeth Ramsey, and Ada Stoflet, and Messrs. Jesse Burgess, Glenn Campbell, John Dudycha, Ronald Kelley, Edward Mason, and Robert Milota. Acknowledgment is made to President H. M. Gage, of Coe College, and to Prof. Charles T. Hickcock, head of the department of economics, sociology, political science and commerce, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *Davenport* was made by Mr. Cecil F. Marshall, under the general supervision of Prof. Benjamin F. Shambaugh. (See p. 489, supra.)

A study for *Des Moines* was made by the Bureau of Municipal Research of Des Moines, Iowa. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. C. A. Crosser, secretary of the bureau, for his cooperation in arranging for and directing this study.

A study for *Sioux City*, covering police and municipal court costs, was made by the Bureau of Municipal Research, Sioux City, Iowa. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. E. S. Weatherley, director of the bureau, for cooperation in arranging for and directing this study.

A study for *Waterloo*, covering police and direct city costs, was made by the social science department of Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa. The investigation was directed by Prof. Harold Tascher as director and Miss Janet Reade as chairman, and was made by Misses Blanche Oxtow and Wanda Mace and Mr. John Hodges, administrative committee, and Misses Madeline Dury and Dorothy Edgar and Mr. Herbert Hoerman, research committee. Acknowledgment is made to Professor Tascher; to Dr. Carl H. Erbe, professor of government, Iowa State Teachers College; and to Dr. Benjamin F.

Shambaugh of the State University of Iowa (cf. p. 489, supra) for cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other Iowa cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Clinton*, *Council Bluffs*, *Dubuque* and *Ottumwa*.

KANSAS

A study for *Kansas City* was made by the Bureau of Governmental Research of Kansas City, Kans. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. M. W. DeWees, director, and Mr. H. B. Kendrick, accountant of the bureau, for cooperation in arranging for and directing this study.

A study for *Topeka* was made by Prof. B. W. Maxwell, of the department of history and political science, Washburn College, Topeka, Kans., assisted by Profs. W. J. Morgan, W. A. Irwin and Mildred Wilson, of that department, and by Miss Dorothy Brink and Messrs. Frank Rice, W. E. Hamblin, Ben Meadows, C. W. Skeen, and Hugh Wales. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Samuel Wilson, manager of the Kansas Chamber of Commerce, Topeka, Kans., and to Mr. Cowden S. Strain, of the research department of the chamber, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study of *Wichita*, covering juvenile court costs only, was made by Prof. Glenn A. Bakkum, head of the department of sociology, Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans. Acknowledgment is made to President H. W. Focht of the Municipal University of Wichita for cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Hutchinson*, the only other Kansas city over 25,000 in population.

KENTUCKY

Studies for *Covington* and *Newport* were made by Mr. M. C. Farrell, executive secretary of the Cincinnati Regional Crime Committee. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. Charles P. Taft, 2d, treasurer of the committee, for cooperation in arranging these studies. (See p. 502, infra.)

Studies for *Lexington* and *Louisville* were made by the Bureau of Municipal Research of the University of Ken-

tucky, Lexington, Ky., under the supervision of Prof. J. Catron Jones, head of the department of political science of the university and secretary of the Kentucky Municipal League. The Lexington report was prepared by Dr. J. W. Manning, assisted by Dr. A. Vanderbosch, Dr. Esther Cole, and Messrs. James B. Holtzclaw, Shepherd Jones, Harry Lynn, and Ellis Reeves. The chapters of the Louisville report containing cost data were prepared by Mr. Roy H. Owsley; the remainder of the report by Dr. J. W. Manning. Acknowledgment is made to Professor Jones for cooperation in arranging for and directing these studies.

It proved impossible to arrange studies for *Ashland* and *Paducah*, the other Kentucky cities over 25,000 in population.

LOUISIANA

A study for *Baton Rouge* was made by Mr. Ben R. Miller, a study for *New Orleans* by Mr. Helmuth Carlyle Voss, and a study for *Shreveport* by Mr. Chandler Furman. These studies were made under the general supervision of Prof. Rufus C. Harris, dean of the College of Law, the Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La., to whom special acknowledgment is made for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Monroe*, the only other Louisiana city over 25,000 in population.

MAINE

A study for *Bangor* was made by Dr. Orren C. Hormell, professor of government, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., assisted by Mr. H. B. Towle of the Maine bar. Studies for *Lewiston* and *Portland* were made under the supervision of Doctor Hormell—the Lewiston study by Messrs. H. M. Lamport and Frederick C. Tucker, and the Portland study by Mr. Tucker. Acknowledgment is made to President Kenneth C. M. Sills of Bowdoin College for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The Maine studies include all the cities over 25,000 in population in the State.

MARYLAND

A study for *Baltimore* was made by Dr. Lewis Danziger, of the Institute of Law of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. L. C. Marshall and Prof. Walter Wheeler Cook, of the Institute of Law, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *Hagerstown* was made by Mr. W. H. Redkey, under the general supervision of Dr. D. W. Willard, professor of sociology, George Washington University, Washington, D. C. Acknowledgment is made to Doctor Willard for his cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Cumberland*, the only other Maryland city over 25,000 in population.

MASSACHUSETTS

Studies for *Beverly*, *Boston*, *Chelsea*, *Everett*, *Fall River*, *Haverhill*, *Lawrence*, *Lowell*, *Lynn*, *Malden*, *New Bedford*, *Newton*, *Revere*, *Salem*, *Taunton* and *Waltham* were made under the supervision of Prof. William G. Sutcliffe, of the College of Business Administration, Boston University, Boston, Mass. Professor Sutcliffe was assisted by Misses Dorothea B. Cogswell, Christine L. Baker, Sara Zeserson, Laura Lacount, and Gertrude Popkin and Messrs. Linwood M. Pattee, Abraham J. Silk, Curtis E. Youngdahl, Julius Farber, Nathan Alpert, John W. Dunning, William T. Templeman, Jacob Goldberg, Mariona Krauzer, Joseph De Freitas, and Daniel Appleton in the collection of the data, and by Mrs. Edward R. Cogswell in the editing of the reports. Acknowledgment is made to President Daniel L. Marsh, of Boston University, and to Dean Everett W. Lord, of the College of Business Administration, for cooperation in arranging for these studies. Acknowledgment is also made to Mr. John Candler Cobb, Boston, Mass., and to Mr. Frank W. Grinnell, secretary of the Massachusetts Judicial Council, for most helpful assistance.

Studies for *Chicopee*, *Holyoke* and *Springfield* were made under the supervision of Prof. Amy Hewes, chairman of the department of economics and sociology, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., and Miss Helen Bonser,

assistant in the department. Doctor Hewes was assisted in the preparation of these reports by Misses Dorothy Benware, Elizabeth Cunningham, Maida Florence, Catherine Green, Alice Higley, Magdalene Klausmann, Cornelia Kuyper, Eileen Leach, Rose Lipman, Alice Lyman, Virginia Mendenhall, Phyllis Mosher, Linnea Petterson and Rachel Thompson. Acknowledgment is made to President Mary E. Woolley, of Mount Holyoke College, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Fitchburg*, covering police and direct city costs, was made by Misses Helen Dempsey and Catharine E. Rogers, of Fitchburg State Normal School, Fitchburg, Mass. Acknowledgment is made to President William D. Parkinson, of Fitchburg State Normal School, for cooperating in arranging for this study.

Studies for *Medford* and *Somerville* were made under the supervision of Prof. Lloyd P. Shanlis, of the department of economics and sociology, Tufts College, Tufts College, Mass. The Medford study was made by Mr. Edward C. Welsh and the Somerville study by Mr. Clyde S. Casaday—both teaching fellows in commerce and finance, Tufts College. Acknowledgment is made to President John A. Cousens, of Tufts College, and to Prof. Herbert V. Neal, head of the department of biology, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Pittsfield* was made by Prof. Charles Fairman and Prof. Donald C. Blaisdell, of the department of political science, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., assisted by Messrs. Charles F. Skeele, William M. Hyde, and William C. Smieding. Acknowledgment is made to President H. A. Garfield, of Williams College, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *Worcester* was made by Mr. Michael Abelsky, under the general supervision of Prof. Paul W. Shankweiler, of the department of economics and sociology, Clark University, Worcester, Mass. Acknowledgment is made to President Wallace W. Atwood, of Clark University, and to Prof. S. J. Brandenburg, head of the department of economics and sociology, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for *Brockton* and *Quincy*, the only other cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

MICHIGAN

Studies for *Ann Arbor*, *Flint*, *Grand Rapids*, *Lansing* and *Saginaw* were made, under the supervision of Dr. H. F. Taggart, associate professor of accounting, School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., by Messrs. L. W. Gilger, D. W. Presser, V. P. Schumaker, and G. A. Spater. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Arthur Evans Wood, professor of sociology, University of Michigan, and to Mr. Harold D. Smith, director Michigan Municipal League, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Dearborn*, *Detroit*, *Hamtramck* and *Highland Park* were made by Mr. Charles C. Bechtel, of the staff of the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Detroit, Mich. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Lent D. Upson, director of the bureau, for cooperation in arranging for and directing these studies.

Information as to police costs for *Muskegon* was furnished by Mr. R. S. McCrea, industrial commissioner of the Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. J. C. Biekema, secretary-manager of the chamber, for cooperation in securing these data.

It proved impossible to arrange studies for the other Michigan cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Battle Creek*, *Bay City*, *Jackson*, *Kalamazoo*, *Pontiac*, *Port Huron* and *Wyandotte*.

MINNESOTA

A study for *Duluth* was made by Messrs. Harry R. Reed and N. C. Dwyer, of the staff of the Taxpayers' League of St. Louis County, Duluth, Minn. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. R. M. Goodrich, executive secretary of the league, for cooperation in arranging for and directing this study.

A study for *Minneapolis* was made by Miss Violet Johnson, under the general supervision of Dr. William Anderson,

professor of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. Acknowledgment is made to Doctor Anderson for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *St. Paul* was made by the St. Paul Bureau of Municipal Research. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. C. P. Herbert, director of the bureau, and to Mr. Leslie M. Gravlin, assistant to the director, for cooperation in arranging for and carrying out this study.

The studies for Minnesota cover all the cities over 25,000 in population in the State.

MISSISSIPPI

A study for *Jackson* was made by Miss Grace Rhodes, under the supervision of Dean N. B. Bond, of the Graduate School of the University of Mississippi, University, Miss. Acknowledgment is made to Chancellor J. N. Powers, of the University of Mississippi, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange a study for *Meridian*, the only other city in the State over 25,000 in population.

MISSOURI

Studies for *Joplin* and *St. Joseph* were made by Mr. Marion Boggs, Columbia, Mo., and a study for *Springfield* by Mr. J. R. Foster, Wentworth Military Academy, Lexington, Mo. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. F. A. Middlebush, dean of the School of Business and Public Administration, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Kansas City* was made by the Kansas City Public Service Institute, Kansas City, Mo. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Walter Matscheck, director of the institute, and to Mr. George W. Hall, jr., of the institute's staff, for cooperation in arranging for and carrying out this study.

A study for *St. Louis* was made by Mr. Carter W. Atkins, director, and Messrs. J. Otis Garber and William A. Lafferty, of the staff of the Bureau of Municipal Research, St. Louis, Mo. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Atkins for cooperation in arranging for and supervising this study.

A study of police and other city costs for *University City* was made by the city administration. Acknowledgment is made to Hon. E. D. Ruth, jr., mayor of University City, for cooperation in arranging for this study. Certain data as to county costs were supplied by the Bureau of Municipal Research of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

The Missouri studies cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

MONTANA

Studies for *Butte* and *Great Falls* were made by Messrs. M. Kast and Austin Roderick, of the State University of Montana, Missoula, Mont. Acknowledgment is made to President Charles H. Clapp, of the State University of Montana, and to Prof. Harry Turney-High, chairman of the department of economics and sociology, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The Montana studies cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

NEBRASKA

Studies for *Lincoln* and *Omaha* were made by Dr. Hattie Plum Williams, professor of sociology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr. Acknowledgment is made to Chancellor Edgar A. Burnett, of the University of Nebraska, and to Prof. J. O. Hertzler, chairman of the department of sociology, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The Nebraska studies cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Studies for *Concord*, *Manchester* and *Nashua* were made, under the supervision of Prof. Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, head of the department of political science, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., by Messrs. Ralph Crosby, Fred Currier, George Hadley, Herbert Hagstrom, Henry Kelly, Henry Lane, Albert Lazure, Paul Reed, Donald Piper, Chandler Ryder and Granville Shattuck. The Manchester and Nashua studies covered police costs only. Acknowledgment is made to President Edward M. Lewis, of the Uni-

versity of New Hampshire, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The New Hampshire studies cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

NEW JERSEY

Studies for *Bayonne*, *Belleville*, *Bloomfield*, *Clifton*, *Elizabeth*, *Hoboken*, *Irvington*, *Jersey City*, *Kearney*, *Montclair*, *Newark*, *Passaic*, *Paterson*, *Plainfield*, *Trenton*, *Union City* and *West New York* were made, under the direction of Mr. Wylie Kilpatrick, assistant secretary of the New Jersey League of Municipalities, Trenton, N. J., by Messrs. Morton D. Weiss and John A. Matson. The studies for Bloomfield, Clifton, Montclair and Passaic covered police costs only. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. Kilpatrick for his public-spirited assistance. Acknowledgment is also made to Mr. Sedley H. Phinney, executive secretary of the New Jersey League of Municipalities, for his cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Information as to police and court costs for *East Orange* and *Orange* was furnished by the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, East Orange, N. J. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. A. Edward Williamson, executive secretary of the chamber, for cooperation in securing this information.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other New Jersey cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Atlantic City*, *Camden*, *Garfield*, *New Brunswick* and *Perth Amboy*.

NEW MEXICO

A study for *Albuquerque*, the only city in the State over 25,000 in population, was made by an undergraduate seminar class in political science under the supervision of Prof. A. S. White, of the department of political science, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex. Acknowledgment is made to President J. F. Zimmerman, of the University of New Mexico, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

NEW YORK

Studies for *Albany*, *Amsterdam*, *Auburn*, *Binghamton*, *Elmira*, *Schenectady*, *Syracuse* and *Troy* were made by Mr. Hubert R. Gallagher, under the general supervision of Prof. W. E. Mosher, director of the School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. Acknowledgment is made to Doctor Mosher for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Buffalo* was made by Messrs. Richard W. Wood and Robert S. Smith, of the staff of the Buffalo Municipal Research Bureau. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Harry H. Freeman, director of the bureau, for cooperation in arranging for and supervising this study.

A study of police and municipal court costs for *Jamestown* was made by the city administration. Acknowledgment is made to Hon. Samuel A. Carlson, mayor of Jamestown, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

Studies for *Kingston*, *Newburgh* and *Poughkeepsie* were made under the general supervision of Dr. Emerson D. Fite, professor of political science, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. The Kingston study was made by Miss Charlotte Tuttle, the Newburgh study by Miss Janet Stillgebauer, and the Poughkeepsie study by Miss Isabelle Bush. Acknowledgment is made to Doctor Fite for his cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Mount Vernon*, *New Rochelle*, *White Plains* and *Yonkers*, were made by Mr. David Wolff, New York, N. Y., under the general supervision of the director of the study.

A study of *New York City* was made by Mr. G. H. McCaffrey, director of research of the Merchants Association of New York, assisted by Mr. C. R. Berghult. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Willis H. Booth, president of the association, and Mr. S. C. Mead, secretary, for cooperation in arranging for the study, and to the association for making it possible that the study be carried out.

A study for *Rochester* was made by Mr. Thomas A. Flynn, jr., of the School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. (This study was necessary because the model Rochester study covered the year 1929 instead of 1930. See p. 261, supra, note 87.) Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Hazen C. Pratt, of the staff of the Rochester Bureau of

Municipal Research (who made the model Rochester study) for cooperation in supervising the 1930 study and revising and correcting the report submitted.

Studies for *Rome* and *Utica* were made by Prof. Roy William Foley, head of the department of sociology, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., assisted by Prof. T. H. Robinson of that department. Acknowledgment is made to President George B. Cutten, of Colgate University, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Niagara Falls* and *Watertown*, the only other cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

NORTH CAROLINA

Studies for *Charlotte*, *Durham*, *Greensboro*, *High Point*, *Raleigh*, *Wilmington* and *Winston-Salem* were made by Dr. Hugh Brinton, jr., and Mrs. Lillian Brinton, under the general supervision of the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. Howard W. Odum, director of the institute, and to Dr. Katherine Jocher, assistant director, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study of *Asheville*, the only other city in the State over 25,000 in population.

NORTH DAKOTA

A study for *Fargo*, the only city in the State over 25,000 in population, was made by Mr. Sverre I. Scheldrup, under the general supervision of Prof. E. T. Towne, dean of the School of Commerce, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak. Acknowledgment is made to President Thomas F. Kane of the University of North Dakota and to Dean Towne for cooperation in arranging for this study.

OHIO

A study for *Akron* was made by the accounting firm of Porter & Tenney, Akron, Ohio, under the supervision of the bureau of municipal research of the Akron Chamber of Commerce. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. H. G. McGee, director of the bureau, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

Studies for *Canton* and *Massilon* were made by the Stark County Tax League, Canton, Ohio. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Walter J. Mackey, secretary of the league, for cooperation in arranging for and supervising these studies.

Studies for *Cincinnati*, *Hamilton*, *Middletown* and *Norwood* were made by Mr. M. C. Farrell, executive secretary of the Cincinnati regional crime committee, Cincinnati, Ohio. Special acknowledgment is made to Mr. Charles P. Taft, 2d, treasurer of the committee, for cooperation in arranging for these studies and for those of Covington and Newport, Ky. (See p. 492, supra.) Acknowledgment is also made to Prof. S. Gale Lowrie, head of the department of political science, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, for invaluable assistance in this regard.

Studies for *Cleveland*, *Cleveland Heights*, *East Cleveland* and *Lakewood* were made by Mr. Russel T. Jones, under the supervision of Mr. Leyton C. Carter, director of The Cleveland Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Benedict Crowell, of Cleveland, Ohio, for assistance in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Columbus*, *Mansfield*, *Newark* and *Springfield* were made under the direction of Dr. F. R. Aumann, professor of political science, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. The Columbus study was made by Messrs. Charles E. Smith, jr., and Thomas E. Ervin; the Mansfield study (which covered police and municipal court costs only) by Messrs. Kenneth Schaefer, Nelson Bernstein, Edward Ryan, Harry Guterman and John Paton; the Newark study by Messrs. Donald S. Hecock and J. Urlin Schoenborn; and the Springfield study by Messrs. Hugh J. Baker, jr., and Ferdinand F. Stone. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. Henry R. Spencer, head of the department of political science of Ohio State University, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Dayton* was made by the Dayton Research Association, Dayton, Ohio. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. W. M. Cotton, director of the association, for cooperation in arranging for and supervising this study.

A study for *Toledo* was made by Miss Bernice F. Husted, under the supervision of Dr. O. Garfield Jones, professor of political science, University of the City of Toledo, Toledo,

Ohio. Acknowledgment is made to Doctor Jones for the arranging of this study.

It proved impossible to arrange studies for the other cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Elyria*, *Lima*, *Lorain*, *Marion*, *Portsmouth*, *Steubenville*, *Warren*, *Youngstown* and *Zanesville*.

OKLAHOMA

Studies for *Oklahoma City* and *Tulsa* were made by Prof. James W. Errant and Prof. P. L. Gettys, of the School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. John Alley, director of the School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, for his cooperation in arranging for these studies.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for *Enid* and *Muskogee*, the other Oklahoma cities over 25,000 in population.

OREGON

A study for *Portland* was made by Messrs. Jerome S. Bischoff and Donald S. Turnbull, under the supervision of Dr. Charles McKinley, professor of political science, Reed College, Portland, Oreg., to whom acknowledgment is made for cooperation in arranging for this study.

A study for *Salem* was made by Miss Rosalind Van Winkle, under the supervision of Prof. S. B. Laughlin, head of the department of economics and sociology, Willamette University, Salem, Oreg. Acknowledgment is made to President Carl G. Doney, of Willamette University, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

The Oregon studies cover all the cities of the State over 25,000 in population.

PENNSYLVANIA

Studies for *Allentown* and *Bethlehem* were made under the direction of Prof. E. B. Schulz, of the department of history and government, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., by Messrs. Donald Sawyer, Milton Funick, Jerome Mayer, Emanuel Schoblionko, Emanuel Honig, Irving Gennet and Clinton Feissner. Acknowledgment is made to President

C. R. Richards, of Lehigh University, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Altoona* and *Johnstown* were prepared by Mr. R. Paul Campbell and Mr. J. R. Roberts, respectively, under the supervision of Dr. H. F. Alderfer, assistant professor of political science, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. Acknowledgment is made to President R. D. Hetzel, of Pennsylvania State College, and to Dr. Jacob Farger, professor of political science, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *Chester*, *Harrisburg*, *Hazleton*, *Lancaster*, *Nanticoke*, *Norristown*, *Philadelphia*, *Reading*, *Scranton*, *Wilkes-Barre* and *York* were made by Dr. Bradford W. West and Messrs. John R. Abersold and John G. Hervey, of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Clair Wilcox, director of research of the commission, for assistance in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Easton* was made by the department of government and law, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. Acknowledgment is made to President William Mather Lewis, of Lafayette College, and Prof. Miller D. Stewer, head of the department of government and law, for cooperation in arranging for the study, and to Prof. Theodore W. Cousens, who made the actual investigation.

A study for *Erie* was made by the Erie County Taxpayers' Association, Erie, Pa. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. John S. Rae, managing director of the league, and Mr. Fred W. Talbot, assistant managing director, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

Studies for *McKeesport* and *Pittsburgh* were made by Messrs. James P. W. Jones and William E. Noble, under the supervision of Prof. Gustav L. Schramm, of the department of political science, University of Pittsburgh, Pa. The study for *McKeesport* covered police costs only. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. Ralph S. Boots, head of the department of political science of the University of Pittsburgh, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

Studies for *New Castle* and *Sharon* were made by Dr. Thomas Mansell, assistant in economics and business ad-

ministration, Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. The study for *Sharon* covered police costs only. Acknowledgment is made to President W. Charles Wallace, of Westminster College, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A report for *Williamsport* was prepared by Mr. Walter R. Moore and Miss Marie Groff, under the supervision of Prof. Harwood L. Childs, head of the department of political science, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. Acknowledgment is made to President Emory W. Hunt, of Bucknell University, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other Pennsylvania cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Aliquippa*, *Lebanon* and *Wilkinsburg*.

RHODE ISLAND

Studies for *Central Falls*, *Granston*, *Newport*, *Pawtucket*, *Providence* and *Woonsocket* were made under the supervision of Prof. H. A. Phelps, of the department of social and political science, Brown University, Providence, R. I., assisted by Miss Catherine E. McCormack and Mrs. Veronica Holland Hurley. Acknowledgment is made to President Clarence A. Barbour, of Brown University, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The Rhode Island study covers all the cities of the State over 25,000 in population, and also covers State costs. (See Appendix H, pp. 655-656, supra.)

SOUTH CAROLINA

Studies for *Charleston*, *Columbia*, *Greenville* and *Spartanburg* were made by Prof. G. Croft Williams, head of the department of sociology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., assisted by Mr. J. M. Brailsford, jr., and by students of sociology in the university. The studies for *Charleston* and *Greenville* covered police costs only. Acknowledgment is made to President D. M. Douglas, of the University of South Carolina, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The South Carolina studies cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

SOUTH DAKOTA

A study for *Sioux Falls*, the only city in the State over 25,000 in population, was made by Mr. George O. Titus, under the supervision of Prof. Herman H. Frachsel, of the department of government, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak. Acknowledgment is made to President Herman G. James, of the University of South Dakota, for cooperation in arranging for this study.

TENNESSEE

A study for *Chattanooga* was made by Dr. F. W. Prescott, professor of political science, University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. John F. Willnot, director of research of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce, for assistance in arranging for this study.

Studies for *Knoxville* and *Memphis* were made by Mr. Robert Monroe Bell, instructor in the School of Commerce of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. Acknowledgment is made to President Harcourt A. Morgan, of the University of Tennessee, and to Prof. Theodore W. Glocker, head of the school of commerce, for cooperation in arranging for these studies. Acknowledgment is also made to Mr. C. F. Holland, executive vice president of the Knoxville Chamber of Commerce, for assistance in assembling data for the Knoxville study.

A study for *Nashville* was made by Prof. E. T. Krueger and Prof. Wayland J. Hayes of the department of sociology and anthropology of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. Acknowledgment is made to President J. H. Kirkland, of Vanderbilt University, and to Prof. W. C. Buckley, head of the division of social sciences of the university, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Johnson City*, the only other city in the State over 25,000 in population.

TEXAS

Studies for *Austin*, *Beaumont*, *Dallas*, *El Paso*, *Fort Worth*, *Galveston*, *Houston*, *Laredo*, *San Antonio*, *Waco*, and *Wichita Falls* were made by Messrs. Samuel A. McCarthy and Ned Gregg Wallace, under the direction of Dean Charles S. Potts, of the School of Law, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex. Special acknowledgment is made to Dean Potts for his able and public-spirited service as organizer and supervisor of these studies. Acknowledgment is also made to Mr. John B. Rienstra, assistant city attorney of Beaumont, and to Capt. E. H. Simons, general manager of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, who supplied data as to those cities.

Information as to police costs for *Amarillo* was furnished by the Amarillo Chamber of Commerce.

It proved impossible to arrange for studies for the other Texas cities over 25,000 in population—viz, *Corpus Christi*, *Port Arthur* and *San Angelo*.

UTAH

A study for *Salt Lake City* was made by Mr. M. H. Harris, statistician of the Utah Taxpayers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. A. C. Rees, secretary of the league, for cooperation in arranging for and supervising this study.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Ogden*, the only other Utah city over 25,000 in population.

VIRGINIA

Studies for *Lynchburg*, *Newport News*, *Norfolk*, *Petersburg*, *Portsmouth*, *Richmond* and *Roanoke* were made by Mr. Harry C. Lamberton, a graduate student in the department of political science of the University of Virginia, University, Va. Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Wilson Gee, director of the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences of the University of Virginia, and to Prof. George W. Spicer, of the department of political science of the university, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The Virginia studies cover all the cities of the State over 25,000 in population.

WASHINGTON

Studies for *Bellingham*, *Everett*, *Seattle* and *Tacoma*, were made by Dr. Joseph P. Harris, professor of political science, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., to whom acknowledgment is made for cooperation in arranging for and carrying out these studies.

A study of police costs for *Spokane* was made by the Taxpayers Economy League of Seattle. Acknowledgment is made to Mr. Lester M. Livengood, manager and counsel of the league, for his cooperation in arranging for and supervising this study.

The Washington studies cover all the cities in the State over 25,000 in population.

WEST VIRGINIA

Studies for *Charleston*, *Clarksburg*, *Huntington*, *Parkersburg* and *Wheeling* were made by Prof. George A. Shipman and Prof. Carl M. Frasure, of the department of political science, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., and research associates of the Bureau for Government Research of the university. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. John F. Sly, head of the department of political science of the university, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

The West Virginia studies cover all the cities of the State over 25,000 in population.

WISCONSIN

Studies for *Appleton*, *Eau Claire*, *Fond du Lac*, *Green Bay*, *Kenosha*, *La Crosse*, *Madison*, *Oshkosh*, *Racine*, *Sheboygan* and *West Allis* were made under the direction of Prof. J. T. Salter, of the department of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., and Prof. Howard L. Hall, of the law school of the university. The Appleton study was made by Messrs. Aaron L. Tietelbaum, Joseph G. Werner, and Leo Solinger; the Eau Claire study by Mr. George Hampel, jr.; the Fond du Lac study by Mr. George E. Engert; the Green Bay study by Mr. George Hines, jr.; the Kenosha study by Mr. William W. Storms; the La

Crosse study by Mr. Walter W. Engleke; the Madison and Racine studies by Messrs. Earl C. Sachse and Duane C. Cressy; the Oshkosh study by Mr. E. F. Istas; the Sheboygan study by Mr. Henry J. Fox; and the West Allis study by Mr. E. J. Youngerman. Acknowledgment is made to Prof. Frederic A. Ogg, chairman of the department of political science of the university, and to Prof. Kimball Young, chairman of the University Social Science Research Council, for cooperation in arranging for these studies.

A study for *Milwaukee* was made by Mrs. Paula Lynagh, statistician of the Citizens' Bureau of Milwaukee, assisted by Mr. E. J. Youngerman. Acknowledgment is made to the board of trustees of the bureau for making possible the study, and to Mr. John A. Davis, acting director of the bureau, for his cooperation.

It proved impossible to arrange for a study for *Superior*, the only other city in the State over 25,000 in population.

NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

MANUAL
FOR
STUDIES OF THE COST OF
ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
IN AMERICAN CITIES



[Reprinted]

WASHINGTON: 1931

**NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT**

MANUAL
FOR
STUDIES OF THE COST OF
ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
IN AMERICAN CITIES

**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1931**

510c

FOREWORD

Among its various investigations, the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement has undertaken a study of the cost of the administration of criminal justice in the United States. The cost of such administration divides itself into that borne by the Federal Government, that borne by the various States directly, and that borne by municipalities. A study of Federal costs of the administration of criminal justice is contemplated by the commission, as is some study of the problem of State costs. A complete study of the cost of administration of criminal justice for all the municipalities of the country would be an undertaking of tremendous magnitude, since there are some 1,700 cities or villages in the United States with populations of 5,000 or over, and a considerably larger number of smaller ones, as well as 3,073 counties. For the present, therefore, it is proposed to confine the study of municipal costs to the larger cities of the country.

It is proposed to carry out the project by enlisting the aid of bureaus of municipal research and of graduate students of the social sciences in making the studies in individual cities. It is believed that this method of approaching the problem will insure thoroughly scientific methods of investigation and will result in the assembling of data which will be of definite value to the commission and to the public.

It is the purpose of this manual to outline certain of the more important elements of the problem under investigation; to set forth specific minimum requirements for the studies which are necessary in order that the data secured may be comparable and of maximum value to the commission; and to suggest methods of investigation which may prove fruitful. It is intended to make a statistical analysis of certain of the data obtained for the various cities as a result of these studies. In order that such analysis may

be possible, it is essential that the data to be analyzed be comparable for all of the cities, and that the study for each city supply all of the necessary data. To this end this manual specifies those topics with regard to which data should in any event be secured, and makes suggestions as to how those data should be obtained.

It is not to be understood that the minimum data called for limit in any way the maximum scope of the studies to be made. These data represent merely the irreducible minimum, and it is to be hoped that each investigator will go as far beyond that minimum as time and facilities for investigation will permit. This manual contains certain suggestions as to topics for investigation other than those included in the minimum requirements. These topics are suggestive only, and it is earnestly desired that each investigation be expanded as far—not only beyond the minimum requirements outlined in this manual but also beyond such suggested further topics for study—as each investigator may find practicable and desirable. The fundamental objective of each investigator should be a complete and thorough study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the community which he is studying in all its aspects, but including, in any event, the minimum data necessary for a statistical analysis of the combined results of all the investigations.

This manual has been prepared in collaboration with an advisory group of experts in the field of municipal government and administration which includes Dean Edith Abbott, of the University of Chicago; Prof. William Anderson, of the University of Minnesota; Dr. Russell Forbes, director of the Municipal Administration Service; Dr. Luther Gulick, director of the National Institute of Public Administration; Prof. A. N. Holcombe, of Harvard University; Dr. Robert Lynd, secretary of the Social Science Research Council; Prof. Samuel C. May, of the University of California; Prof. W. E. Mosher, of Syracuse University; Prof. Howard W. Odum, of the University of North Carolina; Prof. Frederic A. Ogg, of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Lent D. Upson, of the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research; and Dr. W. F. Willoughby, director of the

Institute for Government Research. The manual has also been considered and approved by Price, Waterhouse & Co. as to the accounting aspects of the project; by Dr. Raymond H. Franzen as to its statistical aspects; by Bruce Smith, Esq., director of the committee on uniform crime records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, as to matters relating to police costs; and by Welles A. Gray, Esq., sometime assistant director of the Municipal Administration Service, as to topics relating to municipal government and finance.

The objectives and methods of investigation outlined in this manual have been the subject of a test study made for the commission in the city of Rochester, N. Y., by the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research; and the manual has the approval of W. Earl Weller, Esq., director of that bureau, and of H. C. Pratt, Esq., of the staff of the bureau, who had direct charge of the study. The report of the Rochester study will be available as a model for the studies in other cities.

It is believed that some of the investigators may desire to use the reports of their investigations as academic theses. There is no objection to this. It is expected, however, that the report of each investigation will be submitted to the consultants of the commission in charge of the project prior to its use for any other purpose. The consultants of the commission reserve the right, in the event that publication of any of the reports is proposed, to review the report so to be published prior to publication. In view of the semi-official character of the reports it is felt necessary to reserve this right.

The consultants of the commission will furnish such aid to each investigator upon request as may be feasible and will be prepared to answer any questions with regard to objectives or methods of investigation, or with regard to any of the details of the studies, which may arise from time to time. The general supervision of the investigation is in the hands of Messrs. Goldthwaite H. Dorr and Sidney P. Simpson, of the New York bar, the consultants to the commission's subcommittee on the cost of crime. Any requests

for information or assistance by the investigators carrying on the studies in particular cities should be addressed to Sidney P. Simpson, Esq., 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

PAUL J. McCORMICK,

Chairman, Subcommittee on the Cost of Crime.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LAW

OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT,

Washington, D. C., November 1, 1930.

CONTENTS

	Original page	Reprint page
I. Introduction:		
1. General objective.....	1	517
2. Data as to the community.....	1	517
3. Data as to cost of administration of criminal justice.....	2	517
4. Scope of this manual.....	2	518
II. Community data:		
1. General.....	2	518
2. Location.....	3	518
3. Population and population density.....	3	519
4. Racial composition.....	3	519
5. Sex and age distribution.....	4	519
6. Industrial conditions.....	4	520
7. Employment and labor.....	4	520
8. Wealth.....	5	521
9. Domestic factors.....	5	521
10. Educational factors.....	6	521
11. Machinery for the administration of criminal justice.....	6	521
12. Volume of crime.....	6	522
13. Other factors.....	7	523
14. Minimum requirements.....	7	523
15. Additional topics for investigation.....	8	524
III. Data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice:		
1. General.....	9	524
2. Allocation of costs as between criminal and noncriminal activities.....	10	525
3. Allocation of costs of State and county agencies.....	10	525
4. Capital expenditures.....	12	527
5. Treatment of receipts.....	15	530
6. Period for investigation.....	16	531
IV. Cost of police:		
1. General.....	17	532
2. Elements of cost.....	18	533
3. Detective force.....	19	533
4. Traffic force.....	19	533
5. Patrolmen.....	19	534
6. Special forces.....	19	534
7. License bureaus.....	19	534
8. Supervisory force.....	20	534
9. Allocation of overhead.....	20	535
10. Capital investment.....	20	535
11. Minimum requirements.....	21	536
12. Additional topics for investigation.....	21	536

	Original page	Reprint page
V. Cost of prosecution:		
1. General.....	22	537
2. Elements of cost.....	22	537
3. Civil activities.....	23	537
4. Detective activities.....	23	537
5. Public defenders.....	23	538
6. Capital investment.....	24	538
7. Minimum requirements.....	24	538
8. Additional topics for investigation.....	24	539
VI. Cost of the criminal courts:		
1. General.....	25	539
2. Elements of cost.....	25	540
3. Courts with purely criminal jurisdiction.....	25	540
4. Courts with both civil and criminal jurisdiction.....	26	540
5. Juvenile courts.....	26	540
6. Allocation of overhead.....	26	541
7. Capital investment.....	27	541
8. Minimum requirements.....	27	541
9. Additional topics for investigation.....	27	542
VII. Cost of penal and corrective treatment:		
1. General.....	28	542
2. Elements of cost in penal institutions.....	29	543
3. Jails.....	30	544
4. Workhouses.....	30	544
5. Other institutions.....	30	544
6. Probation.....	30	545
7. Parole.....	31	545
8. Capital investment.....	31	545
9. Minimum requirements.....	31	545
10. Additional topics for investigation.....	32	546
VIII. Sources of information:		
1. Community data.....	32	546
2. Data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice.....	33	547
3. Financial reports.....	33	547
4. Budgets.....	33	547
5. Other sources.....	34	548
6. Period covered by financial reports and budgets.....	34	548
7. Sources of data for allocation of costs.....	35	548
IX. Suggestions as to methods of investigation:		
1. Securing access to sources of information.....	35	549
2. Utilization of sources.....	36	550
3. Aid to investigators.....	36	550
X. Form of reports:		
1. General.....	36	550
2. Title.....	37	550
3. Order of treatment.....	37	550
4. Physical form of reports.....	38	552

MANUAL FOR STUDIES OF THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN AMERICAN CITIES

I

INTRODUCTION

1. *General objective.*—The general objective of these studies is the ascertainment, as nearly as may be, of the cost of the administration of criminal justice in the larger cities of the United States, and the determination of the various factors affecting such cost. With respect to each community, the objective is the ascertainment of the cost of the administration of criminal justice in that community, and the extent to which it is affected by conditions peculiar to the community. With respect to each community, therefore, the investigation requires the securing of two classes of data; viz, data as to the community, and data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice therein.

2. *Data as to the community.*—The data to be secured as to each community relate to such factors as location, population, racial composition, industrial conditions, and all other factors giving the particular community its particular character. One very important factor is that of the volume and kind of crime in the community, as this has an obvious relationship to the cost of administration of criminal justice. Data as to these factors should be secured for the same period as the data which are secured as to costs. The community data to be secured are analyzed in detail in Chapter II of this manual.

3. *Data as to cost of administration of criminal justice.*—The cost of administration of criminal justice may be divided into four principal elements: Cost of police, cost of prosecution, cost of criminal courts, and cost of penal and corrective treatment. Each of these must be studied separately. Certain general aspects of the cost of administration of criminal justice are dealt with in Chapter III

of this manual, and the detailed elements of such cost are analyzed in Chapters IV to VII, inclusive.

These studies will be confined to the direct cost of administration of criminal justice—i. e., police, prosecution, the criminal courts and penal and corrective treatment—and no attempt need be made to allocate to such cost any part of the general administrative overhead expenditures of the city, county, or State.

4. *Scope of this manual.*—This manual discusses certain of the matters to be considered in developing the data as to each community and as to the cost of administration of criminal justice therein, sets forth the minimum requirements for the studies, and makes certain suggestions as to additional topics for investigation. It also makes suggestions as to methods of investigation and states the form to be followed in reporting the results of the investigations to the commission when completed.

II

COMMUNITY DATA

1. *General.*—The community data to be obtained relate, in general, to those characteristics of each community being studied which may affect, directly or indirectly, the cost of administration of criminal justice in that community. Certain of the more obvious of these community factors are enumerated and discussed below and the reasons for their importance pointed out. (See secs. 2-12, *infra.*) In addition to these enumerated factors, there may be operative in particular communities other important factors which should be investigated and reported upon. (See sec. 13, *infra.*)

2. *Location.*—It might seem at first glance that the location of a community has no bearing on the cost of the administration of criminal justice therein. On reflection, however, it will appear that this is not necessarily true. For example, crime conditions in a sea-coast city may very well differ from those in an inland city; and crime conditions in an isolated medium-sized city may differ from those in a city of comparable size located adjacent to a

metropolitan center. It is important, therefore, that consideration be given as to the location of the community in relation to geographical features and to other communities.

3. *Population and population density.*—The population of a community necessarily has a bearing on the total cost of the administration of criminal justice therein. It may also have a bearing on the per capita cost. One of the purposes of the present study is to determine whether and to what extent such a relationship between cost and population exists generally, so that the population of the community under investigation is an essential datum.

Population density may well have a bearing on the cost of administering criminal justice in a community. It has been thought by some that overcrowding tends to breed crime, and hence to increase the cost of preventing, detecting, and punishing it. The study of each community should, therefore, include the securing of data as to this factor, which should be developed as to wards or analogous subdivisions of the municipal area in order to indicate whether overcrowding exists. In reporting population density by wards, it should be indicated whether each ward is predominantly business, residential or mixed in character.

4. *Racial composition.*—The racial composition of a community may perhaps have a bearing on the expense incurred by it in administering the criminal law. It has sometimes been suggested, for example, that persons of certain races or nationalities are prone to commit crimes of a certain character. To permit a study of this factor, data as to racial composition should be secured. Under racial composition should be included not only the distribution of population as between whites, Negroes, Asiatics, and other races, but also distribution with respect to national origins. In this connection, there should be ascertained, with respect to persons of foreign nativity, the number and proportion of aliens and naturalized persons. Data should also be secured as to the number and proportion of children of foreign-born parents.

5. *Sex and age distribution.*—The character of the population of a community as regards distribution by sex and

among various age groups has sometimes been regarded as having a relation to volume and character of crime, and so may have a bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice. These data should therefore be developed, following the classification used by the United States census, for each community.

6. *Industrial conditions.*—The industrial situation in any community may well have a bearing on the cost of administering criminal justice. It may be, for example, that the problem of police will be simpler and less expensive in a city which is primarily a collecting and distributing point for an agricultural area than in one devoted largely to manufacturing industries. Similarly, the crime problem of a city which is primarily a center for heavy manufacturing may differ from that of a city whose principal industries involve primarily the employment of highly paid skilled labor. It is desirable, therefore, to develop the character of the community being studied from an industrial standpoint, with particular reference to determining what proportion of the total number of persons gainfully employed are engaged in various types of manufacturing, in various mercantile occupations, and otherwise. It will probably not be possible to bring out all the facts fully by means of figures, so that it will be desirable to give a description of the community from the industrial standpoint.

7. *Employment and labor.*—It will be desirable to consider the extent to which the cost of administering criminal justice in any community is affected by the character and extent of employment therein. To a certain extent, data as to character of employment will overlap the data as to industrial conditions just discussed; but such data will include, in addition, such factors as proportion of skilled and unskilled labor, proportion of permanent and migratory labor, seasonal character of employment, and the like. In this connection, particular attention should be given to the amount of unemployment, which may well have a close relation to volume and so to cost of crime. It will also be desirable to investigate labor conditions generally, including customary hours of labor, the extent to

which trade unionism has made headway in the community, and any other factors with regard to the laboring population which may appear to be of importance.

8. *Wealth.*—It may be doubted whether the total or per capita wealth of a community has any substantial relation to crime; but it may well be that the distribution of wealth in the community does have such a relation. An effort should be made to secure data as to the extent of destitution, pauperism, low-wage groups, and poverty generally in the community. In this connection, prevailing wage rates for the principal forms of employment which the community offers will be of interest. It should be borne in mind, however, that wage rates by themselves are not of significance unless accompanied by data as to regularity of employment so as to afford a basis for determining average annual earnings, and by data as to the relative cost of living in the community so as to afford a basis for determining real wages. Indices as to the distribution of wealth in the community, with regard to which figures should be obtained, are (a) the extent of home ownership and (b) savings bank deposits per capita.

9. *Domestic factors.*—It may be that the situation of a community with respect to the domestic relations may have some bearing on crime and the cost of suppressing it. In this connection consideration should be given to the relative number of married and single persons, average number of children per family, birth and death rates, infant mortality and divorce rate.

10. *Educational factors.*—The degree of education of the people of a community may well have a bearing on the cost of administration of criminal justice. In this connection data should be secured as to the extent of illiteracy, and, if possible, as to the proportion of the population able to secure various degrees of educational training. The per capita expenditure of the community for public schools, exclusive of capital outlays, should be secured.

11. *Machinery for the administration of criminal justice.*—The efficient and economical administration of criminal justice may depend largely on the character and organization of the machinery of administration—police, prosecution,

criminal courts, penal and corrective agencies, and the city government itself. In any case, no study of cost of administration can be intelligible unless it includes a description of the machinery of administration. Such description should briefly outline the character and organization of (a) city and county government generally; (b) police, including county and State officers exercising police functions in the community; (c) all prosecuting agencies which may act in connection with criminal offenses committed in the community; (d) the courts having criminal jurisdiction over such offenses; and (e) the institutions and agencies which carry out penal or corrective treatment of persons convicted of such offenses. This description of the machinery of administration of criminal justice should be complete, even though this involves a reference to State or other agencies, the cost of which is not being studied as part of the community investigation. In describing penal institutions, the character of cases dealt with by city, county and State institutions, respectively, should be stated.

12. *Volume of crime.*—The cost of administration of criminal justice is obviously related to the amount of crime in the community. Indeed, certain of the factors already referred to may affect that cost principally, although by no means entirely, through their effect on the volume of crime. It is therefore desirable that data as to this factor be secured.

The best theoretical index of the volume of crime in a community is the number of offenses known to the police. Data as to this factor for the first eight months of the year 1930 have been collected by the committee on uniform crime records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police for most of the cities which are to be dealt with in the proposed studies, and such collection is now being continued by the division of identification and information of the Department of Justice. The figures as to offenses known to the police include statistics as to felonious homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny (other than auto theft) and auto theft. These figures will be made available to each investigator for the community under investigation.

13. *Other factors.*—As has already been stated, the list of factors as to community conditions which may affect the cost of administering criminal justice set forth above is by no means exhaustive. In any particular community there may be other factors of equal or even greater importance. Under this head might fall, for example, particular abnormalities affecting the crime situation of the community in any particular year, such as prolonged strikes or extensive mob violence. Due consideration should be given to this possibility, and the existence of any such factors should be reported.

14. *Minimum requirements.*—The minimum requirements with respect to community data may be summarized as follows:

- (1) Geographical location.
- (2) Population and population density.
- (3) Racial composition, including:
 - (a) Distribution by race and nativity.
 - (b) Distribution of foreign-born persons and persons of foreign parentage by national origins.
- (c) Distribution of foreign-born as between aliens and naturalized citizens.
- (4) Distribution by sex and by age groups.
- (5) Industrial conditions.
- (6) Labor conditions, including extent of unemployment.
- (7) Wealth, including:
 - (a) Proportion of home ownership.
 - (b) Savings bank deposits.
- (8) Domestic factors, including:
 - (a) Proportion of married and single persons.
 - (b) Average number of children per family.
 - (c) Birth and death rates.
 - (d) Infant mortality.
 - (e) Divorce rate.
- (9) Educational factors, including:
 - (a) Proportion of illiteracy.
 - (b) Per capita expenditure for public schools.
- (10) Description of machinery of administration of criminal justice.
- (11) Volume and kind of crime.

The data as to these various factors will vary in accuracy, but in all cases should be capable of objective determination. In each case the investigator should give a careful explanation of the sources from which, and manner in which, the particular data were secured. (As to sources of information with regard to community data, see Ch. VIII, sec. 1, *infra*.)

15. *Additional topics for investigation.*—The requirements discussed in the preceding paragraph are, it must constantly be remembered, minimum requirements. A resourceful investigator may well go much further and develop additional data of significance and value. Among possible topics for further investigation may be mentioned:

- (1) Form and efficiency of municipal government, especially with relation to police, prosecution, and the criminal courts.
- (2) Condition and history of local politics as affecting the form and efficiency of municipal government.
- (3) Prestige of police and lower criminal courts.
- (4) Available social-service agencies.
- (5) Activities of police in crime-prevention work.
- (6) Activities of private agencies generally in preventing crime and rehabilitating criminals.

This list of topics is suggestive merely. A careful and thorough investigator will no doubt wish to consider other topics.

III

DATA AS TO THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. *General.*—The administration of criminal justice includes the prevention and detection of crime, the prosecution and trial of criminals, and the penal and/or corrective treatment of those convicted. The function of prevention and detection is ordinarily carried out by police agencies; the function of prosecution by prosecutors' or State attorneys' offices; the function of trial by the criminal courts, and the function of penal and/or corrective treatment by penal institutions and/or probation and parole agencies. Each of these agencies is dealt with in detail in the follow-

ing chapters, and the particular elements of cost involved in each discussed.

There are, however, certain basic problems which will be dealt with in this chapter. These are (a) the problem of allocation of costs as between these activities of governmental agencies which are concerned with crime and those which are not; (b) the problem of allocating to urban communities their proper share of county and State costs; (c) the problem of dealing with capital expenditures by governmental agencies in connection with criminal administration; (d) the problem of the proper treatment of receipts in connection with the administration of criminal justice, and (e) the question of the period of time to be covered by the investigations.

2. *Allocation of costs as between criminal and non-criminal activities.*—Certain of the agencies engaged in administering criminal justice also have other functions. This is particularly true, in many communities, of the courts, and also, to some extent, of the police. In a great many communities the same courts handle civil and criminal cases, so that the entire cost of court administration can not be charged against the cost of administering criminal justice. Similarly, certain of the functions of the police are administrative, such as controlling traffic, administering licensing ordinances, and the like, and only a part of such functions (although a large part) are directly related to crime. In situations like these the problem arises of allocating costs as between the criminal and noncriminal activities of the particular agency.

The correct solution of this problem of allocation is of vital importance to the accuracy of the results reached by the various studies. Certain methods of allocation are suggested in this manual (see Chs. IV to VII, inclusive); but these methods may require modification to adapt them to particular circumstances. In every case, the investigator's report should describe in detail the method of allocation used and the reasons for using it.

3. *Allocation of costs of State and county agencies.*—Certain of the criminal law-enforcement activities in the ordinary city are carried out entirely by municipal agen-

cies. This is ordinarily true of the major part of the police work of the city, of the work of the municipal courts, and of the detention of prisoners in city jails. It may also be true of certain probation activities. Other law-enforcement activities, however, including some of major importance, are carried out by State or county agencies. Here will ordinarily be included most of the work of prosecution, at least for major offenses, and the activities of the superior criminal courts. In such cases it is necessary to allocate the cost of each agency as between those activities primarily concerned with the administration of criminal justice in the city itself and those which have reference to such administration outside the city.

The costs ordinarily borne directly by the county include the cost of prosecution for major offenses, in many cases the cost of maintaining the superior criminal courts, and frequently the cost of probation. There may be also included the cost of penal treatment of minor offenders, but not usually of major offenders. The police activities of the county sheriff also fall in this category, but in practice these are very seldom of importance as far as large cities are concerned. Where it becomes necessary to make an allocation of costs of this character, the most satisfactory basis, if practicable, will be the relative contribution of the city and of the portion of the county outside the city to the county budget. If for any reason such information is not available, some other and less accurate basis may have to be used, as for example, a pro rata allocation on the basis of relative population. In any case, the investigator's report should describe in detail the method of allocation used and the reasons for using it.

The costs ordinarily borne directly by the State, without direct allocation to city or county, include the cost of State police, in rare instances costs of prosecution, sometimes part of the cost of the superior criminal courts, frequently the cost of probation and parole, and habitually the cost of penal treatment of major offenses. For reasons outlined more fully later (Ch. VII, sec. 1), no attempt will be made in the city studies to take account of State costs of penal treatment. In most cases, moreover, it will probably be found that the

activities of the State police within the city itself are negligible. Accordingly, the problem of allocation will ordinarily arise, if at all, only with respect to court, probation, and parole costs. If it proves necessary to allocate such costs, it may be possible to do so on a basis analogous to that suggested above for the allocation of county costs; viz, the relative contributions to the State budget of the city and of the remainder of the State. If this is impracticable (as may be the case, for example, where State funds are raised principally by an income or other similar tax), it may be necessary to resort to an allocation on the basis of relative population or on some other basis which will be applicable to local conditions. Here again the investigator's report should describe in detail the method of allocation used and the reason for using it.

4. *Capital expenditures.*—The budgets or reports of expenditures of many cities do not make that segregation between operating expenses and capital expenditures which is necessarily made by private enterprises. Thus, the investigator may well find that the report of police expenditures for the year includes the cost of a new police station and of a new patrol wagon. Similarly, the county budget may include, as part of the expense of maintaining the courts, the cost of a new courthouse; and, as part of the expense of maintaining the county jail, the cost of adding a new story to the old jail building. It would be obviously misleading to include the entire amount of large capital expenditures as part of the cost of administering criminal justice for a single year. In the first instance, therefore, capital expenditures, *i. e.*, expenditures for buildings or equipment which will last two years or more, should be eliminated.

It must be recognized, however, that the complete elimination of all such capital expenditures, with no adjustment therefor, does not present a wholly accurate picture. Whether the money necessary for investment in permanent structures by municipal corporations is obtained by borrowing or by taxation, a carrying charge on the cost of such investments should be included in annual costs if a fair distribution of such costs as between different city

activities is to be made. While it may be sound financial policy for a city to raise by annual taxation the funds necessary for public improvements (other than unusual ones which would increase the budget requirements of a particular year unduly), thus avoiding interest charges on borrowed money, there must be, as between different departments of the city government, some adjustment to avoid showing an abnormal annual expenditure for a particular department in a particular year. Thus, if a city spends \$50,000 in 1927 on a new schoolhouse, \$50,000 in 1928 on street improvements and \$50,000 in 1929 on a new police station, it may well be desirable to raise the funds for each annual expenditure by taxation, so that there will be no interest charge in fact; but it would be obviously erroneous either to include the \$50,000 spent in 1929 as part of the cost of the police department for that year, or to eliminate it entirely from such cost. This difficulty may be met by including as part of the cost of police for such year an appropriate carrying charge on such capital expenditure.

While it is recognized that in some cases it may be impossible, due to the absence of adequate municipal records, to compute carrying charges on capital investment, it is desirable that this be done wherever reasonably practicable. Where it proves to be practicable to compute such charges, the following principles should be adhered to in making the computation:

In determining the amount of the carrying charge on capital investment for any given year two elements must be considered, (a) the cost of the capital investment involved, and (b) the percentage rate of the carrying charge. The first element must, of course, be separately determined in each particular case. With regard to the second, however, this manual lays down definite standards to insure uniformity.

The cost of property of relatively permanent character used in connection with the administration of criminal justice in the community should be secured in each case, provided this can be done with a reasonable degree of accuracy. If this is impossible, the report should so state.

In determining the percentage to be applied in computing the annual carrying charge on permanent investment,

two factors must be considered—depreciation and interest. Each of these factors must be worked out separately.

Although a municipal corporation, unlike a private enterprise, ordinarily does not charge off depreciation on its permanent plant, it is necessary to allow therefor in order to arrive at the true cost of administration. The rate of depreciation to be used depends upon the normal useful life of the property in question. For the purposes of these studies the following useful lives and depreciation rates should be used:

Type of property	Useful life	Depreciation rate
	Years	Per cent
Brick or stone buildings.....	50	2
Wooden buildings.....	25	4
Machinery.....	10	10
Furniture and fixtures.....	5	20
Motor equipment.....	3	33½

Interest, unlike depreciation, is to be computed at the same rate on all capital investments. It may be assumed that a large city can ordinarily borrow money at a rate not to exceed 4½ per cent per annum. Accordingly a uniform interest of 4½ per cent of the total capital investment, plus depreciation thereon computed as above specified, will be regarded as representing the annual cost of such investment, and such annual investment cost should, where ascertainable, be reported in connection with the respective annual operating costs of the agencies of administration to which the particular capital investment pertain, being in all cases shown separately.

In cases where it is impossible, either because of the complete absence of records or because of the unsatisfactory character of the records available, to work out carrying charges on capital investment in the manner just described, a determination can and should be made of the average expenditures for equipment for the period of 5 years ending with the year for which the cost figures are being determined. This is desirable for two reasons: (a) it will provide an approximation to the appropriate depreciation charge on equipment; and (b) it will insure the elimination of abnormal expenditures for equipment items during

the year under investigation which should be eliminated as capital outlays, but which, due to faulty records, might not otherwise be detected as such. This 5-year average for equipment should be determined as well in cases where it is possible to determine carrying charges thereon as in cases where this is impossible. In either case, the average figure for equipment should be reported as a separate item.

5. *Treatment of receipts.*—To a certain extent, although ordinarily to rather a slight extent, the machinery of the administration of justice may be made to appear to pay its own way. The most usual example of this is the collection of fines. The question thus arises as to how such receipts of moneys in respect of the administration of justice are to be treated.

Statutory and ordinance provisions usually provide that fines and penalties shall be covered into the State or municipal treasury as miscellaneous receipts, or sometimes to the credit of special funds, as school or highway funds. In some cases, however, such receipts may be regarded by particular communities as credits against the cost of administering criminal justice. This is not regarded as a sound view, since fines and penalties, as distinguished from license fees and the like, are intended primarily as a punishment and not as a source of revenue. Moreover, to treat fines and penalties as credits against the cost of administration of justice tends to imply that the larger the amount collected in fines the more advantageous the situation to the taxpaying public, whereas the reverse may well be the case.

Accordingly fines, penalties and other moneys received in connection with the administration of criminal justice will not be treated as credits against the costs thereof. However, the amounts of fines and penalties collected should be reported.

The same principles should be applied in dealing with moneys received by penal institutions from the labor of prisoners, the sale of prison-made goods, etc. If there are such receipts, they should be separately reported, but should not be deducted from the cost of administration of the institution. When receipts from the sale of prison-made goods are reported, care should be taken to see that the cost

of the raw materials used has been duly deducted so as to give the actual gross profit. If it appears that the inmates of a penal institution are engaged in work for the benefit of the State or city, that fact should be reported, although no attempt need be made to estimate the money value of such work.

There is, however, a class of receipts by penal institutions which should be treated as credits against the cost of administration of such institutions, viz, amounts paid by other cities, counties, or States, or by the Federal Government, as compensation to the institution for confining prisoners. If there are receipts of this character, the amount thereof should be ascertained and deducted from the cost of administration of the institution. In some cases, it may be found that the State subsidizes not only the confinement of State prisoners from outside the city, but also certain classes of prisoners from the city itself. If this is the case, the amount of such subsidy and the exact circumstances under which it is paid should be reported, stated separately, but should not be deducted from the cost of administration of the institution.

6. *Period for investigation.*—The minimum period of investigation should be the 5-year period beginning January 1, 1926, and ending December 31, 1930; and the basic figures, without allocation between criminal and noncriminal activities, or of county or State costs, should be ascertained for each year of that period. The computation of cost chargeable to the administration of criminal justice should be for the calendar year 1930. Only in this computation need allocations of cost between criminal and noncriminal functions, and between city, county, and State administrations, be made. Pay rolls, tax budgets, court records, etc., used as a basis for such allocations should be for the year 1930. Following each statement of allocated costs, a tabulation should be included in the report, setting forth the basic figures for the five years beginning January 1, 1926, and ending December 31, 1930. (As to the procedure to be followed in the case of cities having a fiscal year which does not correspond with the calendar year, see Ch. VIII, sec. 6, *infra*.) Any marked changes in the expenditures for any

item from one year to another during the 5-year period should be explained by notes stating whether they are the result of changes of organization, function, fiscal year, or other circumstances.

It is hoped that it may be possible in many cases to expand the studies to cover the 5-year period from January 1, 1926, to December 31, 1930, and in some cases the 10-year period from January 1, 1921, to December 31, 1930, by developing complete figures which include allocations of cost and so give the actual variations over such periods of the cost of administration of criminal justice for the city studied. There is no objection to covering a still longer period; indeed, this would be very desirable. If a period of five years or more is covered, the community data referred to in Chapter II of this manual should be ascertained at 5-year intervals, at least. By covering a considerable period, it may be possible in many cases to obtain worthwhile correlations between population and the cost of administering criminal justice over the period studied, and, perhaps, correlations between other community factors and such cost. This will add greatly to the value and significance of any study, and it is hoped that it may be done in many cases.

IV

COST OF POLICE

1. *General.*—One of the major elements of the cost of the administration of criminal justice in any city is the expense incurred in connection with the prevention and detection of crime. Generally speaking, crime prevention and detection are functions of the police force of the city. In some cases part of this activity may be carried on by State police or other State law-enforcement agencies, or by county officials, such as the sheriff; but, except under unusual circumstances, such activities are negligible, and, if so, may be disregarded. There are also certain law-enforcement activities in the various cities which are carried on by officials of the Federal Government, particularly in connection with the attempted enforcement of the prohibition law and of antinarcotic legislation. The cost of such Fed-

eral activities should be disregarded for purposes of the studies here contemplated, as they fall outside the scope of the present investigation. It follows that the only cost of the prevention and detection of crime to be considered in connection with these studies, at least in most cities, will be that of the city police force.

While the primary reason for maintaining a police force is the prevention, suppression, and detection of crime, and while the very fact that the force exists is a potent factor in crime prevention, it is nevertheless true that certain activities carried on by the police are primarily administrative in their nature. It will be desirable, in order to secure the most accurate results, that an allocation be made as between the administrative and the criminal-law-enforcement activities of each police department. The problem before the investigator, as far as police costs are concerned, therefore resolves itself into (a) the determination from the available records of the actual cost of the police force of the city being studied and (b) the allocation of such cost as between those activities of the police force which are primarily concerned with the prevention and detection of crime, and its administrative activities.

2. *Elements of cost.*—The operating expenses of the police department of any city may be divided into the three main classifications of pay roll, expenditures for supplies and repairs, and general overhead. The first of these items will be by far the largest. The second will include all non-capital expenditures for the supply and upkeep of the department, and the third, such items as pensions, rent of buildings or other property not owned by the city, and other miscellaneous charges.

In dealing with the allocation of pay roll, separate attention should be given to the detective force, the traffic force, the uniformed patrolmen, special forces, license bureaus, and the supervisory force of the police department.

3. *Detective force.*—The entire pay roll of the detective force of any police department will, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, be wholly chargeable to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

4. *Traffic force.*—The problem of regulating traffic is largely an administrative one. It is true that traffic police-

men frequently make arrests and from time to time have to do with the enforcement of the criminal law; but these activities are incidental and not primary. The pay roll of the traffic force should therefore be segregated, and deducted in determining the cost of the administration of criminal justice.

5. *Patrolmen.*—The primary purpose of the activities of the uniformed patrolmen of the police force is the prevention, suppression and detection of crime. Any administrative activities of the uniformed force must be regarded as secondary. Accordingly, it will be proper to treat the entire pay roll of the uniformed force as part of the cost of the administration of criminal justice.

6. *Special forces.*—In many cities there are special forces or squads in the police department carrying on specialized activities. Thus, it is common to have vice squads, special squads concerned with the enforcement of the prohibition law, special squads detailed to cooperate with the district attorney's office, and the like. Where such special forces exist, the allocation of the pay roll of the policemen assigned thereto must be determined by an analysis of the nature of the activities of the particular special squad or force. It is probable that in most cases these activities will be found to have to do with the administration of criminal justice.

7. *License bureaus.*—In many cities the police department carries on such activities as the licensing of taxicab drivers, hackmen, peddlers, etc. These activities have little directly to do with the prevention and detection of crime, and the pay roll of license and similar bureaus should be segregated and deducted in determining the cost of administration of criminal justice.

8. *Supervisory force.*—There will in all cases be a certain general supervisory force in any police department. For purposes of this study, the supervisory force will not be regarded as including officials whose activities relate solely to the supervision of one of the branches of the police department described in the preceding sections. Thus, the chief of detectives, while a supervisory official, would be counted as part of the detective force; precinct captains

would be counted as a part of the uniformed patrol force; and so on. The term "supervisory force" as here used refers only to officials who have general supervision over all or several aspects of the police activities of a city, and the clerks and assistants to such officials. The compensation of such supervisory officers should be allocated in accordance with the allocation of pay roll of the police officers under the particular official's jurisdiction. Thus, if the supervisory force to be considered is the office of the chief of police, and if it appears, for example, that 80 per cent of the pay roll of the police force generally is to be charged to the cost of administration of criminal justice, then 80 per cent of the pay roll of the office of the chief of police should be similarly charged.

9. *Allocation of overhead.*—Expenditures for supplies (other than major equipment, cf. sec. 10), for repairs, and for items of general overhead (pensions, rent, etc.) should be allocated in the same manner as expenses for the supervisory force unless it appears in any particular instance that particular supplies have been purchased, particular repairs made, or particular general overhead costs incurred, for the purposes of a particular branch of the police department. In such case an appropriate adjustment should be made.

10. *Capital investment.*—The principal capital items to be considered in studying police costs will be headquarters and precinct buildings, furniture and fixtures, and motor equipment. The appropriate annual carrying charge on such capital items should, if reasonably practicable, be developed, and should be separately reported. The average annual expenditure for equipment over the 5-year period ending with the year being studied should be ascertained in all cases, and separately reported. (See Ch. III, sec. 4, supra.) The annual carrying charge on capital items, when ascertained, will be allocated in the same manner as general overhead. In any case, care should be taken to eliminate from annual costs capital outlays made during the year. Such minor items as revolvers, uniforms, etc., should be treated as supplies rather than capital expenditures.

11. *Minimum requirements.*—The minimum requirements for this study may be summarized as follows:

(1) Police department pay roll, divided among detective force, traffic force, patrolmen, special forces, license bureaus, and supervisory force, and showing the number and salaries of the policemen in each group.

(2) Expenditures for (a) supplies and repairs, and (b) general overhead.

(3) Annual carrying charge on capital investment if ascertainable; and five-year average of expenditures for equipment.

(4) Allocation of pay roll as between administrative activities (traffic force, license bureaus, etc.) and criminal justice activities.

(5) Similar allocations of expenditures for supplies, general overhead, and annual carrying charges on capital investment (if computed).

In all cases a definite statement of the basis for and method of computing carrying charges, where computed, and of allocating costs, should be included, together with a statement of the sources of information utilized.

12. *Additional topics for investigation.*—The investigator is urged to develop any further information and to pursue any further investigation which may be deemed desirable. Examples of possible topics for investigation are:

(1) Extent to which the police department devotes its time to various types of activities, such as prohibition enforcement, enforcement of building inspection laws, suppression of crimes of violence and fraud, etc.

(2) Time lost by members of the police force in attending court as witnesses.

(3) Analysis of the reasons for variations in police costs over the period being studied.

Other topics of investigation will no doubt suggest themselves to the investigator as the study progresses.

V

COST OF PROSECUTION

1. *General.*—In the ordinary case, at least, part of the cost of the prosecution of criminals in any city will be borne by the county or State rather than directly by the city itself. Regardless of this fact, such cost of prosecution is properly allocable to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the city, and should be so treated even though paid by the county or State. The allocation of cost in the case of county or State paid prosecutors should be worked out as heretofore indicated. (Ch. III, sec. 3, supra.)

As far as allocation of cost as between criminal law enforcement and other activities is concerned, it will probably be found that, subject to the qualifications referred to hereafter (sec. 3), all costs of prosecution are part of the cost of administration of criminal justice, so that no allocation will be necessary.

2. *Elements of cost.*—The principal element of cost of prosecution is the salaries of prosecutors, assistant prosecutors, and clerical help. There will also be in most cases some expenditures for supplies, possibly some general overhead, and some annual carrying charges on capital investment. These latter classes of expenditures and charges need not be allocated as between criminal law enforcement and other activities unless it becomes necessary to allocate the pay roll, in which case such allocation should be made on the same basis as for the pay roll.

3. *Civil activities.*—In some cases the prosecutor's office may have certain civil activities. Thus, for example, the district attorney may be called upon to conduct civil litigation on behalf of the city or State. In such case it will be necessary to ascertain the proportion of time spent by the prosecutor's office on civil and criminal matters and to make an allocation of cost on that basis.

4. *Detective activities.*—Many prosecutors' officers have an investigative force, sometimes detailed from the police and sometimes independent, which functions in the pre-

vention and detection of crime. Logically, such expenditures, even if carried out by an independent investigative force, should be segregated from the head of prosecution and placed under the head of police; but it is not believed that any practical purpose will be served by doing so in the ordinary case. The cost of such activities is, of course, part of the cost of administering criminal justice, so that no allocation need be made in respect thereof. It will be desirable to report such costs separately, although including them in the total for the cost of prosecution, unless, of course, they have already been included as part of the police cost. The cost of the coroner's office, although bearing some relation to both police and prosecution, need not be ascertained or included as part of the cost of administration of criminal justice.

5. *Public defenders.*—In some cities the cost of a public defender whose duty is to defend indigent persons accused of crime is borne by the public. Such cost is, of course, part of the public cost of administering criminal justice. While in a sense directly antithetical to the cost of prosecution, it is obviously related thereto. In cities where the public-defender system has been adopted, the cost thereof should be ascertained in connection with the study of the cost of prosecution, although the amount of such cost should be separately stated and should not be included in cost of prosecution.

6. *Capital investment.*—The capital items to be considered in studying prosecution costs will in all probability be confined to buildings and furniture and fixtures. Ordinarily, the prosecutor's office will occupy part of a building only, and it will therefore be necessary to allocate to the cost of prosecution part of the carrying charge on the entire building, if ascertainable, on the basis of space occupied by that office. A 5-year average for expenditures for equipment should be computed in any case. (See Ch. III, sec. 4, supra.)

7. *Minimum requirements.*—The minimum requirements for the study of the cost of prosecution may be summarized as follows:

(1) Pay roll of the prosecutor's office or prosecutors' offices, showing number and salaries of prosecuting officers.

(2) Expenditures for supplies and general overhead.

(3) Annual carrying charge on capital investment, if ascertainable; and 5-year average of expenditures for equipment.

(4) Allocation as between civil and criminal activities of the prosecutor's office, where necessary.

(5) Cost of public defender's office, if one exists, including number and salary of officers.

In all cases the sources of information should be given, and, where there has been an allocation of cost, the basis on which it was made.

8. *Additional topics for investigation.*—The investigator is urged to develop any further information and to pursue any further investigation which may be found desirable. Examples of possible topics for investigation are:

(1) Extent to which the prosecutor's office devotes its time to various types of activities, such as prohibition enforcement, enforcement of building inspection laws, suppression of crimes of violence and fraud, etc.

(2) Analysis of the reasons for variations in expense over the period being studied.

(3) Analysis of the cost of the coroner's office as related to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

Other topics of investigation will no doubt suggest themselves to the investigator as the study progresses.

VI

COST OF THE CRIMINAL COURTS

1. *General.*—In most cities some of the courts having criminal jurisdiction are supported directly by the city and some are supported by the county or State. For the purposes of these studies, the cost of both classes of courts, in so far as they deal with cases arising in the city which is being studied, is properly to be charged to the cost of administration of criminal justice in the city, and both classes of costs must be included in the study. In the case of courts supported by the county or State, the proportionate cost chargeable to the city should be worked out as already indicated. (See Ch. III, sec. 3, supra.)

The problem of determining the court cost of the administration of criminal justice will be comparatively simple in those cities which have separate criminal courts. This, however, is by no means the universal rule. In many cases the same courts exercise both civil and criminal jurisdiction, so that, in many instances, an allocation of cost will be essential.

2. *Elements of cost.*—The principal element of the cost of the criminal courts is that of salaries, including those of judges, clerks, marshals, and court attendants. There is also to be considered the item of jurors' and witnesses' fees. In addition, there will be some expenditures for supplies, probably some general overhead, and certain annual charges in respect of capital investment.

3. *Courts with purely criminal jurisdiction.*—In the case of courts with purely criminal jurisdiction, no allocation will be necessary with respect to salaries. If a criminal court is housed in the same building and supplied from the same storeroom as other courts or agencies, an allocation in respect of supplies and general overhead may be necessary, and should be made as indicated in section 6 of this chapter. (See also sec. 7, *infra.*)

4. *Courts with both civil and criminal jurisdiction.*—The most serious difficulty will arise in cases where the same court exercises both civil and criminal jurisdiction. In such cases an appropriate basis of allocation will be the relative time spent by the court on civil and on criminal matters. This probably can not be determined with precise exactness; but a satisfactory approximation can be reached by considering the relative number of weeks per year that the court sits on civil and on criminal cases. In particular instances, other methods of allocation may have to be worked out. Salaries, supplies and general overhead should all be allocated on the same basis.

5. *Juvenile courts.*—The jurisdiction of juvenile courts varies considerably. Some are concerned only with dealing with delinquent children, while others have jurisdiction over domestic-relations questions, over dependent or neglected children, etc., and may in some cases exercise purely administrative functions, such as, for example, the

administration of mothers' aid laws. In the former case, the entire cost of the juvenile court may be included in the cost of administering criminal justice. In the latter case, an allocation should be made on the basis of the relative time spent by the court on delinquency cases on the one hand and on domestic-relations cases and administrative and other noncriminal matters on the other.

6. *Allocation of overhead.*—This problem arises principally when several courts of different jurisdiction draw supplies from a common source or occupy space in the same building. The allocation of expenditures for supplies should be on the basis of supplies actually used, or, if this is not ascertainable, on the basis of the number of judges in each class of court. Allocation of rent should be on the basis of the relative amount of floor space used.

7. *Capital investment.*—The principal items of capital investment to be considered in the case of the criminal courts will be buildings and furniture and fixtures. A 5-year average of expenditures for equipment should be secured in all cases. Where a criminal court occupies space in a building also used by other courts or agencies, the annual carrying charge on the building, where ascertainable, should be allocated proportionately to the relative amount of floor space used. (See Ch. III, sec. 4, *supra.*)

8. *Minimum requirements.*—The minimum requirements with respect to the cost of the criminal courts may be summarized as follows:

(1) Analysis in detail of salary expense allocable to the criminal work of the courts, including number and salaries of judges.

(2) Analysis of expenditures for supplies and general overhead allocable to the criminal work of the courts.

(3) Analysis of annual carrying charge on capital investment allocable to the criminal work of the courts, where ascertainable; and 5-year average of expenditures for equipment so allocable.

In each case the cost for each court exercising criminal jurisdiction should be worked out separately, and the basis for allocating costs as between the civil and criminal activities of each court should be fully stated.

9. *Additional topics for investigation.*—The following additional topics for investigation may be suggested:

- (1) Analysis of the effect upon the cost of the criminal courts of giving to those courts particular types of jurisdiction, such as that over domestic relations, prohibition, etc.
- (2) Study of the cost of time lost by jurors in criminal cases.
- (3) Study of the cost of time lost by witnesses in criminal cases.
- (4) Amount of fines collected and analysis of the disposition thereof.

Other topics of investigation will no doubt suggest themselves to the investigator as the study progresses.

VII

COST OF PENAL AND CORRECTIVE TREATMENT

1. *General.*—The postconviction treatment of criminals may be divided into penal treatment and corrective treatment. Under penal treatment is included, in general, the confinement of prisoners in penitentiaries and other penal institutions. Under corrective treatment is included, in general, attempts to rehabilitate convicted criminals without penal treatment, particularly by the use of probation. It must be remembered, of course, that under modern systems of prison administration, penal treatment involves a considerable amount of corrective activities. Parole is an instrument of corrective treatment which differs from probation in that it is made use of after a certain period of penal treatment. The cost of both penal and corrective treatment is obviously to be included in the cost of the administration of criminal justice.

In most cities a certain amount of penal and corrective treatment is carried out by the city itself. In the case of serious crimes, however, punishment is ordinarily by confinement in a State-supported penitentiary or other State institution. Such State institutions contain criminals from all over the State, so that an allocation of the institutional cost to the criminals from a particular city in the State would be a very difficult task for the investigator in an in-

dividual city. For this reason, and also because substantially complete figures as to State institutions are already available, the present studies need not take account of this element of the cost of administering criminal justice, but, so far as penal and corrective treatment is concerned, may confine themselves to such treatment as is carried out in the cities themselves.

The penal and corrective activities of the cities fall into two principal classes, (a) those carried out by penal institutions, and (b) probation and parole activities. With respect to the former, the institutions to be considered may be classified generally as jails, workhouses, and other institutions. In the case of jails, a considerable number of the prisoners will be persons awaiting trial on criminal charges; and there may also be some persons held in default of bail as witnesses in criminal cases. The jail expenses incident to the confinement of both these classes of persons (although not, strictly speaking, part of the cost of penal treatment of convicted offenders, but rather more analogous to police costs) are obviously a part of the cost of administration of criminal justice, and for the sake of convenience may be dealt with here. In some cases there may also be civil prisoners, incarcerated either as a result of civil arrest (in jurisdictions where this is permitted) or as a result of contempt proceedings in equity (and more especially divorce) cases. The expenses incident to the confinement of those persons can not, of course, be allocated to the cost of the administration of criminal justice.

In many instances city prisoners are confined in county penal institutions. In that case an allocation of cost between county and city must be made on the basis already indicated. (See Ch. III, sec. 3, *supra*.) Similar allocation may be necessary in the case of county-administered probation or parole activities.

2. *Elements of cost in penal institutions.*—The principal elements of operating cost in penal institutions are the salaries of the wardens, guards and other members of the staff; the cost of subsistence; and supplies and general overhead. There will in most cases be substantial carrying charges on account of capital investment.

It may be that in some instances the figures as to annual costs in the case of penal institutions will include amounts expended for materials and supplies used in the manufacture of prison-made goods. It is important that the investigator ascertain in each case whether or not this is the fact; and if so, the cost of such materials and supplies should be eliminated. Similarly, there should be eliminated from the annual carrying charge on capital investment, where ascertained, such amount thereof, if any, as accrues in respect of machinery or other equipment used in the manufacture of such goods. (As to receipts by penal institutions, see Ch. III, sec. 5, supra.)

Where allocation as between civil and other prisoners is necessary, it should be made on the basis of the relative number of each class of prisoners.

3. *Jails*.—Allocation as between different classes of prisoners is more likely to be necessary in the case of jails than in the cases of other penal institutions, since jails are frequently used for the confinement of civil prisoners as well as known or suspected criminals. In some cities separate jails may be maintained for civil prisoners. In that case the expense of these jails may be eliminated entirely in ascertaining the cost of administration of criminal justice.

4. *Workhouses*.—In most if not all cases, city workhouses will be penal institutions pure and simple, and will not contain civil prisoners. In consequence, the total expense of maintaining such institutions will be chargeable to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

5. *Other institutions*.—In some cities other penal or corrective institutions exist. In this class fall homes for delinquent children and similar institutions. Where delinquent young children, or (as is frequently the case) delinquent girls, are taken care of in private institutions, the expense of such care should be included in the cost of administering criminal justice only in case such institutions receive support from the public treasury, and then only to the extent of such support.

Institutions for the insane or feeble-minded should not be included in ascertaining the cost of administration of criminal justice, even though some of the inmates of such institutions may be criminal insane.

6. *Probation*.—The cost of probation may, generally speaking, be treated in its entirety as a part of the cost of administration of criminal justice. This is true of the probation departments attached to juvenile courts as well as of those attached to the criminal courts proper. It may be, however, that in some cases probation departments handle domestic-relations cases, and to the extent that this is true a pro rata part of the cost thereof should be eliminated in determining the cost of administration of criminal justice.

7. *Parole*.—The cost of parole activities is in its entirety part of the cost of administration of criminal justice. In some instances probation and parole activities may be combined. If such is the case, they may be dealt with together in studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice.

8. *Capital investment*.—In the case of penal institutions, the element of capital investment will be of especial importance by reason of its magnitude and variety, and should be ascertained if reasonably practicable. Thus, capital items may include buildings, a wide variety of furniture and fixtures, motor equipment and shop machinery. The principles to be followed in determining such investment and the annual charge in respect thereof will, however, be no different from those already discussed. (See Ch. III, sec. 4, supra.)

In the case of probation and parole agencies, the matter will be much simpler. The discussion of capital investment in connection with prosecution costs (Ch. V, sec. 6) will be applicable here with slight modifications.

9. *Minimum requirements*.—The minimum requirements with respect to the cost of penal and corrective treatment may be summarized as follows:

(1) Analysis of the cost of maintaining each penal institution involved, including number and salaries of wardens, guards, etc., and number of prisoners.

(2) Where necessary, allocation of the cost of maintaining such institutions as between criminal and civil prisoners.

(3) Detailed cost of probation agencies, including number and salaries of probation officers and number of persons on probation.

(4) Detailed cost of parole agencies, including number and salaries of parole officers and number of persons on parole.

In all cases the sources of information, and, where there has been an allocation of cost, the basis of that allocation should be fully stated.

10. *Additional topics for investigation.*—The following additional topics for investigation may be suggested:

(1) Amount of receipts by penal institutions, such as receipts from sales of prison-made goods, contract prison labor, etc.

(2) Analysis of the disposition of such receipts.

(3) Discussion of the soundness of such method of disposing of receipts.

(4) Relative number of persons confined for various offenses, such as crimes of violence and fraud, violations of the prohibition law, domestic-relations offenses, etc.

Other topics of investigation will no doubt suggest themselves to the investigator as the study progresses.

VIII

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. *Community data.*—A large part of the community data discussed in Chapter II of this manual is obtainable from the United States census. This is true of the data as to population and population density, racial composition, sex and age distribution, unemployment, married and single adults, average size of family, divorce rate and illiteracy. (See Ch. II, sec. 14, items (2), (3), (4), (6), (8), (a), (8) (b), (8) (e), and (9) (a), supra.) These data, based on the 1930 census, will be furnished each investigator. Data as to birth and death rates and infant mortality (Ch. II, sec. 14, items (8) (c) and (8) (d), supra) will also be furnished. The remainder of the community data will have to be obtained from local sources. It is expected that a certain amount of supplementary data on industrial conditions, labor conditions, and wealth (Ch. II, sec. 14, items (5), (6), and (7), supra) may be made available to the investigators at a later date; but this possibility should not be regarded

as a reason for failing to canvass thoroughly all local sources of information. Data as to volume of crime will, as has been stated (Ch. II, sec 12, supra), be furnished each investigator.

2. *Data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice.*—The major part of the data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in any city will be found in the financial reports and in the books and records of the city, as far as police costs, the cost of municipal criminal courts, and the cost of municipal penal and corrective institutions and agencies are concerned. As far as State or county prosecutors' offices and State or county criminal courts are concerned, it will be necessary to resort to State and county reports and records. In so far as the data as to cost are obtained from published sources (financial reports, budgets, etc.), copies of such documents should accompany the report of the investigator when submitted.

3. *Financial reports.*—Most large cities publish annual financial reports, which in many instances will contain many of the figures necessary as the basis for study. These reports should be carefully analyzed, particularly with a view to verifying the accuracy of classification of the figures given and eliminating capital expenditures charged to expense. If the published reports do not give sufficient detail, the other sources referred to in section 5 of this chapter should be resorted to.

4. *Budgets.*—Most large cities prepare annual budgets. While these budgets are primarily estimates of expenditures for a future year, they ordinarily give the actual expenditures for a previous year, and to that extent will serve the same purposes as the financial reports discussed in section 3 of this chapter and may be dealt with in the same manner. Moreover, a detailed study of a city's budget may throw light on the nature, purpose, and propriety of particular expenditures referred to in financial reports. If for any reason it is desired to use the budget figures in lieu of figures which will later be available in published financial reports, it will be essential to secure data as to budget transfers and supplementary appropriations up to the end of the year in question, as such transfers and supplementary appro-

priations are very common in practice in many cities. Such use of budgets may be necessary in securing figures for the year 1930. When budget figures are so used, a statement should be included in the report showing a comparison of budget estimates and actual expenditures for the preceding two years.

5. *Other sources.*—The ultimate source of data as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in any city is the actual books of account of the city; or, in the case of State or county prosecutors' offices, penal or corrective agencies, and courts, the books of account of the county or State. Where published financial reports are not complete, resort should be had to the original records.

6. *Period covered by financial reports and budgets.*—A considerable number of cities do not keep their accounts on the calendar-year basis. Some of them, following the example of the Federal Government, operate on the basis of a fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 30. Others have various fiscal years, differing widely from each other. In the case of cities which do not operate on a calendar-year basis, it will be necessary either (a) to secure the exact figures for the respective parts of the two fiscal years which together make up the calendar year for which the data are to be secured, or (b) to work out the figures for such respective parts of such two fiscal years on a pro rata basis. The first method is to be preferred if it can be made use of without undue labor; but the second is regarded as sufficiently accurate for practical purposes. In any case, the report should state which method was used, and should give the basic figures for the fiscal years in question. In working out basic figures for the 5-year period ending December 31, 1930 (Ch. III, sec. 6), the figures for the five consecutive fiscal years ending in 1930 may be used, but the figures for 1930 used as a basis for computing the final allocated cost of administration of criminal justice should be worked out on a calendar-year basis.

7. *Sources of data for allocation of costs.*—A more serious problem than that of securing the basic financial data referred to above may well be that of securing the necessary data for the allocation of costs. This problem arises par-

ticularly with respect to the cost of the criminal courts, and may arise in some cases with respect to the cost of penal and corrective institutions. (As to the allocation of police and prosecution costs, see Ch. IV, secs. 3-10, and Ch. V, secs. 2-4, 6, supra.)

With respect to the allocation of the cost of the courts, resort to the offices of the clerks of courts having both civil and criminal jurisdiction will be necessary. It may be that records kept in the clerk's office will in each case readily indicate the relative amount of time spent by the court in question on civil and criminal cases. In any event, the basic records in the clerk's office should afford the material for making this determination.

In the case of penal and corrective institutions, the sources of information for allocation of cost as between civil and criminal prisoners will be the records in the offices of the wardens or jailers of the various institutions. In some cases the information may be contained in annual reports of those institutions, but in many instances it will probably be necessary to examine the original records.

IX

SUGGESTIONS AS TO METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

1. *Securing access to sources of information.*—In so far as studies can be made solely on the basis of published material there will be no difficulty in securing access to sources of information. Where, however, resort must be had to the original financial records of the city, county or State, or to the records or files in court clerks' or wardens' offices, the cooperation of public officials may be necessary. It is believed that those officials will be ready and willing to cooperate, especially if it is made clear that the studies are being carried out under the auspices of the commission. The investigators should exercise the utmost care not to trespass unduly on the time of public officials and not to permit the carrying out of their investigations to interfere with the ordinary work of the offices in which they are examining records.

2. *Utilization of sources.*—All possible sources of information should be utilized to the fullest extent. It is not sufficient merely to adopt the summary results frequently found in financial reports or elsewhere without further investigation. Every possible angle of approach to the problem should be considered and no possible source of data should be neglected. The discussion of possible sources in Chapter VIII of this manual is merely suggestive; the investigator is expected to discover many others.

3. *Aid to investigators.*—If the investigator finds it impossible to secure access to necessary sources, he may properly ask for the assistance of the consultants of the commission as suggested in the foreword to this manual. Such aid should be requested, however, only in the event that the investigator has exhausted every reasonable possibility of securing the desired information on his own account without such assistance.

X

FORM OF REPORTS

1. *General.*—To insure uniformity and comparability in the reports submitted to the commission by the various investigators it is desired that the form of such reports prescribed in this chapter be followed in all cases.

2. *Title.*—Each report should be entitled "Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in the City of _____, _____." It should bear the name or names of the investigator or investigators and the date of submission.

3. *Order of treatment.*—The data contained in each report should be set forth in the following order:

(1) *Data as to community.*—The first chapter of each report should contain the data as to the community outlined in Chapter II of this manual, following the order there set forth, and giving as much detail as the investigator deems advisable. This will give a general picture of the community as a background for the study.

(2) *Police costs.*—This chapter of the report should contain the minimum data as to police costs outlined in Chapter IV of this manual, together with such additional material

as the investigator may have been able to assemble on the subject.

(3) *Cost of prosecution.*—This chapter of the report should contain the minimum data as to costs of prosecution outlined in Chapter V of this manual, together with such additional material as the investigator may have been able to assemble on the subject.

(4) *Cost of the criminal courts.*—This chapter of the report should contain the minimum data as to the cost of the criminal courts outlined in Chapter VI of this manual, together with such additional material as the investigator may have been able to assemble on the subject.

(5) *Cost of penal and corrective treatment.*—This chapter of the report should contain the minimum data as to the cost of penal institutions and probation and parole agencies outlined in Chapter VII of this manual, together with such additional material as the investigator may have been able to assemble on the subject.

(6) *Summary of the cost of administration of criminal justice.*—This chapter of the report should contain a summary combining police costs, cost of prosecution, cost of the criminal courts and cost of penal and corrective treatment.

(7) *Discussion of data.*—This chapter of the report should contain such discussion of the data as to costs in the light of community conditions and other factors as the investigator may deem appropriate. It will be desirable to call attention in this section to any circumstances peculiar to the particular community which affect the cost of the administration of criminal justice. In all cases, the investigator should state the proportionate amount of the governmental expenditures by or in connection with the city which are incurred in connection with the administration of criminal justice.

(8) *Critique and constructive suggestions.*—This chapter is optional. If the investigator wishes, he may include in the report under this heading a critical examination of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the community studied, with suggestions as to how it may be diminished, or as to how it should be increased in the interest of greater efficiency. It should be borne in mind that a suggestion

looking toward an increase of expenditure may be just as sound as one looking toward a decrease. In any case, all criticisms or constructive suggestions will be confined to this section of the report.

(9) *Appendix on sources of information, and critical evaluation of data secured.*—In all cases the report should include, in the form of an appendix, a full discussion of the sources utilized and a critical analysis of the data secured. This is extremely important as affording a basis upon which the consultants of the commission can judge the accuracy of the data submitted and the validity of the conclusions reached by the various investigators.

4. *Physical form of reports.*—All reports should be submitted in typewritten form on letter-sized paper, with typing on one side of the paper only, and should be securely bound. Each report should contain a table of contents to permit ready reference to the data contained therein. Reports will be submitted in triplicate (one original and two carbons), and must be forwarded to Sidney P. Simpson, Esq., the director of the investigation, at 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y., on or before March 1, 1931.

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENTREPORT ON
THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

[Reprinted]

WASHINGTON: 1931

NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

REPORT ON
THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

Prepared by the
ROCHESTER BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1931

552c

FOREWORD

This Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, N. Y., is published as a guide to the investigators who are making studies of the cost of criminal justice for other cities in connection with the project of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement for a nation-wide study of such costs in the cities of the United States over 25,000 in population. The general scope of the project is outlined in the commission's Outline of Project for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice,¹ and details as to the information to be secured and suggestions as to methods of investigation are contained in the commission's Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities.² The present report supplements the information and suggestions given in the pamphlets above referred to, and is in a form which may be taken as a model by the investigators in other cities.

While the report of the Rochester study is thus available as a guide, it is not expected or desired that its form be followed exactly in all cases. Conditions in cities other than Rochester and in States other than New York will differ, and the set-up which has proved satisfactory for the report of the Rochester study may and undoubtedly will require substantial modification in many instances.

The principles to be followed in all the studies are outlined in the Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities in such a way as to be of general applicability, and these instructions should be adhered to in case of doubt. Nevertheless, it is believed that the form and set-up of the Rochester report can be followed in a general way in most of the other reports.

¹ Government Printing Office, Dec. 15, 1930.

² Government Printing Office, Nov. 1, 1930.

The data for the report on Rochester were collected and the report worked out for the commission by the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research. Acknowledgment is made to W. Earl Weller, Esq., director of that bureau, and to H. C. Pratt, Esq., of the staff of that bureau, who had direct charge of the study. Acknowledgment is also made to E. I. Cristy, Esq., of the Rochester bar, who assisted with advice as to legal matters.

The Rochester report, while following as closely as possible the specifications for minimum requirements for the studies set forth in the manual, departs therefrom in certain respects, and consideration must be given to this fact in using the report as a model. The following points should be noted:

(a) The 1930 census data contained in Chapter I of the Rochester report, while the same in form as the similar data to be used in other cities, consist of figures prepared for the commission by the Bureau of the Census in advance of publication, and are subject to revision. The data secured from other sources, such as the Rochester industrial survey, may not be available in identical form for other cities, but are included in this report as illustrative of the character of the data of this nature which should be sought. The descriptions of geographical location, industrial conditions, labor conditions, and the machinery for the administration of criminal justice (Ch. I, secs. 1, 5, 6, and 10, *infra*) will, of course, require modification to suit the particular circumstances in each case. Finally, the report gives the average number of persons per family (Ch. I, sec. 8 (b), *infra*) rather than the average number of children per family, as contemplated by the manual (Ch. II, secs. 9, 14 (8) (b)). This departure from the requirements of the manual is to be made in the other reports also.

(b) The data as to costs are for the year 1929, instead of for the year 1930, as desired in the case of the other reports. This is a result of the necessity of having the Rochester study made during the year 1930, and is not to be taken as indicating that the 1929 figures should be used in the other studies. Similarly, the basic 5-year figures required by the manual (Ch. III, sec. 6) are given for the

period from January 1, 1925, to December 31, 1929, rather than for the period from January 1, 1926, to December 31, 1930. Figures for the latter period should be secured by the investigators in other communities.

(c) The Rochester report gives complete figures as to carrying charges on capital investment, as well as 5-year averages of expenditures for equipment, in all cases. While these data are desired wherever they may be readily secured, the other investigators will be justified, as stated in the manual (Ch. III, sec. 4), in omitting the figures as to carrying charges on capital investment if those figures are not readily obtainable.

Additional copies of the Rochester report will be furnished to any investigator upon request.

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON,
*Director, Study of the Cost of
Administration of Criminal Justice.*

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LAW
OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1930.

CONTENTS

	Original page	Reprint page
I. Community data:		
1. Geographical location.....	1	561
2. Population and population density.....	1	561
3. Racial composition.....	2	562
4. Distribution by sex and by age groups.....	3	564
5. Industrial conditions.....	4	564
6. Employment and labor.....	6	567
7. Wealth.....	6	568
8. Domestic factors.....	7	569
9. Educational factors.....	8	570
10. Machinery for the administration of criminal justice.....	9	571
11. Volume and kind of crime.....	11	573
II. Police costs:		
1. Summary.....	11	574
2. Police pay roll.....	11	574
3. Supplies and repairs.....	15	578
4. General overhead.....	16	579
5. Capital charges.....	16	579
6. Expenditures for equipment.....	17	581
7. Receipts.....	17	581
8. Police expenditures, 1925-1929.....	17	581
III. Cost of prosecution:		
1. Summary.....	18	581
2. District attorney.....	19	583
3. Grand jury.....	19	583
4. Capital investment.....	20	584
5. Expenditures for prosecution, 1925-1929.....	20	585
6. Detailed pay-roll distribution.....	21	585
7. Public defender.....	21	586
8. Receipts.....	21	586
IV. Cost of the criminal courts:		
1. Summary.....	22	586
2. Criminal branch of the city court.....	23	588
3. County court.....	24	589
4. Children's court.....	24	590
5. Criminal and civil trial periods.....	25	590
6. Criminal court expenditures, 1925-1929.....	25	591
7. Detailed pay-roll distribution.....	26	592
V. Cost of penal and corrective treatment:		
1. Summary.....	26	593
2. City probation.....	28	594
3. County probation.....	28	595

	Original page	Reprint page
V. Cost of penal and corrective treatment—Contd.		
4. Jail.....	29	595
5. Penitentiary.....	30	596
6. Penal and corrective treatment expenditures, 1925-1929.....	31	598
7. Detailed pay-roll distribution.....	32	599
8. Number of prisoners.....	32	599
9. Parole.....	32	599
VI. Summary:		
1. Operating cost of administration of criminal justice.....	33	600
2. Additional data on the cost of administration of criminal justice.....	33	600
VII. Discussion of data:		
1. Proportion of expenditures.....	34	601
2. Omissions.....	34	602
Appendix on sources of information:		
1. Methods of investigation.....	35	602
2. Sources of information.....	36	604
3. Evaluation of data.....	37	605

TABLES

1. Population density.....	1	562
2. Race and nativity.....	2	562
3. National origins.....	2	563
4. Predominant nationalities.....	3	563
5. Citizenship of foreign born.....	3	564
6. Sex distribution.....	3	564
7. Age distribution.....	3	564
8. Occupational distribution.....	4	565
9. Principal industries.....	5	566
10. Principal mercantile establishments.....	5	567
11. Wage rates.....	6	568
12. Marital status.....	7	569
13. Birth and death rates.....	7	569
14. Infant mortality.....	7	569
15. Marriages and divorces.....	8	570
16. Divorce rate.....	8	570
17. School attendance.....	8	571
18. Illiteracy.....	9	571
19. Volume and kind of crime.....	11	574
20. Summary of police costs.....	11	574
21. Police pay-roll summary.....	12	575
22. Police pay-roll distribution.....	13	576
23. Consolidated police pay roll.....	15	578
24. Supplies and repair, police.....	15	579
25. Overhead expenses, police.....	16	579
26. Capital investment, police.....	16	580
27. Police expenditures, 1925-1929.....	17	581

	Original page	Reprint page
28. Summary of cost of prosecution.....	18	582
29. District attorney's expenditures.....	19	583
30. Grand jury expenditures.....	19	583
31. Courthouse expenses.....	20	584
32. Distribution of courthouse expenses by floor areas ..	20	584
33. Expenditures for prosecution, 1925-1929.....	21	585
34. Detailed pay-roll distribution, prosecution.....	21	586
35. Summary of cost of the criminal courts.....	22	587
36. Cost of the city court, criminal branch.....	23	588
37. Cost of the county court.....	24	589
38. Cost of the children's court.....	24	590
39. County court days spent on criminal and civil trials..	25	590
40. Expenditures for the criminal courts, 1925-1929.....	25	591
41. Detailed pay-roll distribution, criminal courts.....	26	592
42. Summary of cost of penal and corrective treatment..	26	593
43. Cost of city probation.....	28	594
44. Cost of county probation.....	28	595
45. Cost of the jail.....	29	596
46. Cost of the penitentiary.....	30	597
47. Expenditures for penal and corrective treatment, 1925-1929.....	31	598
48. Detailed pay-roll distribution, penal and corrective agencies.....	32	599
49. Summary of the operating cost of administration of criminal justice.....	33	600
50. Summary of additional data on the cost of adminis- tration of criminal justice.....	33	601
51. Proportion of criminal and other expenditures.....	34	601

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN ROCHESTER, N. Y.

I

COMMUNITY DATA

1. *Geographical location.*—Rochester (population, 328,132) is located in Monroe County (population, 423,172) in the State of New York (population, 12,619,503). It is the third largest city in the State. The city is situated on the shore of Lake Ontario. Up to the present time, however, it has had small importance as a lake port in comparison with such cities as Chicago, Toledo, Cleveland, and Buffalo. The port facilities are small and have not been used to their utmost. The harbor is not of the character of most city water fronts, but is surrounded by city parks and high-class residential developments. The city is of an isolated individual character, located 70 miles from Buffalo (population, 572,913) on the west and 90 miles from Syracuse (population, 207,277) on the east. The only suburbs of importance are East Rochester (population, 6,626) and Fairport (population, 4,586)¹ both manufacturing towns. The climate is that of a northern city. While on the international border, it is influenced only slightly by this fact, owing to the barrier imposed by Lake Ontario.

2. *Population and population density.*—Rochester had a population in 1930 of 328,132 persons, distributed geographically as follows:²

¹ All population figures from United States census, 1930.

² United States census, 1930.

TABLE 1.—Population density

Ward	Character	Area in acres	Population	Population density (persons per acre)
1	Business	90	1,303	15.14
2	do	140	2,100	14.54
3	Mixed	281	7,780	27.71
4	Business	101	4,142	25.73
5	do	320	9,870	30.20
6	Mixed	461	7,172	15.00
7	Business	164	5,847	37.07
8	Mixed	200	14,548	48.65
9	do	242	7,374	30.47
10	Residential	3,202	34,122	10.66
11	do	314	11,717	37.32
12	do	727	17,518	24.09
13	do	214	5,027	23.48
14	do	2,220	20,500	9.24
15	do	300	9,351	26.08
16	do	228	9,091	42.51
17	do	1,434	25,926	18.07
18	do	1,732	30,761	21.22
19	do	1,681	30,022	23.57
20	do	468	11,039	24.88
21	do	1,401	11,540	8.24
22	do	1,845	20,001	10.80
23	do	1,338	6,488	4.84
24	do	2,406	7,854	3.18
Total		10,630	323,132	16.71

The maximum population density is 48.65 persons per acre in the eighth ward; the minimum, 3.18 persons per acre in the twenty-fourth ward.

3. *Racial composition.*—The racial composition of Rochester in 1930 was as follows:

(a) *Distribution by race and nativity.*—Distribution by race and nativity is shown by the following table.³

TABLE 2.—Race and nativity

Group	Number	Per cent
Native white of native parentage	127,435	38.8
Native white of foreign or mixed parentage	123,163	37.5
Foreign-born white	74,006	22.8
Negro	2,030	.8
Other colored	168	.1
Total	323,132	100.0

(b) *Distribution by national origins.*—The following table shows the distribution of foreign-born persons and native-born persons of foreign and mixed parentage by national origins.⁴

³ United States census, 1930.

⁴ United States census, 1930. The classification is by country of birth of father for those with both parents or father of foreign birth, and by country of birth of mother for those with mother only of foreign birth.

CONTINUED

6 OF 7

TABLE 3.—National origins

Country of origin	Foreign born	Foreign or mixed parentage	Country of origin	Foreign born	Foreign or mixed percentage
England.....	5,664	8,707	Turkey in Europe.....	7	6
Scotland.....	1,753	2,051	Greece.....	450	307
Wales.....	92	272	Italy.....	23,935	31,478
Ireland, Northern.....	779	2,624	Spain.....	24	38
Irish Free State.....	2,972	11,100	Portugal.....	135	136
Norway.....	95	128	Other Europe.....	63	63
Sweden.....	421	665	Armenia.....	32	24
Denmark.....	186	330	Palestine and Syria.....	164	222
Netherlands.....	1,826	3,009	Turkey in Asia.....	194	187
Belgium.....	459	350	Other Asia.....	30	25
Luxemburg.....	10	23	Canada:		
Switzerland.....	399	941	French.....	693	1,351
France.....	637	2,123	Other.....	0,420	10,073
Germany.....	10,287	29,034	Newfoundland.....	35	50
Poland.....	5,878	8,231	Mexico.....	6	1
Czechoslovakia.....	203	244	Cuba.....	7	12
Austria.....	932	1,262	Other West Indies.....	12	8
Hungary.....	297	270	Central and South America.....	89	47
Yugoslavia.....	275	220	Australia.....	21	31
Russia.....	4,551	5,756	Azores.....		1
Lithuania.....	1,133	1,188	Iceland.....	2	3
Latvia.....	110	106	Other Atlantic Islands.....	27	34
Estonia.....	6	8	At sea.....	22	41
Finland.....	52	33	All other.....	49	27
Rumania.....	227	282			
Bulgaria.....	35	11	Total.....	74,696	123,163

The predominant nationalities represented in the city's population, including both first and second generations, and their proportion to the total population of the city, are shown in the following table:

TABLE 4.—Predominant nationalities

Nationality	Foreign born	Foreign or mixed parentage ¹	Total	Per cent
American ²			127,435	38.8
British ³	7,509	11,030	18,539	5.7
Irish.....	3,751	13,724	17,475	5.3
Dutch.....	1,826	3,009	4,835	1.5
German.....	10,287	29,034	39,321	12.0
Polish.....	5,878	8,231	14,109	4.3
Russian.....	4,551	5,756	10,307	3.1
Italian.....	23,935	31,478	55,413	16.9
Canadian.....	10,113	11,424	21,537	6.6
Negro and other colored.....			2,838	.9
All other.....	6,846	9,477	16,323	4.9
	74,696	123,163	323,132	100.0

¹ The classification is by country of birth of father for those with both parents or father of foreign birth, and by country of birth of mother for those with mother only of foreign birth.

² Native-born white of native parentage.

³ Includes English, Scotch, and Welsh.

This table includes all nationality groups in the community which make up 1 per cent or more of the population.

(c) *Distribution of foreign born by citizenship.*—The following table shows distribution of foreign-born persons over 21 years of age as regards citizenship.⁵

TABLE 5.—*Citizenship of foreign born*

Group	Number	Per cent
Naturalized.....	44,353	63.7
First papers.....	6,197	8.0
Alien.....	16,898	24.3
Unknown.....	2,205	3.1
Total.....	69,653	100.0

4. *Distribution by sex and by age groups.*—The following table gives the distribution of the population by sex:⁶

TABLE 6.—*Sex distribution*

Sex	Number	Per cent
Male.....	160,261	48.8
Female.....	107,871	51.2
Total.....	328,132	100.0

The following table gives the distribution of the population by age groups.⁷

TABLE 7.—*Age distribution*

Age group	Number	Per cent	Age group	Number	Per cent
Under 5.....	23,129	7.0	45 to 64.....	67,374	20.5
5 to 14.....	55,979	17.1	65 and over.....	19,923	6.1
15 to 20.....	33,583	10.2	Unknown.....	160	.1
21 to 24.....	22,376	6.8	Total.....	328,132	100.0
25 to 34.....	52,423	16.0			
35 to 44.....	53,185	16.2			

5. *Industrial conditions.*—Rochester is not a basic industry city. There are no large steel or cement works, textile mills, or other similar industries requiring a large proportion of cheap, common labor. While it is primarily a manufacturing city, it is one whose products are finished articles

⁵ United States census, 1930.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

of high quality and cost, requiring for their manufacture labor which is highly skilled and well paid. In addition to manufacturing, Rochester serves to some extent as a packing and distributing headquarters for the exceptionally rich fruit and agricultural region in which it is located.

The total number of persons gainfully employed in 1930 was 144,868, which was 44.1 per cent of the total population and 52.1 per cent of the population 10 years old and over.⁸ The distribution of persons gainfully employed among various industries and occupations is shown by the following table.⁹

TABLE 8.—*Occupational distribution*

Industry or occupation	Persons employed	Per cent
Agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry.....	1,203	0.8
Extraction of minerals.....	118	.1
Manufacturing and mechanical industries:		
Building industry.....	9,764	6.7
Chemical and allied industries.....	2,384	1.7
Clothing industries.....	10,494	7.2
Food and allied industries.....	3,390	2.3
Automobile factories and repair shops.....	1,789	1.2
Iron and steel products.....	9,226	6.4
Shoe factories.....	4,593	3.2
Woodworking and furniture industries.....	2,952	2.0
Printing, publishing, and engraving.....	3,041	2.1
Electrical machinery and supply factories.....	4,068	2.8
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	24,839	17.2
Trade.....	76,540	52.8
Transportation.....	20,603	18.4
Public service.....	9,051	6.2
Professional and semiprofessional occupations.....	3,757	2.6
Domestic and personal service.....	12,452	8.6
All other.....	13,276	9.2
	1,868	1.3
Total.....	144,868	100.0

Further details as to the principal manufacturing industries of the city, including figures as to average yearly salaries and wages of employees, are given for the year 1927 in the following table.¹⁰

⁸ United States census, 1930.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Data from industrial survey made in 1928 by Rochester Chamber of Commerce.

TABLE 9.—Principal industries

	Number of employees	Number of firms	Total salaries and wages for year	Per cent of total salaries and wages	Average yearly salary and wage per employee
Photographic products.....	11,785	1	\$20,510,402	18.07	\$1,741
Machinery (except transportation equipment):					
Electrical.....	4,021	11	6,194,080		
Foundry and machine-shop products.....	2,804	60	5,296,252		
Telephone, telegraph, and radio.....	1,032	8	2,838,501		
Machine tools.....	1,437	6	2,048,735		
Office equipment.....	1,447	6	2,114,092		
All other.....	436	11	554,433		
	11,807	102	19,647,063	17.30	1,604
Textiles (tents, clothing, men's furnishings):					
Men's clothing.....	11,109	71	15,057,384		
All other.....	1,315	35	1,404,583		
	12,484	106	16,551,967	14.57	1,325
Printing, engraving, binding, and paper goods, etc.:					
Printing and lithographing.....	3,080	104	5,580,073		
Boxes.....	1,100	10	1,404,000		
All other.....	846	34	1,206,580		
	5,005	157	8,371,208	7.37	1,043
Leather goods:					
Boots and shoes.....	4,046	31	6,204,006		
All other.....	815	15	1,330,687		
	5,761	46	7,534,683	6.63	1,208
Food products:					
Bakeries.....	880	100	1,503,002		
Canneries.....	906	13	1,270,340		
All other.....	2,284	84	3,082,011		
	4,160	197	5,857,222	5.16	1,405
Transportation equipment:					
Motor vehicles and parts.....	1,007	21	1,432,842		
All other.....	2,930	10	4,418,096		
	3,940	31	5,850,938	5.16	1,483
Wood products:					
Furniture.....	1,734	34	2,391,009		
Planing mills.....	660	21	1,228,440		
All other.....	705	32	1,012,097		
	3,189	87	4,633,355	4.08	1,453
Optical goods.....	2,841	6	4,262,612	3.75	1,500
Instruments (professional and scientific).....	1,485	8	2,571,455	2.26	1,732
Jewelry, brass works, tinsmiths, etc.....	1,840	50	2,472,130	2.18	1,339
Stoves, iron work, hardware, cutlery, etc.....	1,400	40	2,342,881	2.06	1,672
Artificial stone, glass cutting, sand, brick.....	1,218	33	2,005,735	1.82	1,600
Oils, perfumes, druggist preparations, etc.....	1,367	53	1,968,418	1.73	1,439
Miscellaneous.....	6,044	127	8,614,381	7.85	1,476
Total.....	74,527	1,044	113,564,461	100.00	1,524

Details as to persons employed and average yearly salaries and wages in the principal mercantile establishments of the city for the year 1927 are given in the following table:¹¹

TABLE 10.—Principal mercantile establishments

	Number of employees	Number of establishments	Total wages and salaries	Average yearly wage and salary
Retail independent.....	7,007	2,373	\$10,085,711	\$1,270
Retail chain.....	2,369	125	2,909,874	1,228
Wholesale independent.....	1,532	171	2,505,876	1,636
Wholesale chain.....	316	35	416,660	1,319
Manufacturers' agents.....	186	24	319,925	1,720
Total.....	12,310	2,728	16,238,046	1,310

6. *Employment and labor.*—The proportion of the working population of Rochester consisting of skilled labor is very high, as appears from the general character of the industries of the city as set forth in the preceding section of this report. Labor is permanent rather than migratory. Seasonal deviations from the normal as regards employment do not exceed 5 per cent. Industrial workers are normally employed the year around, with average annual earnings of \$1,700 to \$1,800 for skilled workers and of \$1,100 to \$1,200 for unskilled workers. Workers in the building trades normally work only eight to nine months out of the year because of climatic conditions, but earn about the same amounts annually as industrial workers.¹²

The number of persons unemployed in April, 1930, was 10,708, amounting to 2.9 per cent of the total population and 7.4 per cent of the persons gainfully employed.¹³

The 48-hour week prevails in industry generally, except that the building trades have a 40-hour week of 5 working days. The 44-hour week prevails in office employment.¹⁴

The building trades are about 55 per cent organized, and the clothing and shoe industries and the printing trades are almost 100 per cent organized; but the other industries of

¹¹ Data from industrial survey made in 1928 by Rochester Chamber of Commerce.

¹² Data from industrial survey made in 1928 by Rochester Chamber of Commerce.

¹³ United States census, 1930.

¹⁴ Data from industrial management council, Rochester Chamber of Commerce.

the city are only very slightly organized. The labor turnover in general industry, including the clothing and shoe industries, is from 35 to 40 per cent. The turnover in the building trades, in mercantile establishments, and in clerical occupations is higher, and that in the transportation and public service industries lower.¹⁵

7. *Wealth.*—No definite statistical data on the extent of destitution and pauperism in Rochester are available. The economic situation of the population is indicated to some extent, however, by the following data:

(a) *Prevailing wage rates.*—The following have been the prevailing wage rates in the building trades during 1930.¹⁶

TABLE 11.—Wage rates

Occupation	Rate per hour	Occupation	Rate per hour
Bricklayers, masons, and plasterers.....	\$1.50	Building laborers.....	\$0.70
Electricians.....	1.37½	Iron workers.....	1.25
Carpenters.....	1.20	Iron-worker apprentices.....	.80
Painters.....	1.20	Street laborers.....	.65

The average weekly wage rates for factory employment for August, 1930, was \$28.91, as against an average for the State, exclusive of New York City, of \$26.91.¹⁷

The cost of living index for Rochester as of June 30, 1928, was 161.5, as compared with 160.9 for the United States as a whole.¹⁸

(b) *Extent of home ownership.*—Of 68,247 heads of families in the city, 28,535, or 41.8 per cent, owned their homes in 1920.¹⁹

(c) *Savings bank deposits.*—The average savings bank deposits per capita for the city, including all savings or interest accounts in banks, whether technically savings banks or not, as of July 1, 1930, was \$891.30.²⁰

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Data from Builders Exchange of Rochester.

¹⁷ Data from New York State Department of Labor. The statistics are compiled from reports covering about 60 per cent of all factory employees.

¹⁸ Data from National Industrial Conference Board compilation of living costs (100 is weighted index for 1914).

¹⁹ United States census, 1920. The figures for 1930 are not yet available.

²⁰ Data as to total deposits from Rochester Chamber of Commerce; data as to population from United States census, 1930.

8. *Domestic factors.*—The following data pertain to domestic factors and to vital statistics for the city:

(a) *Married and single persons.*—The following table shows the marital status of those persons in the population 15 years of age and older.²¹

TABLE 12.—Marital status

Status	Males	Per cent	Females	Per cent	Total	Per cent
Single.....	41,720	34.6	40,128	31.2	81,848	32.0
Married.....	72,748	60.4	72,923	56.8	145,671	58.5
Widowed.....	5,417	4.4	14,565	11.3	19,982	8.0
Divorced.....	564	.5	798	.6	1,362	.5
Unknown.....	90	.1	65	.1	155	.1
Total.....	120,530	100.0	128,470	100.0	249,018	100.0

(b) *Size of family.*—The average number of persons per family in 1920 was 4.3.²²

(c) *Birth and death rates.*—The number of births and deaths per 1,000 population for the 5-year period 1925 to 1929, inclusive, was as follows:²³

TABLE 13.—Birth and death rates

(Per 1,000 population)

Year	Births	Deaths	Year	Births	Deaths
1925.....	19.83	11.05	1928.....	18.72	11.05
1926.....	19.28	12.23	1929.....	17.75	11.49
1927.....	19.90	11.18			

(d) *Infant mortality.*—The number of deaths under 1 year of age per 1,000 births for the 5-year period 1925 to 1929, inclusive, was as follows:²⁴

TABLE 14.—Infant mortality

Year	Deaths per 1,000 births	Year	Deaths per 1,000 births
1925.....	64	1928.....	60
1926.....	67	1929.....	63
1927.....	63		

²¹ United States census, 1930.

²² United States Census, 1920. The figures for 1930 are not yet available.

²³ Data from Rochester Bureau of Health.

²⁴ Ibid.

(e) *Divorce rate.*—No separate figures giving marriages, divorces, and annulments for the city of Rochester are available. The figures for Monroe County, in which Rochester is located, for the years 1928 and 1929 are as follows: ²⁵

TABLE 15.—*Marriages and divorces*

	1928	1929
Marriages.....	3,153	3,199
Divorces.....	243	268
Annulments.....	42	46

The divorce rates per 1,000 population and per 100 marriages performed for these years are as follows:

TABLE 16.—*Divorce rate*

	1928	1929
Per 1,000 population.....	0.75	0.79
Per 100 marriages.....	7.7	8.1

These figures may be compared with the divorce rate of 1.63 per 1,000 population and of 16.6 per 100 marriages for the United States as a whole for the year 1928.²⁶

9. *Educational factors.*—The public school system of Rochester includes 1 normal school, 6 high schools, 3 junior-high schools, 45 grade schools, and 11 special schools, including vocational schools, schools for sick and crippled children, etc. The University of Rochester, a nonsectarian, privately supported institution, the Rochester Mechanics Institute, and Nazareth College, a Catholic institution, are located in the city.

The number and population of children of various ages attending school in 1930 was as follows: ²⁷

²⁵ United States census: Marriage and Divorce, 1928; Preliminary Report on Marriage for New York, 1929.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ United States census, 1930.

TABLE 17.—*School attendance*

Age	Total	Attending school	Per cent
6 years.....	5,310	4,362	82.1
7 to 13.....	30,631	38,391	97.1
14 and 15.....	11,000	11,687	97.3
16 and 17.....	11,143	7,864	70.6
18 to 20.....	10,507	3,832	23.2
Total.....	84,400	66,036	78.3

Further details as to educational factors are:

(a) *Illiteracy.*—The following table shows the extent of illiteracy in the city among persons 10 years old and over.²⁸

TABLE 18.—*Illiteracy*

	Total 10 years old and over	Number illiterate	Per cent
Native white.....	202,050	348	0.2
Foreign-born white.....	73,032	0,820	1.3
Negro.....	2,273	32	1.4
Total.....	277,004	10,200	3.7

(b) *Expenditure for schools.*—The total expenditures in connection with the public schools of the city during 1929, exclusive of capital outlays and debt service, was \$7,777,509.95, amounting to \$23.70 per capita.²⁹

10. *Machinery for the administration of criminal justice.*—The following briefly summarizes the machinery for local government and for the administration of criminal justice in Rochester:

(a) *City and county government.*—The city government since January, 1928, has been of the council-manager type. The mayor is elected by a council of nine elected by the voters. The council also elects the city manager, who appoints the heads of the four departments of public safety, public works, law, and finance. The commissioner of public safety appoints the directors of police, charities, parks, health, the chief of fire, the market master, and the superintendent of fire and police telegraph. The director of

²⁸ United States census.

²⁹ Expenditures from Rochester Comptroller's Report, 1929; population from United States census, 1930.

police in turn appoints the chief of police. The director of police is also deputy commissioner of public safety. The five city judges are elected. One of them is designated by the mayor to sit in the criminal branch, while the other four sit in the civil branch of the city court. The city probation officers and other court employees are appointed by the court. All city appointments generally, excepting department heads and deputies, are from the three highest candidates certified by the civil service commission after competitive examination. The civil service commission of three members is appointed by the city manager.

The county government is administered by officials who are either elected by the people or appointed by the board of 43 supervisors (24 supervisors from the city). The district attorney, county clerk, county treasurer, sheriff, purchasing agent, and the two coroners are elected. The superintendent of the penitentiary, superintendent of highways, county attorney, and clerk of the board are appointed by the board of supervisors. The commissioner of jurors is appointed by the county judges and the surrogate. The county officials appoint their subordinates. The jail is administered by the sheriff, who appoints the jailors and other employees.

(b) *Police*.—Police functions may be exercised by the city police, the State police, or the county sheriff, but are actually exercised within the city only by the city police. The sheriff appoints his 32 deputies and the superintendent of the State police appoints his troopers. The organization of the police bureau of the city is given below (pp. 13-14, infra).

(c) *Prosecution*.—Criminal prosecution is carried on entirely by the district attorney's office, whether in the city, county, or State courts. The district attorney appoints his assistants.

(d) *Courts*.—All judges are elected. The court of appeals is the highest court, having jurisdiction over the entire State. Under this come in order the appellate division of the supreme court, the supreme court, the county court, and the city court. Justices of the supreme court are designated by the governor to sit in the appellate division. Criminal cases arising in the city are heard either in the city court or

in the county court. The city court has jurisdiction over misdemeanors and conducts preliminary hearings in the case of felonies. The county court and the supreme court both have jurisdiction over felonies, but in practice the supreme court exercises jurisdiction in civil cases only. Criminal appeals are not taken to the supreme court but direct from the county court to the appellate division and thence to the court of appeals. Appeals are taken from the city court to the county court.

(e) *Penal and corrective agencies*.—Probation officers are appointed by the judges of the courts they serve; viz, the criminal branch of the city court, the adult division of the county court, and the county children's court. The jail and the county penitentiary are, respectively, under the supervision of the sheriff and of the superintendent of the penitentiary, as stated above.

Sentences by the city court are to the county penitentiary, to the Elmira State Reformatory, or to the Randall's Island State Reformatory. Sentences by the county court are to the county penitentiary, to the Elmira State Reformatory, to the Auburn State Penitentiary, to the Matteawan State Hospital for the Criminal Insane, or to the State Institute for Mental Defectives at Napanoch. Five cases under indictment in 1929 were turned over (not sentenced) to the Rochester State Hospital for the Insane. Cases from the children's court are turned over (not sentenced) to the State Industrial School at Industry, N. Y., or to foster homes. Adult offenders sentenced to serve terms of less than one year are sent to the county penitentiary; prisoners sentenced for longer terms are sent to State institutions, as are juvenile offenders.

The county jail is for detention pending trial only. No civil prisoners are confined there. The city has no jail, except the police jail, which is used for overnight detention only.

11. *Volume and kind of crime*.—The following table gives the number of offenses known to the police in Rochester

during the first nine months of 1930 for each kind of crime specified.³⁰

TABLE 19.—Volume and kind of crime

Offense	Number known to police	Offense	Number known to police
1. Felonious homicide:		5. Burglary.....	402
a. Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.....	5	6. Larceny (other than auto theft):	
b. Manslaughter by negligence.....	4	a. Over \$50.....	235
2. Rape.....	8	b. Under \$50.....	883
3. Robbery.....	43	7. Auto theft.....	333
4. Aggravated assault.....	53	Total.....	2,026

II

POLICE COSTS

1. *Summary.*—The following table summarizes the cost of police for the city of Rochester in 1929 chargeable to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

TABLE 20.—Summary of police costs

Operating cost:	
Pay roll ¹	\$959,400.44
Supplies and repairs ²	24,040.45
General overhead ³	118,569.25
Total.....	1,102,001.14
Additional data:	
Carrying charge on capital investment ⁴	39,493.45
5-year average of expenditures for equipment ⁵	24,008.26
Receipts ⁶	None

¹ From p. 13, *infra*.⁴ From p. 17, *infra*.² From p. 15, *infra*.⁵ From Table 27, *infra*.³ From p. 16, *infra*.⁶ From p. 17, *infra*.

2. *Police pay roll.*—The following table gives the police pay roll divided among criminal functions, noncriminal functions, and supervisory functions:

³⁰ From Uniform Crime Reports, published by the committee on uniform crime records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police for January to July, 1930, inclusive, and by the Division of Identification and Information of the U. S. Department of Justice for August and September, 1930.

TABLE 21.—Police pay-roll summary¹

A. Criminal:	
1. Detective force.....	\$80,430.00
2. Uniformed patrol force.....	726,180.00
3. Special forces:	
(a) Policewomen.....	\$4,200.00
(b) Arson squad.....	2,100.00
(c) Auto-theft squad.....	26,584.00
(d) Bertillon division.....	11,150.00
(e) Criminal records division.....	9,700.00
(f) Motor patrol force.....	11,970.00
(g) Police jail attendants.....	12,700.00
(h) Court officers.....	6,300.00
Total.....	84,704.00
Total criminal.....	891,314.00
B. Noncriminal:	
1. Traffic force.....	122,500.00
2. License bureaus.....	10,710.00
3. Special forces:	
(a) School census.....	12,600.00
(b) Special assignments.....	4,200.00
Total.....	16,800.00
Total noncriminal.....	150,010.00
C. Supervisory:	
1. Supervisory force.....	26,710.00
2. Police school.....	2,100.00
3. Police pistol range.....	2,800.00
4. Property clerk.....	4,760.00
5. Care of buildings—	
(a) Central station.....	\$16,960.00
(b) Precinct stations.....	17,350.00
Total.....	34,310.00
6. Police telephone operators.....	16,000.00
Total supervisory.....	86,080.00
Total pay roll (criminal, noncriminal, and supervisory).....	1,128,004.00

¹ From pp. 13-14, *infra*.

Total personal service expense of bureau of police reported by comptroller.....	\$1,087,834.91
Expense of maintenance of central station from bureau of buildings pay roll.....	16,960.00
Pay roll of police telephone operators from fire and police telegraph bureau.....	16,000.00
Total for comparison with total police pay roll.....	\$1,120,794.91

The difference between these two figures, amounting to \$7,219.09, is due to fluctuations in the amount of the police pay roll during the year.

The total criminal and noncriminal expenditure (not including supervisory) is thus \$1,041,324, and the proportion of criminal functions is $891,314 \div 1,041,324$, or 85.6 per cent.

The police pay-roll expense allocable to the cost of administration of criminal justice is thus 85.6 per cent of \$1,120,794.91, or \$959,400.44.

TABLE 22.—Police pay-roll distribution¹

Item	Rate	Extension	Total
A. CRIMINAL			
1. Detective force:			
1 captain of detectives.....	\$3,570	\$3,570	
4 detective sergeants.....	2,783	11,132	
18 detectives.....	2,546	45,828	
6 patrolmen.....	2,100	12,600	
2 patrolmen as clerks.....	2,100	4,200	
1 stenographer.....	1,700	1,700	
1 laborer.....	1,400	1,400	
			\$80,430
2. Uniformed patrol force (6 precinct stations):			
2 inspectors.....	3,150	6,300	
7 captains of police.....	2,835	19,845	
6 lieutenants of police.....	2,625	15,750	
21 sergeants of police.....	2,415	50,715	
242 patrolmen.....	2,100	508,200	
22 patrolmen—first year.....	1,785	39,270	
23 patrolmen as clerks.....	2,100	48,300	
18 patrolmen as chauffeurs.....	2,100	37,800	
			726,180
3. Special forces:			
(a) Policewomen—2 policewomen.....	2,100		4,200
(b) Arson squad—1 patrolman.....	2,100		2,100
(c) Auto-theft squad—			
1 lieutenant of detectives.....	2,992	2,992	
2 detectives.....	2,546	5,092	
6 patrolmen.....	2,100	12,600	
2 patrolmen as clerks.....	2,100	4,200	
1 stenographer.....	1,700	1,700	
			26,584
(d) Bertillon division—			
2 Bertillon clerks.....	2,625	5,250	
2 patrolmen as clerks.....	2,100	4,200	
1 stenographer.....	1,700	1,700	
			11,150

¹ The organization shown in this distribution is as given by the statistician of the police bureau. It has been checked against the budget and in some instances against the pay roll.

TABLE 22.—Police pay-roll distribution—Continued

Item	Rate	Extension	Total
A. CRIMINAL—continued			
3. Special forces—Continued.			
(e) Criminal records division—			
3 patrolmen as clerks.....	\$2,100	\$6,300	
2 stenographers.....	1,700	3,400	
			\$9,700
(f) Motor-patrol force—			
3 patrolmen on patrol cars.....	2,100	6,300	
3 chauffeurs.....	1,890	5,670	
			11,970
(g) Police jail attendants—			
3 patrolmen as turnkeys.....	2,100	6,300	
4 matrons.....	1,600	6,400	
			12,700
(h) Court officers—3 patrolmen at criminal court.....			
	2,100		6,300
B. NONCRIMINAL			
1. Traffic force:			
1 captain of police.....	2,835	2,835	
2 lieutenants of police.....	2,625	5,250	
1 sergeant.....	2,415	2,415	
41 patrolmen.....	2,100	86,100	
2 patrolmen as clerks.....	2,100	4,200	
11 laborers.....	1,400	15,400	
5 laborers.....	1,260	6,300	
			122,500
2. License bureau:			
1 chief license clerk.....	2,310	2,310	
2 patrolmen.....	2,100	4,200	
2 sanitary officers.....	2,100	4,200	
			10,710
3. Special forces:			
(a) School census—6 patrolmen.....			
	2,100		12,600
(b) Special assignments—			
1 patrolman to city hall.....	2,100	2,100	
1 patrolman to county clerk.....	2,100	2,100	
			4,200
C. OVERHEAD			
1. Supervisory force:			
1 director of police.....	6,000	6,000	
1 chief of police.....	4,935	4,935	
1 deputy chief.....	3,675	3,675	
1 stenographer.....	2,000	2,000	
1 stenographer.....	1,700	1,700	
4 patrolmen as doorman, clerk, etc.....	2,100	8,400	
			26,710
2. Police school: 1 patrolman as instructor.....			
	2,100		2,100
3. Police pistol range: 2 laborers.....			
	1,400	2,800	2,800
4. Property clerk:			
1 patrolman as clerk.....	2,100	2,100	
1 laborer.....	1,400	1,400	
1 laborer.....	1,260	1,260	
			4,760
5. Care of buildings:²			
(a) Central station—			
1 janitor.....	1,900	1,900	
1 assistant janitor.....	1,800	1,800	
1 forewoman.....	900	900	
4 charwomen.....	750	3,000	
1 night watchman—50 cents per hour.....	1,440	1,440	
3 elevator conductors.....	1,440	4,320	
3 laborers.....	1,200	3,600	
			16,960

² Taken from bureau of buildings pay roll, December, 1929. Does not come under police appropriation although a police expense.

TABLE 22.—Police pay-roll distribution—Continued

Item	Rate	Extension	Total
C. OVERHEAD—continued			
5. Care of buildings—Continued.			
(b) Precinct stations ² —			
5 janitors.....	\$1,800	\$0,000	-----
6 charwomen.....	750	4,500	-----
5 laborers.....	770	3,850	-----
			\$17,350
6. Police telephone operators: 8 operators.....	2,000		16,000

¹ Taken from bureau of buildings pay roll, December, 1929. Does not come under the police appropriation although a police expense.

TABLE 23.—Consolidated police pay roll ¹

Item	Rate	Extension	Total
1 director of police.....	\$0,000	\$0,000	-----
1 chief.....	4,935	4,935	-----
1 deputy chief.....	3,075	3,075	-----
2 inspectors.....	3,150	6,300	-----
1 captain of detectives.....	3,570	3,570	-----
1 lieutenant of detectives.....	2,902	2,902	-----
4 detective sergeants ¹	2,783	11,132	-----
20 detectives.....	2,540	50,820	-----
8 captains of police.....	2,835	22,680	-----
8 lieutenants of police.....	2,625	21,000	-----
22 sergeants.....	2,415	53,130	-----
373 patrolmen ¹	2,100	783,300	-----
22 patrolmen, 1st year.....	1,735	39,270	-----
1 chief license officer.....	2,310	2,310	-----
2 sanitary officers.....	2,100	4,200	-----
2 policewomen.....	2,100	4,200	-----
4 matrons.....	1,600	6,400	-----
3 chauffeurs ⁴	1,800	5,070	-----
1 stenographer.....	2,000	2,000	-----
6 stenographers ¹	1,700	10,200	-----
2 Bertillon clerks.....	2,625	5,250	-----
8 telephone operators.....	2,000	16,000	-----
1 janitor.....	1,900	1,900	-----
5 janitors.....	1,800	9,000	-----
1 assistant janitor.....	1,800	1,800	-----
1 forewoman.....	900	900	-----
10 charwomen.....	750	7,500	-----
1 night watchman.....	1,440	1,440	-----
3 elevator operators.....	1,440	4,320	-----
15 laborers.....	1,400	21,000	-----
6 laborers.....	1,200	7,560	-----
3 laborers.....	1,200	3,600	-----
5 laborers ⁶	770	3,850	-----
Total.....			\$1,128,004
Total previously reported (p. 12).....			1,128,004

¹ Taken from 1929 budget salary schedule with corrections as indicated. This table is included for the purpose of checking the pay roll distribution.

² 8 authorized; only 4 appointed.

³ This is the average distribution through the year as figured on a basis of months.

⁴ 4 authorized; 3 appointed.

⁵ 1 added by amendment of the salary schedule.

⁶ 7 months at \$110 a month.

3. *Supplies and repairs.*—The following table gives expenditures for supplies and repairs allocated as between criminal and noncriminal activities.

TABLE 24.—Supplies and repairs, police

Repairs.....	\$17,084.59
Materials and supplies.....	23,070.04
Telephone maintenance.....	2,400.00
Total.....	42,504.63
Deduct materials and supplies for traffic control: ¹	
Repairs to standards and signals.....	\$4,416.45
Standards, signs, and lanterns.....	4,295.41
Textile letters and strips.....	5,848.97
Zone painting.....	335.80
	14,396.63
Balance.....	28,108.00
85.6 per cent of balance allocated to criminal.....	24,040.45

The cost of repairing and maintaining street signals, pavement markings, and other traffic aids tabulated above is chargeable only to the traffic control (noncriminal) function of the police force, and is in addition to the ordinary current expense costs of the traffic bureau. It is, therefore, deducted from the total costs reported by the comptroller before making the allocation between criminal and non-criminal functions. An item entitled "street signals," amounting to \$4,406.45, is carried in the purchase of equipment account (capital expense) and is not included, therefore, in this deduction.

4. *General overhead.*—The following table gives expenditures for general overhead expenses allocated as between the civil and criminal activities of the police department.

TABLE 25.—Overhead expenses, police

Pension payments.....	\$78,277.30
Miscellaneous expenses.....	47,577.33
Telephone rental.....	12,200.00
Insurance and subscription.....	450.34
Total.....	138,504.97
85.6 per cent allocated to criminal.....	118,560.25

5. *Capital charges.*—The following table gives the capital investment and carrying charges thereon for the police department for 1929:

¹ Annual report of the police bureau, 1929, p. 72.

TABLE 26.—Capital investment, police

	Investment	Carrying charge
LAND		
Central police station ¹	\$20,000	-----
Precinct police stations ¹	30,686	-----
	50,686	-----
Interest at 4½ per cent.....		\$2,560.87
BUILDINGS		
Central police stations ²	54,824	-----
Precinct police stations ³	141,303	-----
	190,127	-----
Interest, 4½ per cent; depreciation, 2 per cent—6½ per cent.....		12,748.25
MOTOR EQUIPMENT (ORIGINAL COST)		
Autos, motor cycles and patrols ⁴	20,451	-----
Interest, 4½ per cent; depreciation, 33½ per cent—38 per cent.....		10,051.38
FURNITURE AND FIXTURES		
Total equipment ⁵	74,407	-----
Deduct motor equipment ⁶	6,420	-----
	68,077	-----
Interest, 4½ per cent; depreciation, 20 per cent—24½ per cent.....		16,678.86
POLICE TELEPHONE (ORIGINAL COST) ⁷		
Boxes and stands.....	4,984	-----
Recall system.....	900	-----
Twenty-third ward telephone.....	1,420	-----
Wires and conduits.....	29,953	-----
	28,330	-----
Interest, 4½ per cent; depreciation, 10 per cent—14½ per cent.....		4,107.85
Total.....		46,137.21

¹ Comptroller's Report, 1929, p. 31. Includes precinct headquarters No. 1, criminal court, and garage.

² Comptroller's Report, 1929, p. 31.

³ Comptroller's Report, 1929, p. 31. Built in 1895, brick and stone.

⁴ Comptroller's Report, 1929, p. 31. Brick.

⁵ Original cost. Comptroller's depreciated figure is \$85,016.10.

⁶ Inventory. The figure was arrived at by selecting items of motor equipment from the comptroller's inventory of Jan. 1, 1930. The original cost of the equipment was then supplied from the bureau of purchase proceedings. The equipment is as follows:

	Inventory	Cost
6 Studebakers, 1927.....	\$1,105	\$7,950
10 motor cycles, at \$450.....	515	4,500
4 Ford sedans, at \$600.....	800	2,400
8 Ford coupés, 1928.....	750	3,696
1 Hupmobile, 1928.....		1,605
1 Packard patrol, 1929.....	3,000	3,300
1 Cunningham patrol.....	250	3,000
	6,420	26,461

⁷ Comptroller's Report, 1929, p. 39. The depreciated figure is used in place of original costs. The inventory includes many articles of supplies as well as equipment. These can not be segregated without greater labor than the importance of the figure warrants. The inclusion of supplies compensates for the depreciation so that this amount is approximately correct for equipment at original cost. See par. 6, *infra*.

⁸ Inventory.

⁹ Furnished by superintendent of fire and police telegraph; taken from the inventory ledger. As the inventory figures had been depreciated, 15 per cent was added to restore them to approximate original cost amounts.

The carrying charge on capital investment allocable to the cost of administration of criminal justice is 85.6 per cent of \$46,137.21, or \$39,493.45.

6. *Expenditures for equipment.*—The item of expenditures for equipment is omitted in the table of police costs above. This item is covered instead by the carrying charges on police equipment, namely:

Motor equipment.....	\$10,051.38
Furniture and fixtures.....	16,678.86
	26,730.24

That this allowance is not excessive is shown by the fact that the average 5-year expenditure for equipment is \$28,047.03. (See Table 27.) The amount allocable to the cost of administration of criminal justice is 85.6 per cent of \$28,047.03, or \$24,008.26.

7. *Receipts.*—There were no receipts by the police in 1929 in connection with the administration of criminal justice.

8. *Police expenditures, 1925-1929.*—The following table shows the police bureau expenditures during the years 1925-1929 and the average expenditures for the 5-year period (unallocated).

TABLE 27.—Police expenditures, 1925-1929

	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	5-year average
Personal services.....	\$935,792.68	\$959,908.24	\$1,035,272.07	\$1,047,964.86	\$1,087,834.91	\$1,013,354.73
Other services.....	75,588.45	72,805.40	78,524.81	62,225.23	64,611.02	70,751.10
Materials and supplies.....	28,333.26	34,506.96	33,457.51	35,672.43	23,670.04	31,005.04
Equipment.....	28,373.55	29,092.04	40,243.34	20,407.69	16,118.54	28,047.03
Insurance, etc.....	3,251.84	1,181.20	200.89	428.84	450.34	1,120.62
Total.....	1,071,339.78	1,097,493.84	1,193,780.52	1,166,690.05	1,192,085.75	1,144,281.68

III

COST OF PROSECUTION

1. *Summary.*—The following table summarizes the cost of prosecution for the city of Rochester in 1929 chargeable to the cost of administration of criminal justice.

TABLE 28.—Summary of cost of prosecution

	Expense, 1920, criminal	Appor- tioned to city
OPERATING COST		
<i>City administration</i>		
Corporation counsel ¹		
<i>County administration</i>		
District attorney: ²		
Pay roll.....	\$40,061.20	
Supplies and general overhead.....	0,061.68	
	<u>50,022.97</u>	
83.78 per cent city portion ³		\$40,952.10
County attorney ⁴		
Grand jury: ⁵		
Pay roll.....	5,212.50	
Supplies and general overhead.....	8,020.44	
	<u>13,832.94</u>	
83.78 per cent city portion.....		11,670.23
<i>State administration⁶</i>		
Total cost of prosecution.....		<u>61,631.33</u>
ADDITIONAL DATA		
Carrying charge on capital investment: ⁷		
District attorney's office.....	5,797.45	
Grand jury.....	2,592.07	
	<u>8,389.50</u>	
83.78 per cent city portion.....		7,028.72
5-year average of expenditures for equipment: ⁸		
District attorney's office.....	230.00	
Grand jury.....		
	<u>230.00</u>	
83.78 per cent city portion.....		200.23
Receipts ⁹		None.

¹ Functions are noncriminal.² From p. 19, *infra* (original page).³ City's portion of the total county tax levy is $\frac{\$3,207,966.47}{\$3,820,150.00} = 83.78$ per cent. Board of supervisors' proceedings for 1923, p. 812.⁴ Functions are noncriminal.⁵ There are no State agencies concerned in criminal prosecution except in the rare instance of one trial in which a prosecutor was appointed by the governor.⁶ From p. 21, *infra* (original page).

2. *District attorney.*—The following table gives the cost of the district attorney's office in 1921.

TABLE 29.—District attorney's expenditures

	Expense, 1920	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll:		
Salaries and wages ¹	\$40,061.20	
100 per cent criminal ²		\$40,061.20
Supplies and general overhead:¹		
Expense.....	0,172.20	
Special court expense.....	780.48	
	<u>0,961.68</u>	
100 per cent criminal.....		0,961.68
Total.....		<u>50,022.97</u>
Carrying charge on capital investment:		
Purchase of equipment ³	230.00	
Building ⁴	5,797.43	
	<u>6,036.43</u>	
100 per cent criminal.....		6,036.43
Receipts.....		None.

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1920, county board of supervisors' clerk.² The function of the district attorney's office is entirely criminal.³ From p. 21, *infra* (original page). The average expenditure 1925-1929 is here used instead of the 1929 expenditure of \$426.10 or any attempt to compute depreciation on equipment.⁴ From p. 20, *infra* (original page).

3. *Grand jury.*—The following table gives the cost of the grand jury in 1929.

TABLE 30.—Grand jury expenditures

	Expense	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll:¹		
Salaries.....	\$5,212.50	
100 per cent criminal ²		\$5,212.50
Supplies and general overhead:¹		
Special court expense.....	8,020.44	
100 per cent criminal.....		8,020.44
Total.....		<u>13,832.94</u>
Carrying charge on capital investment:		
Equipment ³		
Building ³	2,592.07	
100 per cent criminal.....		2,592.07
Receipts.....		None.

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1929.² Grand jury functions are entirely criminal.³ From Table 32, *infra*.

4. *Capital investment.*—The following tables give the basis for the allocation of carrying charges on capital investment.

TABLE 31.—*Courthouse expenses*

	Outlay	Expense, 1929
Pay roll: Salaries ¹		\$70,986.51
Supplies and general overhead: ¹		
Materials and supplies.....		13,445.31
Expense.....		35,381.18
Carrying charge on capital investment:		
Building (stone erected, 1896) ²	\$880,361.06	
Interest, 4½ per cent; depreciation, 2 per cent—6½ per cent.....		57,223.47
5-year average of expenditures for equipment ³		10,562.40
		⁴ 187,598.87

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1929.

² The cost of the courthouse was derived by adding the annual amounts expended from the courthouse building fund, 1894-1899, as reported by the county treasurer, in the board of supervisors' proceedings. The bond issue for this purpose was \$850,000. Furniture and fixtures are included. The original furniture is still in use after 34 years and practically as good as new.

³ The average yearly expenditure, 1925-1929, is here used instead of the expenditure for 1929, which was \$3,793.56. (See Table 32, *infra*.)

⁴ Current and capital expenditures are here included as one item for convenience in reporting by floor area. (See Table 32, *infra*.)

TABLE 32.—*Distribution of courthouse expenses by floor areas¹*

Occupancy	Area in square feet	Expense, 1929, apportioned
Criminal functions:		
District attorney.....	2,212	\$5,707.43
Grand jury.....	959	2,532.07
County court.....	7,056	18,493.03
Children's court.....	1,466	3,684.99
Sheriff.....	1,792	4,696.65
Commissioner of jurors.....	1,749	4,533.06
Probation.....	1,316	3,449.11
Total.....	16,520	43,297.20
Noncriminal functions:		
Commissioner of elections.....	3,864
County clerk.....	13,143
County treasurer.....	4,836
County engineer.....	1,337
Superintendent of poor.....	1,598
Surgate.....	2,660
Supreme court.....	7,022
Naturalization office.....	748
Law library.....	6,006
Appellate division.....	5,571
Equity term court.....	1,184
Purchasing agent.....	705
County supervisors.....	5,484
Total.....	55,058	144,301.68
Grand total.....	71,578	187,598.87

¹ The areas in square feet were obtained from plans of the courthouse giving the dimensions of each room. The total annual expense, \$187,598.87 (derived in Table 31), divided by the total area of 71,578 square feet, shows an annual expense per square foot of \$2.62. This latter figure was multiplied by the area of rooms devoted to each function to obtain the apportionment expressed in the last column. Areas of public corridors, superintendent of building office, etc., are omitted as overhead.

5. *Expenditures for prosecution, 1925-1929.*—The following table gives the expenditures for prosecution during the years 1925-1929, and the average expenditures for that period.

TABLE 33.—*Expenditures for prosecution, 1925-1929*

	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	5-year average
DISTRICT ATTORNEY						
Salaries.....	\$38,962	\$43,817	\$44,604	\$45,302	\$40,661	\$44,487.20
Equipment.....	112	160	238	250	420	239.00
Expense.....	4,460	7,057	6,007	7,271	0,172	6,925.40
Special court expense.....	705	690	1,581	3,361	780	1,426.20
Total.....	44,239	51,733	53,090	56,274	60,048	53,076.80
GRAND JURY						
Salaries.....	928	1,995	2,420	2,433	5,212	2,598.20
Special court expense.....	7,045	8,115	5,010	8,282	8,620	7,714.40
Total.....	8,573	10,113	8,330	10,715	13,832	10,312.00
COURT HOUSE						
Salaries.....	48,711	54,797	60,997	69,374	70,986	60,073.00
Equipment.....	1,066	20,532	13,962	8,408	8,794	10,562.40
Materials and supplies.....	13,346	14,733	13,612	12,478	13,445	13,522.80
Expense.....	19,283	23,612	27,196	44,127	35,381	29,019.80
Total.....	82,406	113,724	115,767	134,387	128,606	114,978.00

The county does not publish a statement of yearly expenditures. These figures, except for 1929, were derived by subtracting the January 1 balances from the appropriation for the year, as reported in the board of supervisors' proceedings. The 1929 figures were taken from the appropriation ledger, but were checked against appropriations and balances as published.

6. *Detailed pay-roll distribution.*—The following table gives the detailed pay-roll distribution for the district attorney's office.

TABLE 34.—Detailed pay-roll distribution, prosecution

Item	Rate	Extension
1 district attorney.....	\$10,000	\$10,000
1 assistant district attorney.....	5,075	5,075
1 assistant district attorney.....	4,750	4,750
1 assistant district attorney.....	4,150	4,150
1 assistant district attorney.....	3,850	3,850
1 assistant district attorney.....	3,475	3,475
1 assistant district attorney.....	3,150	3,150
1 assistant district attorney.....	2,850	2,850
1 grand-jury stenographer.....	2,000	2,000
1 grand-jury stenographer.....	1,825	1,825
1 confidential stenographer.....	1,825	1,825
1 stenographer.....	3,500	3,500
1 managing clerk.....	1,700	3,400
2 interpreters.....	1,330	1,330
1 telephone operator.....		
Total.....		52,380

The difference between this total, \$52,380, and \$49,661.29 (Table 29), amounting to \$2,718.71, is due to fluctuations in the amount of the pay roll during the year.

7. *Public defender.*—The office of public defender does not exist in Rochester.

8. *Receipts.*—There were no receipts by the prosecutor's office in 1929 in connection with the administration of criminal justice.

IV

COST OF THE CRIMINAL COURTS

1. *Summary.*—The following table summarizes the cost of the criminal courts in 1929.

TABLE 35.—Summary of cost of the criminal courts

	Expense, 1929, criminal	Apportioned to city
OPERATING COST		
CITY ADMINISTRATION		
City court—civil branch ¹		
City court—criminal branch: ²		
Pay roll.....	\$18,111.17	
Supplies and general overhead.....	580.16	
100 per cent city portion ³	18,691.32	\$18,691.32
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION		
Supreme court ⁴		
County court: ⁴		
Pay roll.....	22,750.54	
Supplies and general overhead.....	19,300.92	
83.78 per cent city portion ⁴	42,141.46	35,396.10
Children's court: ⁴		
Pay roll.....	17,541.00	
Supplies and general overhead.....	2,982.74	
83.78 per cent city portion.....	20,523.74	17,195.24
STATE ADMINISTRATION ⁷		
Appellate division.....		
Court of appeals.....		
Total.....		71,192.00
ADDITIONAL DATA		
Carrying charge on capital investment: ⁸		
City court—criminal branch.....		
County court.....	6,472.58	
Children's court.....	3,684.99	
83.78 per cent city portion.....	10,157.57	8,510.01
5-year average of expenditure for equipment: ⁹		
City court—criminal branch.....	531.85	
County court.....		
Children's court.....		
100 per cent city portion.....		531.85
Receipts:		
City court—criminal branch, fines and forfeitures ¹	44,830.00	
County court—fines and forfeitures ¹	4,888.00	
Children's court—fines ¹	17,741.99	
Total.....	67,459.99	

¹ Function of civil branch is noncriminal.

² From p. 23, *infra* (original page).

³ Supported by city tax; jurisdiction within city only.

⁴ Since 1920, when the county court was given concurrent jurisdiction over murder trials, there has been only one criminal trial in the Supreme Court, and that was a special trial ordered by the governor. Indictments are returned by the grand jury to the Supreme Court, but this function takes only a very small portion of the court's time.

⁵ From p. 24, *infra* (original page).

⁶ City's portion of the county general tax is $\frac{\$3,207,966.47}{\$3,829,159.00} = 83.78$ per cent.

⁷ See p. 34, *infra* (original page).

⁸ From pp. 23-24, *infra* (original pages).

2. *Criminal branch of the city court.*—The following table gives the cost of the criminal branch of the city court in 1929:

TABLE 36.—*Cost of the city court, criminal branch*

	Expense, 1929	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll:		
Salaries and wages ¹	\$38,901.18	
Deduct probation ²	9,004.00	
	29,897.18	\$28,027.11
93.0 per cent criminal ³		
Supplies, and general overhead: ⁴		
Services other than personal.....	1,221.96	
Materials and supplies.....	342.67	
Insurance and subscriptions.....	50.75	
	2,115.38	
Deduct probation expense ⁴	1,169.02	
	956.36	897.46
93.0 per cent criminal.....		
Capital charges: Land and buildings ⁵		
5-year average of expenditures for equipment ⁶	876.20	
93.0 per cent criminal.....		822.74
Receipts:		
Fines—to general revenues.....	20,998.00	
Fines—to police pension fund.....	1,309.00	
Forfeitures—to police pension fund.....	22,553.00	
Total.....	44,830.00	

¹ Comptroller's report, 1929, p. 82.

² See p. 28, *infra* (original page). Probation, although a separate office with a separate function, is carried in the budget and comptroller's accounts in the criminal court appropriation. The costs are as reported by the chief probation officer.

³ Of the 9,984 cases handled in city criminal court in 1929, a total of 608 may be classed as noncriminal as follows: Education law (school attendance), 333; disorderly conduct (almost all nonsupport, 275; total, 608). The remainder of 9,376, or 93.9 per cent, are classed as criminal. These data were secured from daily summary of cases kept by court clerk.

⁴ See p. 28, *infra* (original page).

⁵ Occupies part of central police station, previously reported under police costs, p. 16, *supra* (original page).

⁶ From p. 25, *infra* (original page).

3. *County court.*—The following table gives the cost of the county court in 1929:

TABLE 37.—*Cost of the county court*

	Expense, 1929	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll:		
County judge salaries ¹	\$37,054.86	
County court salaries.....	38,638.35	
1 county court clerk ²	3,475.00	
1 assistant court clerk ²	3,475.00	
	82,643.21	
Deduct children's court ³	17,541.66	
	65,001.55	\$22,760.54
35 per cent criminal ⁴		
Supplies and general overhead:		
Expense.....	14,036.41	
Special court expense (pay to jurors and witnesses).....	44,348.00	
	58,385.37	
Deduct children's court.....	2,082.74	
	56,302.63	19,300.02
35 per cent criminal.....		
Carrying charges on capital investment:		
Building ⁵	18,493.08	
35 per cent criminal.....		6,472.58
Receipts: Fines and forfeitures ⁶	4,888.00	

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1929, county board of supervisors' clerk.

² Supervisors' proceedings for 1928, p. 818; salary schedule for 1929. Salaries of these 2 clerks are carried under appropriation to county clerk as clerk of court. The remaining clerks on this appropriation are for the supreme court and appellate division.

³ The children's court salaries and expenses, classed as 100 per cent criminal, are given separately in Table 38.

⁴ See p. 25, *infra* (original page).

⁵ See p. 20, *supra* (original page).

⁶ Figures on revenues for county functions were all supplied from the county treasurer's ledger of miscellaneous revenues.

7. *Detailed pay-roll distribution.*—The following table gives the detailed pay-roll distribution for the criminal branch of the city court and for the county court.

TABLE 41.—*Detailed pay-roll distribution, criminal courts*

Item	Rate	Extension
CITY COURT—CRIMINAL		
1 judge.....	\$8,000	
1 clerk.....	3,600	
1 deputy clerk.....	2,400	
1 investigator.....	2,700	
1 confidential clerk.....	2,800	
1 interpreter (Polish).....	2,100	
1 court stenographer.....	3,000	
1 probation officer (female).....	1,900	
1 interpreter (Italian).....	2,100	
1 court stenographer and deputy clerk.....	2,300	
1 clerk to probation officer.....	440	
Total.....	31,340	
COUNTY COURT		
2 county judges.....	12,000	\$24,000
1 special county judge.....	10,000	10,000
1 county court clerk.....	3,475	3,475
1 supreme court clerk.....	3,600	3,600
1 naturalization and assistant court clerk.....	3,600	3,600
2 assistant court clerks.....	3,475	6,950
1 assistant court clerk.....	3,000	3,000
1 messenger, naturalization court.....	1,700	1,700
2 court stenographers.....	3,100	6,200
1 special clerk, children's court.....	3,000	3,000
1 confidential clerk to county judge.....	1,825	1,825
1 confidential clerk to special county judge.....	1,825	1,825
1 confidential clerk to county judge.....	1,825	1,825
1 clerk, children's court.....	1,825	1,825
1 clerk and stenographer, children's court.....	1,825	1,825
1 stenographer and record clerk.....	1,825	1,825
1 chauffeur.....	1,500	1,500
1 court attendant and interpreter.....	2,580	2,580
17 court attendants.....	2,400	40,800
Total.....	121,355	
Grand total.....	162,695	

V

COST OF PENAL AND CORRECTIVE TREATMENT

1. *Summary.*—The following table summarizes the cost of penal and corrective treatment in 1929:

TABLE 42.—*Summary of cost of penal and corrective treatment*

	Expense, 1929, criminal	Apportioned to city
OPERATING COST		
CITY ADMINISTRATION		
Probation: 1		
Pay roll.....	\$4,532.00	
Supplies and general overhead.....	579.81	
100 per cent city portion 2.....	5,111.81	\$5,111.81
Jail: 3.....		
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION		
Probation: 1		
Pay roll.....	32,620.13	
Supplies and general overhead.....	5,162.25	
83.78 per cent city portion 4.....	37,782.38	31,655.08
Jail: 5		
Pay roll.....	39,595.82	
Supplies and general overhead.....	44,522.22	
83.78 per cent city portion.....	84,118.04	70,474.09
Penitentiary: 6		
Pay roll.....	39,649.40	
Supplies and general overhead.....	71,856.85	
39.31 per cent city portion 7.....	111,506.25	43,833.11
Total.....		151,074.09

1 From p. 28, *infra* (original page).

2 Supported by city tax. Takes cases only from city court.

3 The city has no jail but uses the county jail.

4 City's portion of the total county tax levy is $\frac{\$3,207,966.47}{\$3,829,154.00} = 83.78$ per cent.

5 From p. 29, *infra* (original page).

6 From p. 30, *infra* (original page).

7 The city's share of the 1929 expenditures for the penitentiary of \$119,615.93 (including carrying charges on land and building but not including farm expenses or revenues) is as follows:

	City share	Other sources	Source of data
BOARD OF PRISONERS			
City.....	\$50,812.58		Local tax, 1929. Supervisors' Proceedings, pp. 823-826.
Towns in county.....		\$8,897.42	
State (felons and tramps).....		12,229.00	County treasurer's accounts.
Other counties.....		52,195.84	
SUBTRACT SURPLUS	50,812.58	73,322.26	
City, 83.78 per cent.....	-3,785.94		As the amount collected exceeds the expenditure, the excess is deducted in proportion as the city and towns share in the saving in county tax.
Towns, 16.22 per cent.....		-732.97	
Add city's share.....	47,026.64	72,589.29	
		47,026.64	
		119,615.93	
City's share = $\frac{\$47,026.64}{119,615.93} = 39.31$ per cent.			

TABLE 42.—Summary of cost of penal and corrective treatment—
Continued

	Expense, 1929, crim- inal	Apportioned to city
STATE ADMINISTRATION ¹		
ADDITIONAL DATA		
Carrying charge on capital investment; City probation:		
100 per cent city portion.....	270.00	270.00
County probation.....		
83.78 per cent city portion.....	3,449.11	2,889.66
Jail.....		
83.78 per cent city portion.....	4,420.13	3,703.18
Penitentiary.....		
39.31 per cent city portion.....	8,109.68	3,187.91
Total.....		10,050.75
5-year average of expenditure for equipment:		
Jail.....	893.40	
83.78 city portion.....		748.49
Receipts:		
Jail—extra quality meals paid by prisoners.....	\$4,798.35	
Penitentiary—		
Sale of products.....	26,831.93	
Miscellaneous sales.....	7,650.58	
Total.....	39,280.86	

¹ Omitted. See Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities, Ch. VII, sec. 1.

2. *City probation.*—The following table gives the cost of city probation in 1929:

TABLE 43.—Cost of city probation

	Expense, 1929	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll:		
Salaries and wages ¹	\$9,064.00	
50 per cent criminal ²		\$4,532.00
Supplies and general overhead:		
Expense.....	1,159.62	
50 per cent criminal.....		579.81
Carrying charges on capital investment:		
Building ³	540.00	
50 per cent criminal.....		270.00
Equipment ⁴		
Revenues.....	None.	

¹ Figures furnished from accounts kept by the chief city probation officer and clerk of court.
² While 114 of the 327 cases received from city court or 35 per cent were domestic relations (nonsupport), the probation officers handle a large number of nonsupport cases which do not go through the city court. The chief probation officer estimates the proportion to the entire activities as 50 per cent.

³ The probation office occupies 3 offices, 9 by 10, partitioned off from the council chamber in city hall. The carrying charge and maintenance on this space is estimated at \$2 per square foot annually, on the basis of the figure of \$2.62 found for the courthouse (Table 32, note 1). The city hall is an older and less elaborate building. A more exact calculation for this small space is not worth the labor involved.

⁴ Included with city court, p. 23, supra (original page).

The average number of persons on city probation during the year 1929, beginning April 1 when the office was separated from county probation, was 243.

3. *County probation.*—The following table gives the cost of county probation in 1929:

TABLE 44.—Cost of county probation

	Expenses, 1929	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll: ¹		
Salaries.....	\$32,620.13	
100 per cent criminal ²		\$32,620.13
Supplies and general overhead: ³		
Materials and supplies.....		
Expense.....	5,162.25	
100 per cent criminal.....		5,162.25
Carrying charges on capital investment:		
Building ⁴	3,449.11	
Equipment ³		
100 per cent criminal.....		3,449.11
Revenues.....	None.	

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1929, board of supervisors' clerk.
² Domestic relations cases are handled by the city—not the county. This appropriation account carried both children's and adult probation.
³ Appropriation ledger, 1929.
⁴ From p. 20, supra (original page).

The average number on probation during 1929 was 404 in the children's division and 440 in the adult division.

City probation is for misdemeanors requiring probation of three months to two years, while county probation (adult division) is for felonies requiring probation from two to five years.

4. *Jail.*—The following table gives the cost of the county jail in 1929.

TABLE 45.—Cost of the jail

	Expense, 1929	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll: ¹		
Salaries—		
Building.....	\$5,225.18	-----
Inmates.....	34,370.64	-----
	39,595.82	-----
100 per cent criminal ²		\$39,595.82
Supplies and general overhead:		
Expense, administration ³	2,325.10	-----
Materials and supplies, building ⁴	5,220.63	-----
Expense, building ⁴	10,688.29	-----
Materials and supplies, inmates ⁵	26,049.11	-----
Expense, inmates.....	239.00	-----
	44,522.22	-----
100 per cent criminal.....		44,522.22
Carrying charge on capital investment:		
Land \$20,000, interest 4½ per cent ⁶	900.00	-----
Building \$54,155.91; interest, 4½ per cent; depreciation, 2 per cent—6½ per cent ⁶	3,520.13	-----
	4,420.13	-----
100 per cent.....		4,420.13
5-year average of expenditures for equipment ⁷	893.40	893.40
Revenues: Extra-quality meals, paid by prisoners ⁸	4,798.35	-----

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1929, county board of supervisors' clerk.

² Function of jail is entirely criminal and paid for by county tax budget. There are no civil prisoners.

³ Appropriation ledger, 1929.

⁴ From p. 31, *infra* (original page). Expenditures for this item vary considerably from year to year. The appropriation for 1929 of \$7,500 was overexpended by \$18,366.44 to a total of \$25,866.44. Previous years' expenditures are shown on p. 31 (original page) and were much less. It is evident that expenditures under this appropriation occasionally include major alterations of some lasting benefit. The 5-year average, 1925-1929, is accordingly used in place of the 1929 expenditure as more accurately stating the normal expenditure for this item.

⁵ Expenditures for land as stated in the county treasurer's report, p. 27 of the proceedings of the board of supervisors, 1884, when the jail was built.

⁶ Brick building. Expenditures for building and equipping jail as reported by county treasurer. Proceedings board of supervisors, 1885 (p. 12) and 1886 (p. 24).

⁷ From p. 31, *infra* (original page). The 5-year average, 1925-1929, is used in place of the 1920 expenditure, which was \$1,916.19.

⁸ The prisoners are not employed in any labor and there is no product manufactured to yield a revenue. The jail is for short-time detention only.

5. *Penitentiary.*—The following table gives the cost of the county penitentiary for the year 1929.

TABLE 46.—Cost of the penitentiary

	Expense, 1929	Apportioned to criminal
Pay roll: ¹		
Salaries—		
Administration.....	\$6,750.00	-----
Inmates.....	21,174.40	-----
Farm ²	11,725.00	-----
	39,649.40	-----
100 per cent criminal ³		\$39,649.40
Supplies and general overhead: ⁴		
Expenses—Administration.....	2,315.02	-----
Materials and supplies—Building.....	8,135.98	-----
Expense.....	8,996.20	-----
Materials and supplies—Inmates.....	51,947.08	-----
Expense.....	461.91	-----
Materials and supplies—Farm.....	\$11,061.66	-----
Expense—Farm.....	6,450.31	-----
	71,856.85	-----
100 per cent criminal.....		71,856.85
Carrying charge on capital investment:		
Land ⁵	1,564.00	-----
Interest 4½ per cent.....	70.38	-----
Building ⁶	123,681.60	-----
Interest 4½ per cent.....	8,309.30	-----
Depreciation 2 per cent] ⁶ 6½ per cent.....		-----
	8,109.68	-----
100 per cent criminal.....		8,109.68
Equipment—Farm.....	1,921.57	-----
Revenues:		
Output—		
Sale of products.....	26,831.93	-----
Miscellaneous sales.....	7,050.58	-----
Board of prisoners—		
City.....	50,812.58	-----
State (for tramps and felons).....	12,229.00	-----
Towns in county.....	8,897.42	-----
Other counties.....	52,195.84	-----
Total.....	158,617.35	-----

¹ Appropriation ledger, 1929, county board of supervisors' clerk.

² The salaries of employees overseeing the farm are included as they are on duty to take care of and prevent the escape of prisoners as well as direct farm work. Other farm expenditures are not included. The superintendent advised this allocation. In this manner both revenues and expenses attributable to the manufactured product of the penitentiary are omitted. A portion of the product in vegetables and dairy products is consumed at the penitentiary, but the major portion is sold.

³ The function of the jail is entirely criminal. There are no civil prisoners. Commitments in 1929 were:

City.....	939
Towns.....	194
County (including 15 felons, 27 tramps).....	42
Other counties (including 46 felons, 150 tramps).....	623
	1,798

⁴ Appropriation ledger, 1929.

⁵ 4 acres of land purchased in 1854 for this amount. The other 16 acres are used for the farm. Report of 1859, as published in book of rules, superintendent's office.

⁶ Brick and stone building. The investment in the building is:

Date	Nature	Amount	Source of data
1854-1859..	Original building with additions to 1859.	\$64,232.16	Report published 1859, p. 141, Supervisors Proceedings.
1854-1859..	Furniture and fixtures.....	11,046.00	Report of 1859.
1894-1895..	Addition to building.....	48,403.44	Treasurer's reports. Supervisors Proceedings of 1894, p. 41, and of 1895, p. 53.
		123,681.60	

6. *Penal and corrective treatment expenditures, 1925-1929.*—The following table shows the expenditures for penal and corrective treatment during the years 1925-1929 and the average expenditures for the 5-year period.

TABLE 47.—*Expenditures for penal and corrective treatment, 1925-1929*¹

	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	5-year average
PROBATION OFFICERS						
Salaries.....	\$12,358	\$14,318	\$15,807	\$20,812	\$32,020	\$20,383.00
Expense.....	2,329	3,070	3,053	3,095	5,162	3,341.80
Total.....	14,687	17,388	18,860	23,907	37,182	23,724.80
JAIL						
Administration:						
Expense.....	1,172	1,272	1,426	1,416	2,325	1,522.20
Total.....	1,172	1,272	1,426	1,416	2,325	1,522.20
Building:						
Salaries.....	3,917	4,400	4,365	4,796	5,225	4,540.60
Equipment.....	167	1,448	872	64	1,916	893.40
Materials and supplies.....	4,690	5,034	3,853	3,377	5,220	4,434.80
Expense.....	3,585	13,228	4,948	5,814	25,560	10,688.29
Total.....	12,359	24,110	14,038	14,051	38,227	20,557.09
Inmates:						
Salaries.....	23,886	27,341	29,188	31,959	34,370	29,348.80
Materials and supplies.....	14,409	25,123	24,769	24,100	26,049	23,891.00
Expense.....	249	195	248	297	239	245.60
Total.....	38,544	52,664	54,205	56,356	60,658	52,485.40
PENITENTIARY						
Administration:						
Salaries.....	5,500	5,063	6,036	6,486	6,750	6,207.00
Expense.....	925	798	778	909	2,315	1,145.00
Total.....	6,425	6,401	7,414	7,395	9,065	7,352.00
Building:						
Materials and supplies.....	650	4,314	8,546	7,740	8,135	5,877.00
Expense.....	14,962	4,074	3,434	7,711	8,906	7,835.40
Total.....	15,612	8,388	11,980	15,451	17,131	13,712.40
Inmates:						
Salaries ²	13,452	16,014	16,763	19,552	21,174	17,391.00
Materials and supplies.....	36,719	48,044	48,238	53,717	51,947	47,013.00
Expense.....	1,686	430	1,187	598	461	854.40
Total.....	51,857	65,388	66,188	73,777	73,582	66,158.40
Farm:						
Salaries.....	7,206	9,020	9,203	11,308	11,725	9,602.40
Equipment.....		3,502	431	893	1,921	1,361.40
Materials and supplies.....	4,639	9,335	12,407	10,792	11,001	9,658.80
Expense.....	15,641	15,161	11,834	7,555	6,450	11,328.20
Total.....	27,486	37,078	33,935	30,548	31,157	32,040.80

¹ Taken from appropriations and balances, county board of supervisors' proceedings, excepting the 1929 figures, which were taken from the appropriation ledger.

² Prison employees, etc.

7. *Detailed pay-roll distribution.*—The following table gives the detailed pay roll distribution of the penal and corrective agencies.

TABLE 48.—*Detailed pay-roll distribution, penal and corrective agencies*

Item	Rate	Extension	Total
CITY PROBATION			
1 chief probation officer.....	\$3,000	\$3,000	
3 probation officers, male.....	2,400	7,200	
1 stenographer.....	1,500	1,500	\$11,700
COUNTY PROBATION			
1 chief probation officer, adult division of county court.....	2,600	2,600	
1 assistant probation officer, adult division county court.....	3,000	3,000	
1 clerk to adult division of county court.....	1,940	1,940	
5 probation officers, adult division county court.....	2,400	12,000	
1 stenographer, adult division of county court.....	1,500	1,500	
1 chief probation officer, children's division county court.....	3,075	3,075	
1 assistant chief probation officer, children's division county court.....	2,700	2,700	
2 probation officers, children's division county court.....	1,940	3,780	
1 probation officer, children's division county court.....	2,150	2,150	32,745
JAIL			
3 jailers and deputies.....	2,420	7,260	
1 assistant jailer.....	2,125	2,125	
2 engineers.....	1,825	3,650	
1 matron.....	855	855	
4 deputy sheriffs.....	2,420	9,680	
2 women jailers.....	1,250	2,500	
1 physician.....	1,050	1,050	
2 chaplains.....	575	1,150	
1 Jewish chaplain, county institutions.....	575	575	
1 cook.....	1,020	1,020	
2 waitresses.....	1,020	1,530	
4 laborers.....	1,825	7,300	
1 porter.....	1,250	1,250	40,011
PENITENTIARY			
1 superintendent.....	4,500	4,500	
1 deputy superintendent.....	2,850	2,850	
1 deputy superintendent (without maintenance).....	3,500	3,500	
1 physician.....	768	768	
1 clerk.....	2,250	2,250	
2 chaplains.....	575	1,150	
1 farmer.....	1,400	1,400	
12 farmers.....	1,250	15,000	
1 night watchman.....	1,650	1,650	
1 keeper.....	1,250	1,250	
1 laundryman.....	1,250	1,250	
1 overseer.....	1,250	1,250	
3 cooks.....	1,020	3,060	
1 baker.....	1,575	1,575	
1 domestic.....	768	768	
1 farmer.....	1,575	1,575	43,796
Total.....			128,252

8. *Number of prisoners.*—The average number of prisoners confined in the county jail in 1929 was 67, and in the county penitentiary 329.

9. *Parole.*—No parole system is operated, either by the city of Rochester or by the county.

2. *Omissions.*—In the case of the appellate courts, and of the offices of the sheriff, the coroner, and the commissioner of jurors, the proportion of the total cost allocable to the administration of criminal justice has been omitted as negligible.

(a) *The appellate courts.*—The appellate division, fourth department, sits over one-fourth of the State. Of the 468 appeals to this court, both criminal and civil, and the 345 motions, only 8 were on criminal cases from Monroe County. The court of appeals has jurisdiction in cases from the entire State. Only one criminal appeal was taken from Monroe County in 1929.⁸¹ The cost is therefore disregarded.

(b) *The sheriff.*—The undersheriff estimates that 10 per cent of the sheriff's duties consist in the serving of subpoenas to jurors and witnesses for trial in county court. The expense of the county court is 35 per cent criminal. Thirty-five per cent of 10 per cent is 3.5 per cent. The cost on this basis would be \$5,720.91. The amount is so small that it is omitted.

(c) *The coroner.*—Less than 4 per cent of the deaths investigated by the coroner in 1929 were the results of crimes. Accordingly, no attempt has been made to allocate part of the cost of the coroner's office to the cost of administering criminal justice.

(d) *The commissioner of jurors.*—Approximately one-half of the jurors drawn go to the county court, which is criminal, and one-half go to the noncriminal supreme court. Thirty-five per cent of the expense of the county court is criminal.⁸² Fifty per cent of 35 per cent is 17.5 per cent, or \$2,535.79. This sum has been omitted as unimportant.

APPENDIX ON SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. *Methods of investigation.*—In securing the community data, all possible information was obtained from the United States census. This source of information was given preference as the most accurate and reliable. Then the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, a large and capable organization,

⁸¹ Data furnished by clerk of court and from district attorney's report, 1930, p. 98.

⁸² From p. 25, *supra*.

was asked to cooperate in supplying information which was lacking in the census reports.

In securing the cost data, the first essential was a knowledge of what city and county agencies were concerned with the administration of criminal justice and to what degree. The complete list of city and county offices was given both in the budgets and in the expenditure reports published by the city and county. The city budget and the city expenditure report (comptroller's report) are published annually as separate volumes obtainable at the comptroller's office. The county budget and the county expenditure report (report of balances remaining from budget appropriations) are published annually in the proceedings of the county board of supervisors, copies of which were obtainable at the office of the clerk of the board. With the complete list of city and county offices secured, inquiry was then made of the proper city and county officials as to which of these agencies are concerned with criminal work and to what degree. These inquiries were directed to the comptroller, corporation counsel, chief of police, statistician of the bureau of police, city court clerk, and chief probation officer. In the case of the county, similar inquiries were made at the offices of the clerk of supervisors' board, district attorney, sheriff, coroner, and the clerks of the various courts. The city and county offices found to be concerned with criminal matters were:

City offices	County offices
Bureau of police. Bureau of fire and police telegraph. City court—criminal branch (including probation).	District attorney. Coroners. County court (including children's court). Sheriff. Commissioner of Jurors. Probation. Jail. Penitentiary.

The organization within each of these offices was apparent to a large degree from an examination of the salary schedules published in the respective budgets. Where more detailed knowledge of the organization was necessary, this was secured by inquiry. The statistician of the police bureau, for instance, furnished the analysis of the police pay roll divided among the various offices (pp. 13-14,

supra), which is used in this report as a basis for allocating police costs as between criminal and noncriminal.

In the matter of allocations of cost, the superintendent of fire and police telegraph, the clerk of county court, the undersheriff, the superintendent of the county courthouse, the coroner, and the superintendent of the penitentiary were also consulted. These allocations are described in detail where they occur in this report.

The investment in county buildings and land was found by inquiring as to the approximate date of the original buildings and all additions, then searching through the county board of supervisors' proceedings for the years affected to find all records of expenditures for the buildings in question in the annual treasurer's reports. The outlay for city buildings and land is carried in the annual comptroller's report as an exhibit on the balance sheet. The county does not keep a similar record.

2. *Sources of information.*—The sources of information on which this report is based have been specified in the tabulations wherever used. These may be summarized as follows:

Community data:

- United States census, 1930.
- Rochester industrial survey, Rochester Chamber of Commerce.
- Industrial management council, Rochester Chamber of Commerce.
- Bureau of statistics, Rochester Chamber of Commerce.
- Rochester building-trade scale, Builders' Exchange, Rochester.
- Monthly reports, Rochester Bureau of Health.

City cost data:

- Comptroller's reports, 1925-1929, comptroller's office.
- City budget, 1929, comptroller's office.
- Police telephone costs, superintendent fire and police telegraph.
- Police organization, statistician of police bureau.
- Bureau of buildings' pay roll, superintendent of buildings' office.
- Police bureau report, 1929, police bureau.
- City equipment inventory, comptroller's office.
- Probation office expenditures, chief probation officer.

County cost data:

- Appropriation ledger, 1929, county board of supervisors' clerk.
- Proceedings board supervisors, 1924-1929, county board of supervisors' clerk.
- Annual budgets, 1925-1929, proceedings board of supervisors.
- Annual statements of balances, 1925-1929, proceedings board of supervisors.

- Salary schedule, 1929, proceedings board of supervisors.
- County tax levy, proceedings board of supervisors.
- Plans of courthouse, superintendent of courthouse.
- Miscellaneous revenue ledger, county treasurer.
- Minutes of court proceedings, clerk of county court.

3. *Evaluation of data.*—A number of approximations and estimates have been used in the derivation of the cost of administering criminal justice. In one case—the allocation to criminal work of the expenses of city probation—the estimate was based on the opinion of the city's chief probation officer, supported to some degree by actual figures as to the proportion of criminal and noncriminal probation cases. Where, however, such estimates have been used, the amounts in question have been relatively small, so that any error would affect the result in only a small proportion. The allocations of cost included in the computation of the cost of police and courts, where the expenditures are large, have been based on exact data, such as pay roll divisions and actual time of court spent on criminal and civil functions, giving a basis for allocations which may be regarded as reliable. In the case of the criminal branch of the city court, the district attorney, the grand jury, county probation, the jail, and the penitentiary, the functions are entirely criminal, so that allocations are not needed.

In all cases where approximations or estimates have been used, these have been purposely made conservatively so that the final result may be regarded as less rather than more than the actual expenditure.

The carrying charges on land and buildings are in every case based on actual outlay and may be considered reliable. The matter of carrying charges on equipment is subject to more debate. In any case the distinction between supplies and equipment is indefinite and subject to various interpretations by the various city and county accounting agencies. For instance, stationery worth approximately \$1,200 was included in the equipment inventory taken by the police for the comptroller's office, although this item is obviously one of supplies rather than equipment. The carrying charge on police equipment was not used, therefore, until it had been checked by comparison with the average annual expenditure for equipment and found to be substantially the same in amount.

In the case of the county offices, a number were found to lack any appropriation for the purchase of equipment, so that such purchases had to be made from the current expense appropriation. As the extent of these purchases could not be ascertained, the amounts could not be deducted from the computations and replaced by the carrying charge. Throughout the report, following the chapter on police, the 5-year average expenditure for equipment has been used in place of the year's expenditure or any estimated carrying charge on the equipment on hand. As these amounts appear to run reasonably uniform from year to year, the 5-year average probably gives the best figure to use for equipment. It shows the normal and usual annual expense for this item, which is what is desired. It also avoids all uncertainty as to what factor of depreciation to use.

The city records of expenditures as reported by the comptroller are generally accepted without question in considering municipal affairs. They are checked by an independent audit in Rochester before the comptroller's report is published. The 5-year record of expenditures furnishes an additional check to some degree, serving to reveal any gross errors. The county expenditure figures for 1929 were taken from the appropriation ledger kept by the bookkeeper in the clerk of the board of supervisors' office. These were checked by comparison with the published statements of appropriations and of balances remaining from appropriations. This latter source was also used to derive the record of expenditures for previous years.

The inclusion of expenditure figures for the five years ending with 1929 is considered of value in serving to reveal any extraordinarily high or low expenditure in the year used as a basis for the report. In one case, viz, the county jail current expense, the expenditure for the year 1929 was rejected as obviously extraordinary in amount and the 5-year average figure substituted. (See p. 29, supra, footnote 4.) This position was taken for the reason that what is desired is the normal and usual expenditure. Backed by the published records of expenditures in previous years showing a gradual and approximately uniform increase, or an approximately equal expenditure from year to year, the figures for the year in question may be accepted with confidence.

NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

OUTLINE OF PROJECT FOR STUDIES OF
THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE



[Reprinted]

WASHINGTON: 1930

**NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT**

**OUTLINE OF PROJECT FOR STUDIES OF
THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1930**

FOREWORD

The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, through its subcommittee on the cost of crime, has undertaken a study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States. The general objectives and character of that study are set forth in the foreword to the commission's Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities, published November 1, 1930. The addresses reprinted in this pamphlet outline in some detail the commission's project for a nation-wide investigation of municipal costs of this character, and will, it is believed, be of value to the investigators who are carrying out the studies contemplated by the project and of interest to others.

These addresses were delivered on November 12, 1930, at the annual convention of the Government Research Association, held at Cleveland, Ohio. The first address, by Sidney P. Simpson, Esq., of the New York bar, director of the commission's study of the cost of administration of criminal justice, deals with the project as a whole and outlines its general scope and purpose. The second address, by Hazen C. Pratt, Esq., of the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research, deals with the test study made for the commission by that bureau in Rochester, N. Y., and should be of practical value to the investigators in other cities. The discussion of these addresses by Dr. Luther Gulick, director of the National Institute of Public Administration, considers the project from the standpoint of the government research organizations of the country.

As the director of the study states (p. 9, *infra*), the success of the project will depend entirely on the response of the various agencies—research bureaus, colleges and universities, city administrations, and chambers of commerce—whose assistance must be enlisted if it is to be carried into execution. It is the earnest hope of the commission that such assistance may be enlisted for all the cities which are included in the project.

PAUL J. McCORMICK,

Chairman, Subcommittee on the Cost of Crime.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND
ENFORCEMENT,

Washington, D. C., December 15, 1930.

CONTENTS

	Original page	Reprint page
Studies of Municipal and State Costs of the Administration of Criminal Justice, by Sidney P. Simpson, Director, Study of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice, National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement.....	1	615
The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, by Hazen C. Pratt, Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research, Rochester, N. Y.....	10	625
Discussion—From the Standpoint of the Government Research Organizations of the United States, by Luther Gulick, Director, National Institute of Public Administration, New York, N. Y.....	16	632
63666—31—40		613

STUDIES OF MUNICIPAL AND STATE COSTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

By SIDNEY P. SIMPSON

The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement was appointed by the President on May 28, 1929.¹ The purpose of the commission is, in the words of the President, "an exhaustive study of the entire problem of the enforcement of our laws and the improvement of our judicial system, including the special problems and abuses growing out of the prohibition laws"² and the development of "some constructive program for decrease and control of crime as a whole."³ The commission has formed 11 subcommittees, dealing, respectively, with volume of crime and criminal statistics; causes of crime; cost of crime; police; prosecution; courts; juvenile delinquency; penal institutions, probation and parole; crime and the foreign-born; lawlessness by Government officials in the enforcement of the law; and prohibition. Our study of State and municipal costs of the administration of criminal justice is being carried out for the commission's subcommittee on the cost of crime.

The chairman of the commission has recently said that this subcommittee is "seeking as accurate an answer as may be obtained to the question: What is America's annual bill for the luxury of crime?"⁴ It may be well to say at the outset that we are under no illusions as to our ability to get a complete answer to that question. The theoretically correct answer would no doubt be obtained by ascertaining what would be the annual national income if there were no

¹ See second deficiency bill, approved Mar. 4, 1929, appropriating \$250,000 "for the purpose of a thorough inquiry into the problem of the enforcement of prohibition under the provisions of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and laws enacted in pursuance thereof, together with the enforcement of other laws * * *." See also second deficiency bill, 1930-31, approved July 3, 1930, appropriating an additional \$250,000 for the work of the commission during the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1931.

² Annual message to Congress, Dec. 3, 1929, 72 Congressional Record, 28.

³ Statement of June 30, 1929, quoted in George W. Wickersham, *The Program of the Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement*, 16 *American Bar Association Journal*, 654.

⁴ George W. Wickersham, *op cit.*, *supra*, note 3, at p. 60.

crime, and finding the difference between that figure and the actual national income. This would be something like an endeavor to determine what the course of history would have been if Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo. We do not propose to venture into any such realm of conjecture, and consequently will not attempt to develop any single lump-sum figure for the annual economic cost of crime to the United States.

There are, however, certain costs to the community or to particular elements in the community which have a definite and obvious relation to crime, and which are susceptible of accurate and objective ascertainment. These may be classified as official or public costs and unofficial or private costs. In the first category is included the cost of public agencies for the administration of criminal justice. In the second category are included such elements as direct losses to private individuals due to crime, and private expenditures for protection against crime. The commission's subcommittee on the cost of crime feels that data on both these classes of costs should be developed, although recognizing, as indicated above, that both are rather costs *related to* crime than costs *of* crime in any strict sense, and that it will not be possible, by adding the figures for these two classes of costs, to secure a lump-sum figure for the cost of crime to the country. We are concerned in this particular discussion with the official or public costs in connection with crime; more accurately stated, we are concerned with the cost of administration of criminal justice.

The cost of the administration of criminal justice may be divided into four principal elements—cost of police, cost of prosecution, cost of criminal courts, and cost of penal and corrective treatment of criminals. The total of these costs may be fairly said to be the public cost of administering the criminal law. Theoretically, perhaps, part of the general administrative overhead of the executive departments of city and State governments should be included, but as a practical matter this is so relatively small in amount and so difficult of accurate ascertainment that it may well be disregarded. There will also be some other special costs which in given instances should be included, as, for example, the cost of the public defense of accused persons in jurisdictions

where this is provided for by law; but, speaking generally, the four divisions above referred to cover the field.

Perhaps the most serious problem which arises in any attempt to develop accurate figures as to the cost of administration of criminal justice is that of allocation of costs. This problem has a double aspect. In the first place, certain of the law enforcement agencies mentioned above have both civil and criminal functions. Thus the police carry on certain administrative activities, such as traffic control; prosecuting officers may also represent cities, counties, or States in civil litigation; many courts exercise both civil and criminal jurisdiction; and some penal institutions are also used to confine civil prisoners. In all such cases, an allocation of cost as between the civil and criminal activities of the particular law enforcement agency must be made. In the second place, where the attempt is made to determine the cost of administration in given municipal units, it is frequently necessary to allocate costs borne by the counties or States to cities, or costs borne by the State to counties. Thus, prosecution for major offenses in cities is frequently handled by the prosecutor for the county in which the city is located; the criminal courts frequently have jurisdiction over offenses committed in several municipal divisions; and persons convicted of major crimes are usually confined in State institutions. The problem of allocation is thus an omnipresent one in these studies.

When we began our study for the commission of the cost of criminal justice, the obvious first step, once we had analyzed the problem, was to determine what published material was available on the subject. This we proceeded to do. Our examination of the published material has covered that in the Library of Congress and that in the New York Public Library, and also a considerable mass of material collected by Prof. Sam B. Warner at the Harvard Law School in the course of his investigation of available crime statistics, other than financial, for the commission's subcommittee on volume of crime and criminal statistics.⁵ We have also examined all the data, published and unpublished, avail-

⁵ Sam B. Warner, *Survey of Criminal Statistics in the United States for National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement* (confidential tentative draft of December, 1929, not yet made public by the commission).

able in the Bureau of the Census and in the annual reports of the various departments of the Federal Government charged with law enforcement activities. This canvass of the available published material has now been completed and will form the basis for a report to the commission which will constitute a complete inventory of the available published statistical data on the cost of criminal justice. This report will include, in addition to a discussion of financial statistics bearing on the subject, a complete check list of all publications—Federal, State, or municipal—of recent date which have been found to contain such statistics.

The results of our examination of the published material has been disappointing. With the exception of the data as to Federal and State penitentiaries⁶ and certain total figures as to police costs in the larger cities⁷ published by the Bureau of the Census, which are relatively complete and are assembled on a comparable basis, the published figures are most unsatisfactory. In the first place, they are very incomplete geographically; secondly, they are not reported on a comparable basis; and, finally, they do not afford any basis for necessary allocations of cost.

Detailed figures as to municipal police costs are published⁸ on a state-wide basis only by the State of Indiana.⁸ Only one State, Massachusetts, has a uniform system of accounting for such costs. A few other States publish total figures for police expenditures on a state-wide basis, but no details; and those States which have State police forces ordinarily report the cost of those forces, but, except as already stated, take no account of municipal costs. Municipal costs are published by 362 cities and towns, of which 104 are in the State of Massachusetts. Figures for municipalities in the Southern and Mountain States are particularly lacking. County figures are practically nonexistent, being available for only 5 out of the 3,073 counties in the United States. In addition to these meager State and municipal statistics, the Bureau of the Census publishes total figures as to police costs for the 250 largest cities of the country, and has avail-

⁶ U. S. Census, *Prisoners in State and Federal Prisons and Reformatories: 1926*, pp. 134-139.

⁷ U. S. Census, *Financial Statistics of Cities: 1927*.

⁸ Statistical Report for the State of Indiana, 1928.

able in its files unpublished manuscript material giving some details of these costs on a comparable basis. In no case are the data available for allocating police costs as between criminal and administrative activities.

Figures as to prosecution costs are even more scanty. Some figures are available for 9 States, for 45 cities, and for 89 counties; in other words, less than 3 per cent of the existing State and municipal units publish reports as to such costs. There is no uniformity of accounting, and no basis is given in the figures for allocating costs between civil and criminal activities in those cases where the prosecutor's office carries on both. The census collects no figures whatever on prosecution costs.

Figures as to the cost of the courts are published by 40 States, 109 cities, and 109 counties, but, with the solitary exceptions of the State of Connecticut and the city of St. Louis, there is no segregation of cost as between civil and criminal. The Bureau of the Census collects figures as to court costs for all 48 States and for 250 cities, but here again no basis for allocation of cost as between civil and criminal is afforded. Moreover, the available figures give no basis for allocation of cost as between city, county and State.

Fairly complete figures for State penal institutions are available, as already stated, in the published statistics of the census. State reports are also available in most cases, although the State statistics are not comparable as to details. Figures as to jails, workhouses and similar institutions, on the other hand, are very incomplete, statistics being available for less than 1 per cent of the jails and workhouses of the country. Figures as to the cost of probation and parole are available for 9 States and 68 municipalities, but these figures do not give adequate detail in most cases.⁹

⁹ The data as to the available statistical material given above (pp. 3-5, supra) are based upon an examination by Messrs. John H. Libby and J. W. Coatsworth, of Washington, D. C., of the published material in the Library of Congress and of the material, published and unpublished, in the Bureau of the Census; an examination by Miss Mary Daugherty, assistant to the director, of the commission's study of the cost of administration of criminal justice, of the material in the New York Public Library; and an examination by Messrs. W. G. Mulligan, jr., and D. B. Stookey, of the Harvard Law School (class of 1930), of the material in the Harvard Law School library. While these figures are believed to be substantially accurate, they are subject to check and possible revision. Complete revised figures will appear in a report on the available published material on the cost of administration of criminal justice to be made to the commission at a later date.

Our survey of the available statistical material has thus showed us that any satisfactory study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the United States must be based, for the most part, upon original investigation. This is true not only as to those numerous communities for which no published figures at all are available, but also as to those for which figures are published, since those figures are not, generally speaking, comparable, and do not afford the basis for necessary allocation of costs. This became apparent early in the course of our studies, and we determined to organize a field investigation of the problem on a nation-wide scale.

The project for the investigation contemplates studies of the cost of administration of criminal justice for all the cities of the United States over 25,000 in population. There are 364 such cities, of which 94 are over 100,000 in population. We plan to make, in addition, special studies for a few entire States and for some representative cities and towns of less than 25,000 population. The State investigations and the investigations for these smaller cities will be in the nature of type studies, and will not be included in our statistical analysis, which will be confined to the 365 cities of the country over 25,000 in population, or such number thereof as we shall be able to arrange to have studied and reported upon.

The great obstacle in the way of organizing this project has been and is the paucity of the funds available. The ideal method would no doubt have been to employ a small field staff of trained experts to make all the 364 studies. If the funds had been available, this is what we probably would have done. However, the commission's aggregate appropriation of only \$500,000, for two years' work is extremely meager, and, indeed, barely sufficient to meet ordinary overhead expenditures, even though the members of the commission and its consultants and expert advisors are serving without compensation. When the administrative overhead of the commission's offices in Washington is allowed for, and the balance available is divided among 11 different investigations, the amount available for each such investigation is extremely small. As illustrating this, our appropriation for the current fiscal year for the cost of

crime studies is just one-sixth of what we asked for. In this situation, we have been compelled to seek to organize our investigation on a cooperative basis, on the theory that the opportunity for definite public service will in itself be a compensation, however inadequate, to those public-spirited citizens and organizations who make for us the studies in the various communities included in our project.

We hope to enlist the cooperative assistance of three classes of agencies. In the first place, there are the municipal research bureaus, taxpayers' leagues, civic affairs departments of chambers of commerce, and similar organizations. Their personnel is trained and familiar with the available sources of information in their respective cities, and we believe that they will be able to render large service in carrying out this project without serious interference with their other work.

We also hope to secure the assistance of graduate, and in some cases undergraduate, students of the social sciences, and particularly of municipal government and public administration, in the colleges and universities. We feel that such students should be able, with some faculty assistance and supervision, to carry out the studies satisfactorily. The results of the investigations made for us by such students will be available for use by them as thesis material.

We further desire to enlist the assistance of the various city administrations themselves in many cases, especially in cities where we can not secure the aid of research organizations or of graduate students in making the studies. We are hopeful that mayors and city managers will be willing to detail personnel to carry out studies for us in many of these cities.

Our progress to date has been most encouraging, in view of the fact that the project was definitely authorized by the commission only a short time ago.¹⁰ We have already made arrangements for studies in 124 out of the 364 cities included in the project,¹¹ and are continuing our canvass of the research organizations and of the educational institutions of the country. As soon as we have completed canvassing the bureaus and the colleges and universities, we intend to bring

¹⁰ On Oct. 8, 1930.

¹¹ The figure given above is as of Dec. 8, 1930.

the project to the attention of the city administrations in those cities which have not been otherwise taken care of.

We recognized when we were developing this project that some standard set of instructions to the various investigators would be necessary to insure comparability of results, especially if we were to make use of such diverse agencies for making the studies as those mentioned above. Accordingly, we have prepared, and the commission has approved, a manual to serve as a guide to those investigators.¹² In this manual, we have outlined the objective of the project, have set forth the minimum requirements to be met by the studies, and have made certain suggestions as to sources of information and methods of investigation. The text of the manual was under consideration for some six months. In preparing it we had the assistance of a group of expert advisors to whom the commission is much indebted. That debt is especially great to the members of our advisory committee, which includes an outstanding group of experts in the field of political science and public administration. The members of this advisory committee have made most valuable suggestions with regard to the manual and with regard to the project generally, and have approved the final edition of the manual. In addition, we have secured advice as to the statistical aspects of the project, as to the cost-accounting problems involved, and as to the specific problem of police costs, from recognized experts on each of these subjects.¹³ Finally, we have secured helpful advice from the other consultants of the commission. The manual is thus no haphazard production, but has been subjected to careful scrutiny by experts and embodies the results of repeated revision in the light of expert criticism.

Moreover, the manual has been subjected to practical test. Through the cooperation of the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research, we were able to arrange for a test study in Rochester along the lines of the manual as originally drafted. This study was completed last September, except for final revision of the report. The manual was completely revised

¹² Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities: Government Printing Office, Nov. 1, 1930.

¹³ The names of the members of the advisory group and of these special advisors are given in the commission's Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities, pp. iv-v.

in the light of the Rochester investigation, particularly with a view to simplifying it and eliminating unnecessary and difficult requirements, and the final edition of the manual as printed embodies the lessons of practical experience. The final report of the Rochester study itself is being printed as a model report covering the minimum requirements set forth in the manual, and will be circulated to the investigators making the various city studies to serve as a guide in the preparation of their reports.¹⁴

We expect to render all practicable assistance to the investigators in the various communities. At a later date we propose to circulate a form, or data sheet, which will be helpful in checking the completeness of the final reports of the investigations, as well as being valuable to us in preparing the data for statistical analysis. We will aid in making appropriate official contacts where necessary, as may well be the case where the studies are to be made by graduate students; and we will be prepared to answer, to the best of our ability, any inquiries as to matters arising in the course of the individual studies. Finally, we will obtain for each investigator all available data from the 1930 census as to community factors, and figures from the Department of Justice as to volume of crime as indicated by offenses known to the police.

We are asking that the reports of the various investigations be sent in to us by March 1, 1931. Even with the reports in our hands by that date, we will have only three months for checking the data, making our statistical analysis, studying its implications, and drafting our final report for submission to the commission. This period, as you will readily realize, is none too long, and we therefore hope that we may count on having all the basic material in the form of the reports on the individual cities, in our hands by the date stated.

There should be no serious difficulty in completing the reports by that date. The Rochester study took the full time of one man for four weeks, but it was a pioneer study, and at least half of that time was spent in securing data on matters which we have eliminated from our minimum re-

¹⁴ Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, N. Y.: Government Printing Office (in press).

quirements in the final edition of the manual, or else have determined to handle by supplying complete data to the investigators. We believe, on the basis of our experience in Rochester, that the investigation necessary to meet the minimum requirements of the manual as finally revised should not require more than two weeks. This contemplates full-time work by a trained man. Studies by graduate students will, no doubt, take longer, but we do not believe that either the amount of time which will be required for investigation or the limit of time on completion of the reports should be a serious obstacle to the studies.

We believe that the studies contemplated by our project will have a very definite value in several respects. In the first place, they will supply the first and only reliable data on the cost of administration of criminal justice ever obtained in the United States. We feel, and the commission feels, that this in itself is worth while. Second, we believe that the individual studies for the various cities will be of value to those cities themselves in considering what they are spending to prevent and suppress crime and what results they are getting for their expenditures. Third, the reports for all the studies, taken together, will provide a vast storehouse of accurately ascertained and comparable data, not only with regard to cost but also with regard to such matters as community characteristics, governmental and law enforcement machinery, and volume of crime, which will be available in the future to students of public administration and of the social sciences generally. Fourth, by means of our statistical analysis of the data on cost and on volume of crime in correlation with community factors, we hope to develop comparative figures as to the cost and efficiency of the administration of the criminal law in various communities which will be both interesting and useful. Finally, we hope to make a beginning, at least, toward the development of norms or standards as regards efficiency and expense in the administration of criminal justice in American cities. This may or may not prove practicable; but, in any case, the attempt to do so will serve to emphasize the importance of the cost factor in the administration of justice. In almost all other branches of administration extensive studies of cost have been made,

but such studies have been conspicuously absent so far as the administration of justice is concerned. We feel that one of the functions of this investigation is to bring out the necessity for considering the cost element in any comprehensive study of the administration of the criminal law.

We feel that our project for a nation-wide study of the cost of administration of criminal justice is an important one. We believe, for the reasons outlined, that the successful carrying out of this project will produce results of real and definite value. This is a pioneer project, not only as to subject matter but also in attempting to secure voluntary cooperation in a research project on a nation-wide scale. We earnestly hope that it may succeed. Whether or not it does succeed will depend entirely on the response of the agencies whose assistance we must enlist if we are to carry the project into execution.

THE COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN ROCHESTER

By HAZEN C. PRATT

During July, 1930, the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement called upon the Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research to advise in regard to the proposed study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in the larger cities of the United States. We were asked to make a trial study in Rochester, following the outline given in the manual which the director of the study, assisted by his advisory group, had prepared in the form of a tentative draft. This was proposed in order to test out the manual so that it might be revised with some certainty that the studies directed were practical, would not take more than a reasonable time to complete, and would yield the results desired. A second object was the preparation of a report which would serve as a guide for other investigators to follow, showing in concrete form just what was desired.

Our test study showed that the manual in its original tentative draft was correct and practical. Only in a few instances, chiefly in connection with the chapter on general community data, was the information found to be unobtainable or difficult to secure. These matters have now been

omitted from the requirements upon revision, and the manual has been very considerably simplified in the light of the experience gained in the Rochester study. The effort throughout has been to reduce the amount of labor required of the investigator by eliminating all requests for data which were not essential, particularly those which required considerable time either to secure or compile. The Rochester study, as it has now been prepared for publication, follows the manual in its revised form.

As it is now arranged, the manual directs the way for the prosecution of this study with a definiteness which should be a joy to the research worker, accustomed, as most of us are, to stumbling along more or less in the dark making up the outline for our report as we go along. Most of the data for the chapter entitled "Community Data" is in the form of statistics gathered by the United States Census Bureau and will be furnished to each investigator by the director of the study. The remainder of the information required for this chapter was secured without difficulty in Rochester from the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, the Builders' Exchange, and the municipal Bureau of Health.

The next four chapters of the study deal with the derivation of costs in the four divisions of police, prosecution, courts and penal institutions, the latter including probation and parole. The basic data for these chapters are provided by the records of city and county expenditures, obtainable in Rochester from the city comptroller's office and the office of the clerk of the county board of supervisors in the form of published reports. Three city offices and six county offices were found, upon investigation, to be concerned with the administration of criminal justice, as follows:

City offices.—Bureau of police, bureau of fire and police telegraph, city court—criminal branch (including probation).

County offices.—District attorney, county court (including children's court), probation, jail, penitentiary.

The coroner's office and the county sheriff were originally included in the Rochester study, but have been omitted upon revision, as only a small and indefinite portion of the work of these offices could be classed as of a criminal law enforce-

ment nature and the amount involved was in any case so small that it could affect the total only slightly.

The compilation of the report consisted mainly in securing the expenditures of the offices listed above and allocating the proper proportion to criminal activities and to city (rather than county) expenses. The allocations of expenditures of county offices as between the city and the rest of the county were made in ratio to the tax levy. The allocations of cost between criminal and noncriminal activities were based, in most cases, on the pay roll. In five of the nine offices, the latter allocation was not necessary, as the functions were found to be entirely of a criminal administrative nature.

The report on the Rochester study shows quite graphically and simply how these allocations were made. In the case of the bureau of police, the entire pay roll was obtained, showing the number and salaries of the employees in each office, the patrolmen, detective bureau, license bureau, traffic squad, etc. These were listed in the three categories of criminal, noncriminal and overhead, according to the directions contained in the manual. The proportion or percentage of the work of the entire police bureau was then found by obtaining the ratio which the total of the criminal pay roll bore to the total of the criminal and noncriminal. This percentage, applied to the total expenditures of the police bureau as reported by the comptroller in his annual report, yielded the result desired; *i. e.*, the police costs of administering criminal justice in Rochester. As 87 per cent of the police expenditures were for personal service, this method of allocating costs could not introduce any very large error, as it is reasonable to assume that expenditures for supplies and miscellaneous current expense, upkeep of buildings, etc., are to be divided approximately in proportion to the division of the pay roll as between criminal and noncriminal functions.

In one respect, however, it was possible to improve upon this allocation. The annual expenditures for supplies and maintenance for traffic signals, traffic law markings, street-car loading zones, etc., are fairly considerable. This appears to be in the nature of an extraordinary expense, additional

to the ordinary supplies and current expense allocable to the traffic squad in common with other functions of the police bureau. It was therefore deducted from the police supply expenditures before the allocation between criminal and noncriminal functions was made.

The pay roll was also used in determining the portion of the expenses of the bureau of fire and police telegraph chargeable to criminal justice, and the division of cost between the children's court and the other branches of the county court. The county court (exclusive of the children's court branch) hears both civil and criminal cases in each of its five terms a year. The time devoted to each of these is, however, fairly definitely marked, the civil cases being all heard before criminal trials are begun. In order to secure a basis for the allocation of cost, it was necessary to refer to the book of minutes kept by the clerk of the court, noting the date the criminal trial period and the civil trial period began and ended in each term. The number of days devoted to each was then calculated from a calendar, allowing for all Saturdays, Sundays and holidays when court was in recess. The proportion which the time taken by criminal trials bore to the total time taken by both criminal and civil trials was then applied to the total expenses of this court, exclusive of the children's branch. The children's court was considered as entirely part of the criminal law enforcement machinery, as directed by the manual.

Following this allocation between criminal and noncriminal costs, the expenses of the county offices were, with one exception, divided between the city and the surrounding towns in the county in the ratio in which the annual county tax was levied. As the city contains the bulk of the population and most of the valuable property, it bears most of the tax. The single exception was in the case of the county penitentiary. Penitentiary expenses are assessed against a number of near-by counties, as well as against the city and the other towns in the county, for the most part in the form of charges for the daily board of prisoners committed from the various jurisdictions. The State also contributes in some degree. The actual charge against the city was used as the basis for the allocation of this expense.

Expenditures for the repair and maintenance of buildings were included in the costs reported for each office. The bureau of police, jail and penitentiary were found to occupy quarters of their own. The central police station, however, is maintained by the bureau of buildings under an appropriation distinct from that of the police bureau, requiring an allocation of this maintenance expense to the police bureau costs. This was made by means of the pay roll. The fire and police telegraph headquarters occupies one large room over a fire house. The police service rendered by this bureau is but a small proportion of its duties, the larger portion being for fire-protection purposes, and so the building maintenance charge theoretically allocable to police purposes was dismissed as negligible. The remainder of the police, jail and penitentiary building maintenance expenses appear in the appropriation expenditures for these offices. The city court, criminal branch, has its court room in the central police station. A separate accounting was not made on this score, and the entire charge was included in the police costs.

The remaining offices, including those of the district attorney, county court, children's court, and probation force, occupy quarters in the county courthouse. The plans of the courthouse were obtained from the superintendent and the floor area was computed. The expenses of courthouse maintenance were then apportioned proportionately to the floor space occupied.

Carrying charges on investment in land, buildings and equipment are given in the final Rochester report, but are not included in the total cost figure. This is in harmony with the revision of the manual, following the draft Rochester report, as a result of which these capital expense items have been removed from the list of absolute requirements. In the case of land and buildings owned by the city, the original cost was easily found in the comptroller's annual report, but the county building costs were very difficult to locate and were found only by searching through the proceedings of the county board of supervisors for some 70 or 80 years back. The revision of the manual in this respect was made in order to facilitate the work of other investigators who do not have much time at their disposal.

Outlays for new lands, buildings, or equipment made during the year studied must, of course, be omitted in deriving the annual costs, whether these outlays be from tax or bond funds or other revenues. The original intention was to include any annual carrying charge, made up of depreciation and interest, as a proper part of the annual expense in place of any such outlays omitted. It is only on account of the labor involved that the carrying charges on lands and buildings have been omitted from the minimum requirements for the other studies. These should be obtained wherever the data are readily available.

The carrying charges, on equipment were especially difficult to secure. The city takes a physical inventory each year but the county does not have any inventory figures. The city inventory includes supplies and materials as well as equipment and is priced at estimated depreciated values. The inventory is, therefore, not at all suitable as a basis for deriving a carrying charge on equipment, since, in order to apply rates of depreciation and interest, it is necessary to have the original cost figures for equipment. For example, Ford automobiles were carried in the inventory at \$50 to \$150 each. The application of a depreciation figure of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent to these values would yield an obviously false result. Another difficulty arose in the county offices, a number of which were found to have no appropriation for the purchase of equipment. Equipment purchases were apparently charged to current expense along with other expenditures. As the extent of those could not be ascertained, the current year's expenditure for new equipment could not be deducted from the reported expenses and replaced by a carrying charge. This serves to call attention to the fact that the distinction between supplies and equipment is in any event indefinite and susceptible of many different interpretations by the accounting officials of the city and county.

In a broader aspect, however, it appears that what is desired is the normal annual expenditure for equipment by each of the offices studied. In one year the police may purchase a new fleet of automobiles, while in the next the expenditure for new equipment may be small. The use of an average annual expenditure will equalize these fluctua-

tions and show more truly what the normal expenditure is in fact. The average annual expenditure for the last five years has therefore been used in place of the expenditure for the year studied wherever an appropriation was carried for the purchase of equipment. As the expenditures for equipment are relatively small in comparison with the total, any error will not affect the total to any large degree. It appears that this 5-year average figure is the best one to use, since it avoids all uncertainty as to methods of accounting, as to distinctions between supplies and equipment, and as to the depreciation rates to be employed. The 5-year average is now suggested by the manual as an alternative to the carrying charge, and it appears that very considerable labor will be saved the investigator thereby.

Other changes have been made in the manual to simplify the work of the investigator. The computation of costs, with the allocations between criminal justice administration and other functions, is now required for only one year, 1930, instead of, as originally, for the two years 1929 and 1930. Since the derivation of percentages, tabulation of pay roll, and investigation of court calendars required for these allocations forms a considerable portion of the work, the saving in labor is considerable. The tabulation of criminal prosecutions originally called for by the draft manual, which in Rochester required considerable time to prepare, has also been omitted from the list of minimum requirements.

With all these changes in the nature of the study required, it becomes rather difficult to say just how much time would be necessary to fulfill the present requirements as set forth in the printed manual. Judging by my own experience, however, after making allowances for these changes, I should think that the work could be completed by an experienced investigator in about two weeks.

The results of the Rochester study are interesting in showing the predominant position which police costs occupy and the very large proportion of expenditures for personal service. The police costs for the city for 1929 allocable to the administration of criminal justice in 1930 were \$1,102,001.14, or 79.5 per cent of the total cost of \$1,385,-

799.22. The cost of prosecution was \$61,531.33, or 4.4 per cent; the cost of the criminal courts \$71,192.66, or 5.1 per cent; and the cost of penal institutions \$151,074.09, or 11 per cent, of the total. The latter figure seems considerably lower than would naturally be expected, even after allowing for the fact that no part of the cost of State penal institutions is included. The study further shows that the cost of administration of criminal justice made up 7.07 per cent of the total governmental expenditures for the city of Rochester, including its pro rata portion of county expenditures, during the year 1929.

DISCUSSION—FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

By LUTHER GULICK

There are two reasons for a special interest in the commission's study of the cost of criminal justice administration on the part of the bureaus of research and students of government.

In the first place, we can rest assured that the work which we do will not be limited in its usefulness by the value of the individual study to the city in which it is made, though this alone will justify the work in most communities. The work which is done in the 300 or more cities which are working together in this study will be turned over to expert statistical analysis under the direction of Dr. Raymond H. Franzen. I have talked with Doctor Franzen and know something of his plans, and have no hesitation in saying that if sufficient accurate material is turned over to him, he will produce a study of first-rate importance for all of us, and especially for the cities that join in the collection of the basic facts. And there may come from this study something much more important than mere conclusions as to the norms of crime administration costs. There may emerge new techniques in the handling of comparative governmental and social facts. It is this wider promise that will mean most to governmental researchers in their quest for better methods of understanding the present, predicting the future, and controlling events. The

fact that definite funds have been set aside by the Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement and that a man of Doctor Franzen's technical knowledge and mental ingenuity has been retained to synthesize the various studies is a guarantee that the work which the individual researchers do will be expertly handled to form a larger picture.

A second reason for cooperation lies in our basic philosophy of the research movement. We have long said that the wide distribution of research organizations furnished an ideal nexus for the making of nation-wide studies of given problems without the need of setting up in each case a separate organization which will reach down into each city to gather its materials. Here we have the first carefully prepared nation-wide study of this character. The request for the study comes from the President's commission; funds are in hand through congressional appropriation to pay for the analysis of the data obtained. We are assured, moreover, that the results will be handled professionally and that no conclusions will be "forced" merely for the sake of cheap publicity. Under these conditions, it seems to me, we have in this study a test of the idea that we have in this country a research movement, rather than many scattered individuals and groups with no interest in working together or developing a technique of cooperation.

APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTION CIRCULARS ISSUED TO FIELD INVESTIGATORS

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 1

To all investigators:

The Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities states that we will furnish from this office the 1930 census figures as to population and population density; racial composition; distribution by sex and by age groups; labor conditions (including extent of unemployment); domestic factors, including proportion of married and single persons, average number of persons per family, and divorce rate; and the proportion of illiteracy. The figures as to population and its distribution by wards, according to the 1930 census, have already been distributed from this office. The remaining figures have not yet been made available by the Bureau of the Census except for Delaware and the District of Columbia. For this reason we have determined to extend the time limit for all studies from March 1 to May 1, 1931.

The manual states that the birth and death rates and infant mortality figures will be furnished to the investigators. It has been decided, however, that it will be preferable for you to secure this material from your local board of health or other appropriate local source.

I trust that the time extension will facilitate your making a thorough survey.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 2

To all investigators:

Some question has arisen as to the extent to which it is essential that the investigators include in their reports data as to carrying charges on capital investment. You will note that the Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities (ch. 3, sec. 4) provides (a) that capital expenditures are to be eliminated from operating expenses; (b) that carrying charges on capital investment, taking account of depreciation and interest, are to be reported, shown separately, "where ascertainable"; and (c) that in all cases a 5-year average of expenditures for equipment is to be reported. You will further note that the sections relating to capital expenditures (ch. 4, sec. 10; ch. 5, sec. 6; ch. 6, sec. 7; ch. 7, sec. 8), provide for the inclusion in each report of a statement of carrying charges on capital investment where the ascertainment thereof is "reasonably practicable," such item to be separately reported.

The experience of a number of investigators has indicated that in many, and perhaps in most cases, the data necessary for the computation of carrying charges on capital investment are so difficult to secure that the ascertainment of such carrying charges can not be regarded as "reasonably practicable" within the meaning of the term as used in the manual. In view of this fact, and in view of the comparatively short time remaining prior to the date set for the completion of the investigations (which under Instruction Circular No. 1 is May 1, 1931), all investigators are hereby authorized to omit from their reports data on carrying charges on capital investment.

Experience has also indicated that the 5-year average on equipment called for by the manual is of relatively minor importance except in the case of police costs. The investigators are therefore authorized to omit these data except in the case of police costs.

The effect on the reports of the various investigators of the omissions above authorized may be most quickly per-

ceived by an examination of the model report of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Rochester, N. Y. The omissions hereby authorized are: (a) The item "carrying charge on capital investment" in Table 20; (b) all of chapter 2, section 5; (c) the items under the headings "carrying charge on capital investments" and "5-year average of expenditures for equipment" in Tables 28, 29 and 30; (d) all of chapter 3, section 4; (e) the items under the headings "carrying charge on capital investment" and "5-year average of expenditures for equipment" in Tables 35, 36, 37 and 38; (f) the items under the headings "carrying charge on capital investment" and "5-year average of expenditures for equipment" in Tables 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46; (g) all the items under the heading "carrying charge on capital investment" in Table 56; and (h) the items of "prosecution," "criminal courts," and "penal and corrective treatment," under the heading "5-year average of expenditures for equipment," in Table 50.

This authorization of the omission of carrying charges on capital investment makes it of vital importance that all investigators take special care to ensure that capital expenditures made during the year under investigation are not included in operating costs for the year under investigation. In this respect the provisions of the Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities (ch. 3, sec. 4, par. 1), remain in full force and effect.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 3

To all investigators:

It appears that some difficulty is being experienced by investigators in cities which operate on the basis of a fiscal year which does not coincide with the calendar year. The Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities (Ch. 8, sec. 6; see also Ch. 3, sec. 6) contemplates that in such cases figures for the fiscal years 1929-30 and 1930-31 be combined, either on the basis of actual expenditures or on a *pro rata* basis, so as to give figures for 1930. Experience has proven that this is impractical in most cases, and it has been determined to accept figures for any fiscal year ending during 1930 on the same basis as figures for the calendar year 1930.

In a few cases it has proven impossible to secure the required data either for the year 1930 or for a fiscal year ending in 1930, although data for prior years are available. Any investigator who finds himself in this situation is requested to communicate with this office with a view to receiving special instructions.

It is hoped that the abrogation of the requirement of figures for the calendar year 1930 for cities operating on a fiscal year which does not coincide with the calendar year will facilitate the early completion of the reports in such cities.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 4

To all investigators:

Reference has already been made in Instruction Circular No. 1 to the difficulty which has been encountered in securing from the Bureau of the Census certain of the 1930 census figures which, according to the Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities, are to be furnished to investigators. Since Instruction Circular No. 1 was issued, it has developed that the census data in question will not be available in time for inclusion in the reports of many of the investigators, if such reports are to reach this office by May 1, 1931. Accordingly, it has been determined to omit these census data from the reports.

The omission from reports as submitted to this office of the following information is hereby authorized:

- (a) Distribution by race and nativity. (See Table 2 in the model Rochester report.)
- (b) Distribution by national origins. (See Tables 3 and 4 in the Rochester report.)
- (c) Distribution of foreign born by citizenship. (See Table 5 in the Rochester report.)
- (d) Distribution by sex and age groups. (See Tables 6 and 7 in the Rochester report.)
- (e) Distribution by industry and occupation. (See Table 8 in the Rochester report. It will be observed that Tables 9 and 10 are optional in any case.)
- (f) Extent of unemployment. (See Rochester report, Ch. I, sec. 6, second paragraph.)
- (g) Extent of home ownership. (See Rochester report, Ch. I, sec. 7, par. (b).)
- (h) Married and single persons. (See Table 12 in the Rochester report.)
- (i) Number of persons per family. (See Rochester report, Ch. I, sec. 8, par. (b).)
- (j) Divorce rate. (See Tables 15 and 16 in the Rochester report.)

(k) School attendance. (See Table 17 in the Rochester report.)

(l) Illiteracy. (See Table 18 in the Rochester report.)

These omissions will considerably shorten the chapter of each report dealing with community data, and should so facilitate the completion of the reports by May 1, 1931, which remains the final date for their submission.

In preparing the reports, it will be desirable to follow the numbering of the sections in the Rochester report, but, wherever 1930 census data are called for, insert the words: "Data from 1930 census not yet available." This will preserve uniformity of numbering as between those reports where the census data must be omitted and those where they are available, as is the case in a few instances.

It is not to be understood that the commission does not intend to make use of the census data referred to above. Those data, while they will not be available in time for distribution to the various investigators and inclusion in the individual reports, will, as far as available, be made use of by this office in preparing its consolidated report of the study. Moreover, this office will see that these data are furnished as soon as available to any investigator desiring them for his own purposes, provided that the investigators who desire the data will notify this office to that effect.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 5

To all investigators:

It is requested that this office be furnished with a statement, as of April 11, 1931, of the progress which has been made in securing the data on the city or cities being studied by you or under your direction. This report should indicate (a) the progress made to date (stated separately by cities if more than one city is included in the survey); (b) special difficulties encountered, if any; and (c) an estimate of the date upon which the final report or reports will be completed. It is requested that every effort be made to have such progress report in the hands of this office by April 15, 1931.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 6

To all investigators:

Many investigators have found either that complete figures as to police, prosecution, courts, penal and corrective agencies for the 5-year period 1926-1930 are not available, or that undue labor is entailed in securing these figures. Consequently, while every effort should be made to secure figures for expenditures for police equipment during this 5-year period, you are authorized to omit the 5-year figures in all other cases.

You will note that this circular permits the omission from your reports of the data corresponding to the following tables in the Rochester report: Table 27, Table 33, Table 40 and Table 47.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

INSTRUCTION CIRCULAR NO. 7

To all investigators:

The Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities (Ch. II, sec. 12), states that we will furnish to the investigators statistics as to volume of crime as evidenced by the figures as to offenses known to the police as compiled by the Department of Justice. We have now been advised that the compilation of these figures will not be completed by the department in time for us to distribute this information to the investigators before the date (May 1, 1931) set for the completion of the reports. You are therefore authorized to omit these figures from your report entirely, and, accordingly, your report need not contain any data like those contained in the Rochester report, Chapter I, section 11.

The volume of crime figures will be available about May 1, 1931, and will be supplied to any investigator desiring them upon request addressed to this office.

Yours very truly,

SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, *Director.*

APPENDIX G

POPULATION, FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND PART I OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 IN POPULATION *

City and State	City population	County	County population	End of fiscal year	Form of city government	Part I offenses known to the police, 1930	
						Number of offenses	Per 100,000 population
Alabama:							
Birmingham	259,678	Jefferson	431,493	Aug. 31, 1930	Commission	5,112	1,968.6
Mobile	68,202	Mobile	118,863	Sept. 30, 1930	do	1,587	2,326.9
Montgomery	66,079	Montgomery	98,671	June 30, 1930	do		
Arizona:							
Phoenix	48,118	Maricopa	150,970	(1)			
Tucson	32,506	Pima	55,676	(2)	Council-manager	724	2,056.5
Arkansas:							
Fort Smith	31,429	Sebastian	54,426	Dec. 31, 1930	(?)	251	798.6
Little Rock	81,679	Pulaski	137,727	do	(?)		
California:							
Alameda	35,033	Alameda	474,883	do	Council-manager	634	1,809.7
Los Angeles	29,472	Los Angeles	2,208,492	(?)	Commission-manager	287	973.8
Alhambra	26,015	Kern	82,570	(1)	(1)	799	3,071.3
Bakersfield	82,109	Alameda	474,883	June 30, 1930	Council-manager	1,111	1,353.1
Berkeley	52,513	Fresno	144,379	do	Commission	2,212	4,212.3
Fresno	62,736	Los Angeles	2,208,492	(2)	Council-manager	900	1,434.6
Glendale	142,032	do	2,208,492	June 30, 1930	do	2,785	1,950.8
Long Beach	1,238,048	do	2,208,492	do	Mayor-council		
Los Angeles	284,063	Alameda	474,883	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	5,748	2,023.5
Oakland	76,086	Los Angeles	2,208,492	June 30, 1930	Council-manager	972	1,277.5
Pasadena	29,696	Riverside	81,024	(1)	(1)	564	2,112.7
Riverside	93,750	Sacramento	141,999	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager	3,211	3,425.1
Sacramento	37,481	San Bernardino	133,900	(1)	(1)	708	1,889.0
San Bernardino	147,995	San Bernardino	209,653	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	2,878	1,944.7
San Diego	634,394	(?)		June 30, 1930	Mayor-board of supervisors		
San Francisco	57,651	Santa Clara	145,118	(1)	(1)	1,356	2,352.1
San Jose	30,322	Orange	118,674	(1)	(1)	328	1,031.7
Santa Ana	33,613	Santa Barbara	65,167	(1)	(1)	826	2,457.4
Santa Barbara							

Santa Monica	37,146	Los Angeles	2,208,492	(?)	Commission	1,166	3,139.0
Stockton	47,963	San Joaquin	102,940	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager	2,144	4,470.1
Colorado:							
Colorado springs	33,237	El Paso	49,870	Dec. 31, 1929	Council-manager	682	2,051.9
Denver	287,881	(?)		do	do	5,956	2,069.1
Pueblo	50,096	Pueblo	66,038	do	Commission	1,132	2,259.7
Connecticut:							
Bridgeport	146,716	Fairfield	386,702	Mar. 31, 1930	(?)	1,950	1,329.1
Bristol	28,451	Hartford	421,097	(1)	(1)	30	105.4
Hartford	164,072	do	421,097	Mar. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	3,171	1,932.7
Meriden	38,481	New Haven	463,449	Dec. 31, 1930	do	383	995.3
New Britain	68,128	Hartford	421,097	Mar. 31, 1930	do	289	424.2
New Haven	162,655	New Haven	463,449	Dec. 31, 1930	(?)		
New London	29,640	New London	118,966	Sept. 30, 1930	Council-manager		
Norwalk	36,019	Fairfield	386,702	Aug. 31, 1930	Mayor-council		
Stamford	46,346	do	386,702	Dec. 15, 1930	do	435	938.6
Torrington	26,040	Litchfield	82,556	(1)	(1)	22	84.5
Waterbury	99,902	New Haven	463,449	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-aldermen	1,395	1,396.4
Delaware: Wilmington	106,632	New Castle	161,032	June 30, 1930	(?)	1,398	1,311.1
District of Columbia: Washington	486,869	do		do	U. S. Congress and commission	9,400	1,930.7
Florida:							
Jacksonville	129,549	Duval	155,503	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	2,714	2,017.8
Miami	116,637	Dade	142,955	June 30, 1929	Commission-manager	2,913	2,632.9
Orlando	27,330	Orange	49,737	(?)	(?)	604	2,210.0
Pensacola	31,579	Escambia	53,594	(?)	(?)		
St. Petersburg	40,425	Pinellas	62,149	(1)	(1)	794	1,964.1
Tampa	101,161	Hillsborough	153,519	(1)	(1)	1,123	1,110.1
West Palm Beach	26,610	Palm Beach	51,781	(1)	(1)	755	2,837.3
Georgia:							
Atlanta	270,366	De Kalb	70,278	Dec. 31, 1930			
Augusta	60,342	Fulton	318,587	do			
Columbus	43,131	Richmond	72,990	do		653	1,082.2
Macon	53,829	Muscogee	57,558	do		593	1,374.9
Savannah	85,024	Bibb	77,042	do		507	941.9
Chatham		Chatham	105,431	do		1,904	2,239.4
Illinois:							
Alton	30,151	Madison	143,830	do	Mayor-council	638	2,116.0
Aurora	46,589	Kane	125,327	do	Commission	495	1,062.5
Belleville	28,425	St. Clair	157,775	do	Mayor-council		
Berwyn	47,027	Cook	3,982,123	do	do	149	316.8
Bloomington	30,930	McLean	73,117	Apr. 30, 1930	Mayor-aldermen		
Chicago	3,376,438	Cook	3,982,123	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council		
Cicero	66,602	do	3,982,123	do	President and trustees		
Danville	36,765	Vermilion	89,339	Apr. 30, 1930	Commission	1,010	2,747.2

* Prepared by Miss Mary Daugherty, research assistant to the writers of this report.

See footnotes at end of table.

POPULATION, FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND PART I OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 IN POPULATION—continued

City and State	City population	County	County population	End of fiscal year	Form of city government	Part I offenses known to the police, 1930	
						Number of offenses	Per 100,000 population
Illinois—Continued.							
Decatur	57,510	Macon	81,731	Apr. 30, 1930	Commission	1,325	2,304.0
East St. Louis	74,347	St. Clair	157,775	Dec. 31, 1930	do		
Elgin	35,929	Kane	125,327	do	do	208	578.9
Evanston	63,338	Cook	3,982,123	do	Mayor-council		
Galesburg	28,830	Knox	51,336	Mar. 31, 1930	do		
Granite City	25,130	Madison	143,830	Dec. 31, 1930	do		
Joliet	42,993	Will	110,732	do	Commission		
Maywood	25,829	Cook	3,982,123	do	President and trustees	196	758.8
Moline	32,236	Rock Island	98,191	Mar. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	476	1,476.7
Oak Park	63,982	Cook	3,982,123	Dec. 31, 1930	President and trustees	442	690.8
Peoria	104,969	Peoria	141,344	do	Mayor-council	1,718	1,636.7
Quincy	39,241	Adams	62,784	Apr. 30, 1930	do	165	420.5
Rockford	85,864	Winnebago	117,373	Dec. 31, 1930	do		
Rock Island	37,953	Rock Island	98,191	Mar. 31, 1930	do		
Springfield	71,864	Sangamon	111,733	Feb. 28, 1930	Commission	525	1,383.3
Waukagan	33,499	Lake	104,357	Dec. 31, 1930	do	1,648	2,292.2
Indiana:							
Anderson	39,804	Madison	82,888	(1)	(1)		
East Chicago	54,784	Lake	261,310	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-aldermen		
Elkhart	32,949	Elkhart	68,875	do	(2)		
Evansville	102,249	Vanderburgh	113,320	do	Mayor-council		
Fort Wayne	114,946	Allen	146,743	do	do		
Gary	100,426	Lake	261,310	do	Mayor-aldermen	2,599	2,587.9
Hammond	64,560	do	261,310	do	do	892	1,381.7
Indianapolis	364,161	Marion	422,666	do	Mayor-council	11,328	3,110.7
Kokomo	32,643	Howard	46,696	(1)	(1)		
Lafayette	26,240	Tippecanoe	47,535	(1)	(1)		
Michigan City	26,735	La Porte	60,490	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	503	1,916.9
Mishawaka	23,630	St. Joseph	160,033	do	(3)	174	607.7

Muncie	46,548	Delaware	67,270	do	Mayor-council		
New Albany	25,819	Floyd	34,655	(1)	(1)	61	235.3
Richmond	32,493	Wayne	54,809	(1)	(1)		
South Bend	104,193	St. Joseph	160,033	Dec. 31, 1930	(2)	1,634	1,568.2
Terre Haute	62,810	Vigo	98,861	(1)	(1)	723	1,151.1
Iowa:							
Burlington	26,755	Des Moines	38,162	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	105	392.4
Cedar Rapids	56,097	Linn	82,336	Mar. 31, 1931	do		
Clinton	25,726	Clinton	44,377	(1)	(1)	62	241.0
Council Bluffs	42,048	Pottawattamie	69,888	(1)	(1)		
Davenport	60,751	Scott	77,332	Mar. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	590	967.6
Des Moines	142,559	Polk	172,837	do	(2)	3,252	2,276.4
Dubuque	41,679	Dubuque	61,214	(1)	(1)	460	1,099.4
Ottumwa	28,075	Wapello	40,480	(1)	(1)		
Sioux City	79,183	Woodbury	101,669	Mar. 31, 1930	(2)		
Waterloo	46,191	Black Hawk	69,146	do	Mayor-council	273	589.7
Kansas:							
Hutchinson	27,085	Reno	47,785	(1)	(1)		
Kansas City	121,857	Wyandotte	141,211	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	2,434	1,995.9
Topeka	64,120	Shawnee	85,200	do	do	174	269.7
Wichita	111,110	Sedgwick	136,330	do	do	2,768	2,491.2
Kentucky:							
Ashland	29,074	Boyd	43,849	(1)	(1)		
Covington	65,252	Kenton	93,534	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission-manager	108	162.2
Lexington	45,736	Fayette	68,543	do	Commission	1,557	3,394.3
Louisville	307,745	Jefferson	355,350	do	(2)		
Newport	29,774	Campbell	73,391	do	Commission		
Paducah	33,541	McCracken	46,271	(1)	(1)		
Louisiana:							
Baton Rouge	30,729	East Baton Rouge	68,208	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	434	1,382.2
Monroe	26,028	Orleans	54,337	do	do	465	1,785.6
New Orleans	458,762	Orleans	458,762	Dec. 31, 1929	Commission	4,514	947.9
Shreveport	76,665	Caddo	124,670	do	do		
Maine:							
Bangor	28,749	Penobscot	92,379	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council		
Lewiston	34,948	Androscoggin	71,214	Feb. 28, 1930	do	235	815.1
Portland	70,810	Cumberland	134,645	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager		
Maryland:							
Baltimore	804,874	(1)	(1)	do	Mayor-council	9,933	1,234.1
Cumberland	37,747	Allegany	79,098	(1)	(1)	240	635.8
Hagerstown	30,861	Washington	65,882	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	130	421.2
Massachusetts:							
Beverly	25,086	Essex	498,040	do	do	201	801.2
Boston	751,188	Suffolk	879,536	do	do	11,756	1,504.9

See footnotes at end of table.

POPULATION, FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND PART I OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 IN POPULATION—continued

City and State	City population	County	County population	End of fiscal year	Form of city government	Part I offenses known to the police, 1930	
						Number of offenses	Per 100,000 population
Massachusetts—Continued.							
Brockton	63,797	Plymouth	162,311	(1)	(1)		
Cambridge	113,643	Middlesex	934,924	Mar. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	1,306	1,149.3
Chelsea	45,816	Suffolk	879,536	Dec. 31, 1929	do	242	528.2
Chicopee	43,930	Hampden	335,496	Nov. 30, 1930	do	110	250.1
Everett	48,424	Middlesex	934,924	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council-aldermen	182	375.9
Fall River	115,274	Bristol	364,590	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager	720	624.6
Fitchburg	40,692	Worcester	491,242	Nov. 30, 1929	Mayor-council	239	587.3
Haverhill	48,710	Essex	498,040	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	48	98.5
Holyoke	56,537	Hampden	335,496	Nov. 30, 1930	Mayor-council		
Lawrence	85,068	Essex	498,040	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	198	232.8
Lowell	100,724	Middlesex	934,924	do	Mayor-council	485	481.5
Lynn	102,320	Essex	498,040	do	do		
Malden	58,036	Middlesex	934,924	do	Mayor-council-aldermen	219	370.8
Medford	59,714	do	934,924	do	Mayor-council	595	996.4
New Bedford	112,597	Bristol	364,590	Nov. 30, 1930	Mayor-council-aldermen		
Newton	65,276	Middlesex	934,924	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	243	372.3
Pittsfield	49,577	Berkshire	120,700	do	Mayor-council-aldermen	414	835.4
Quincy	71,983	Norfolk	299,426	(1)	(1)	386	1,236.6
Revere	35,680	Suffolk	879,536	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	479	1,342.5
Salem	43,353	Essex	498,040	do	do	100	230.7
Somerville	103,908	Middlesex	934,924	do	do	1,553	1,494.5
Springfield	149,900	Hampden	335,496	Nov. 30, 1930	Mayor-council-aldermen	1,737	1,158.8
Taunton	37,355	Bristol	364,590	do	Mayor-council		
Waltham	39,247	Middlesex	934,924	Jan. 31, 1930	do	579	1,475.3
Worcester	105,311	Worcester	491,242	Nov. 30, 1930	do	3,972	2,033.7
Michigan:							
Ann Arbor	26,944	Washtenaw	65,530	Dec. 31, 1930	do	171	634.7
Battle Creek	43,573	Calhoun	87,043	(1)	(1)	924	2,120.7
Bay City	47,355	Bay	69,474	(1)	(1)		
Dearborn	50,358	Wayne	1,888,946	(2)	Mayor-council	1,133	2,219.9
Detroit	1,568,662	do	1,888,946	June 30, 1930	do	26,306	1,677.0

Flint	156,402	Genesee	211,641	Feb. 28, 1930	Commission-manager	3,215	2,054.4
Grand Rapids	168,502	Kent	240,511	Mar. 31, 1931	do	2,273	1,348.8
Hamtramck	56,268	Wayne	1,888,946	June 30, 1930	Mayor-council		
Highland Park	52,959	do	1,888,946	June 30, 1930	Commission-mayor	892	1,684.3
Jackson	55,187	Jackson	92,304	(1)	(1)	1,326	2,402.7
Kalamazoo	54,786	Kalamazoo	91,368	(1)	(1)	1,057	1,929.3
Lansing	78,397	Ingham	116,587	Apr. 30, 1930	(2)	671	855.9
Muskegon	41,390	Muskegon	84,630	Dec. 31, 1930	(2)	614	1,483.5
Pontiac	64,928	Oakland	211,251	(1)	(1)	1,319	2,031.5
Port Huron	31,361	St. Clair	67,563	(1)	(1)		
Saginaw	80,715	Saginaw	120,717	June 30, 1930	Commission-mayor	1,734	2,148.3
Wyandotte	28,368	Wayne	1,888,946	(1)	(1)		
Minnesota:							
Duluth	101,463	St. Louis	204,596	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission		
Minneapolis	464,356	Hennepin	517,785	do	Mayor-council		
St. Paul	271,606	Ramsey	286,721	do	do	1,634	601.6
Mississippi:							
Jackson	48,282	Hinds	85,118	do	Commission		
Meridian	31,954	Lauderdale	52,748	(1)	(1)		
Missouri:							
Joplin	33,454	Jasper	73,810	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	1,298	3,880.0
Kansas City	399,746	Jackson	470,454	Apr. 30, 1930	Council-manager	8,984	2,247.4
St. Joseph	80,935	Buchanan	98,633	do	Mayor-council	2,270	2,615.8
St. Louis	821,960	(1)	(1)	do	do	18,497	2,250.4
Springfield	57,527	Greene	82,929	June 30, 1930	Mayor-commission	1,588	2,760.4
University City	25,809	St. Louis	211,593	(2)	Mayor-council	315	1,220.5
Montana:							
Butte	39,532	Silver Bow	56,969	Apr. 30, 1930	(2)	952	2,408.2
Great Falls	28,822	Cascade	41,146	June 30, 1930	Mayor-council	642	2,227.5
Nebraska:							
Lincoln	75,933	Lancaster	100,324	Aug. 31, 1930	do	1,077	1,418.4
Omaha	214,006	Douglas	232,982	Dec. 31, 1929	Commission	4,884	2,282.2
New Hampshire:							
Concord	25,228	Merrimack	56,152	(2)	Mayor-council		
Manchester	76,834	Hillsborough	140,165	Dec. 31, 1930	do		
Nashua	31,428	do	140,165	do	(2)		
New Jersey:							
Atlantic City	66,198	Atlantic	124,823	(1)	(1)	2,652	4,006.2
Bayonne	88,979	Hudson	690,730	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission		
Belleville	26,974	Essex	833,513	do	do		
Bloomfield	38,077	do	833,513	do	Mayor-council	177	464.8
Camden	118,700	Camden	252,312	(1)	(1)		
Clifton	46,875	Passaic	302,129	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	262	558.9
East Orange	68,020	Essex	833,513	do	do		
Elizabeth	114,589	Union	305,209	do	do	1,772	1,546.4

See footnotes at end of table.

POPULATION, FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND PART I OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 IN POPULATION—continued

City and State	City population	County	County population	End of fiscal year	Form of city government	Part I offenses known to the police, 1930	
						Number of offenses	Per 100,000 population
New Jersey—Continued.							
Garfield	29,739	Bergen	364,977	(1)	(1)	308	1,035.7
Hoboken	59,261	Hudson	690,730	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	326	550.1
Irvington	56,733	Essex	833,513	do	do	587	1,034.7
Jersey City	316,715	Hudson	690,730	do	do	1,055	333.1
Kearney	40,716	do	690,730	do	Mayor-council	319	783.5
Montclair	42,017	Essex	833,513	do	Commission	167	397.5
Newark	442,337	do	833,513	do	do		
New Brunswick	34,555	Middlesex	212,208	(1)	(1)		
Orange	35,399	Essex	833,513	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	435	1,228.8
Passaic	62,959	Passaic	302,129	do	do	1,066	1,693.2
Paterson	138,513	do	302,129	do	Commission	896	646.9
Perth Amboy	43,516	Middlesex	212,208	(1)	(1)	447	1,627.2
Plainfield	34,422	Union	305,209	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council		
Trenton	123,356	Mercer	187,143	do	Commission	1,152	933.9
Union City	58,659	Hudson	690,730	do	do	185	315.4
West New York	37,107	do	690,730	do	do		
New Mexico: Albuquerque	26,570	Bernalillo	45,430			623	2,344.7
New York:							
Albany	127,412	Albany	211,953	Dec. 31, 1929	Mayor-council	1,472	1,155.3
Amsterdam	34,817	Montgomery	60,076	do	do		
Auburn	36,652	Cayuga	64,751	do	Council-manager	226	616.1
Binghamton	76,662	Broome	147,022	do	Mayor-council	748	949.6
Buffalo	573,076	Erie	762,408	Dec. 31, 1930	do	4,974	868.0
Elmira	47,397	Chemung	74,680	Dec. 31, 1929	do	151	318.6
Jamestown	45,172	Chataqua	120,457	do	do		
Kingston	28,088	Ulster	80,155	Dec. 31, 1930	do	132	470.0
Mount Vernon	61,499	Westchester	520,947	do	do	739	1,201.7
Newburgh	31,275	Orange	130,383	Dec. 31, 1929	do	196	626.7
New Rochelle	54,000	Westchester	520,947	Dec. 31, 1930	do	534	988.9

New York *	6,930,446	Bronx	1,265,258				
		Kings	2,560,401				
		New York	1,867,312	do	do		
		Queens	1,079,129				
		Richmond	158,346				
Niagara Falls	75,460	Niagara	149,329	do	(1)	893	1,183.4
Poughkeepsie	40,283	Dutchess	103,462	Dec. 31, 1929	Mayor-council	391	970.5
Rochester	328,132	Monroe	423,881	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager	2,867	873.7
Rome	32,338	Oneida	198,763	do	Mayor-council	307	949.4
Schenectady	95,692	Schenectady	125,021	Dec. 31, 1929	do	995	1,039.8
Syracuse	209,323	Onondaga	291,606	do	do		
Troy	72,783	Rensselaer	119,781	do	do		
Utica	101,740	Oneida	198,763	Dec. 31, 1930	do	733	1,007.4
Watertown	32,205	Jefferson	83,574	(1)	(1)	1,283	1,231.6
White Plains	35,830	Westchester	520,947	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	487	1,512.2
Yonkers	134,646	do	520,947	do	do	162	452.1
North Carolina:							
Asheville	50,193	Buncombe	97,337	(1)	(1)		
Charlotte	82,675	Mecklenburg	127,971	May 30, 1930	City-manager	1,784	2,157.9
Durham	52,037	Durham	67,196	do	(2)	1,766	1,472.0
Greensboro	53,569	Guilford	133,010	do	Council-manager	1,085	2,025.4
High Point	36,745	do	133,010	Dec. 31, 1930	do	839	2,555.5
Raleigh	37,379	Wake	361,055	do	Commission	702	1,878.1
Wilmington	32,270	New Hanover	94,757	do	do	679	2,104.1
Winston-Salem	75,274	Forsyth	111,681	May 30, 1930	do	1,945	2,583.9
North Dakota: Fargo	28,619	Cass	48,735	do	do		
Ohio:							
Akron	255,040	Summit	344,131	do	Mayor-manager-council	4,410	1,729.1
Canton	104,906	Stark	221,784	do	(2)	2,321	2,212.5
Cincinnati	451,160	Hamilton	589,356	do	(2)	9,191	2,037.2
Cleveland	900,429	Cuyahoga	1,201,455	do	(2)	19,034	2,113.9
Cleveland Heights	50,945	do	1,201,455	do	(2)	493	967.7
Columbus	290,584	Franklin	361,055	do	Mayor-council	7,740	2,663.8
Dayton	200,982	Montgomery	273,431	do	Commission-manager	3,740	1,860.9
East Cleveland	39,667	Cuyahoga	1,201,455	do	(2)	375	945.4
Elyria	25,633	Lorain	109,206	do	(1)	325	1,267.9
Hamilton	52,176	Butler	114,084	Dec. 31, 1930	(2)	896	1,717.3
Lakewood	70,509	Cuyahoga	1,201,455	do	(2)	385	546.0
Lima	42,287	Allen	69,419	(1)	(1)	470	1,111.5
Lorain	44,512	Lorain	109,206	(1)	(1)	849	1,907.4
Mansfield	33,525	Richland	65,902	(2)	(2)	178	631.0
Marion	31,084	Marion	45,420	(1)	(1)	350	1,193.5
Massillon	28,400	Stark	221,784	(2)	(2)	201	761.4
Middletown	29,992	Butler	114,084	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager	593	1,977.2
Newark	30,596	Licking	59,962	do	Mayor-council	160	522.9

See footnotes at end of table.

POPULATION, FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND PART I OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 IN POPULATION—continued

City and State	City population	County	County population	End of fiscal year	Form of city government	Part I offenses known to the police, 1930	
						Number of offenses	Per 100,000 population
Ohio—Continued.							
Norwood	33,411	Hamilton	589,356	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council		
Portsmouth	42,560	Scioto	81,221	(1)	(1)	447	1,050.3
Springfield	68,743	Clark	90,936	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission-manager	1,147	1,668.5
Staubenville	35,422	Jefferson	88,307	(1)	(1)	731	2,063.6
Toledo	290,718	Lucas	347,709	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	9,621	3,309.4
Warren	41,062	Trumbull	123,063	(1)	(1)	493	1,185.1
Youngstown	170,002	Mahoning	256,142	(1)	(1)	3,872	2,277.6
Zanesville	36,440	Trumbull	123,063	(1)	(1)	366	1,004.4
Zanesville	36,440	Muskingum	67,398	(1)	(1)		
Oklahoma:							
Enid	26,399	Garfield	45,588	(1)	(1)	523	1,633.1
Muskogee	32,026	Muskogee	66,424	(1)	(1)	4,168	2,248.3
Oklahoma City	185,389	Oklahoma	221,738	June 30, 1930	Council-manager		
Tulsa	141,258	Tulsa	187,574	do	Commission		
Oregon:							
Portland	301,815	Multnomah	338,241	Nov. 30, 1930	do		
Salem	26,266	Marion	60,541	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council		
Pennsylvania:							
Alliquippa	27,116	Beaver	149,062	(1)	(1)	258	278.7
Allentown	92,563	Lehigh	172,893	Jan. 7, 1930	Commission		
Altoona	82,054	Blair	139,840	do	do		
Bethlehem	57,892	Northampton	169,304	do	do		
Chester	59,164	Lehigh	172,893	do	do	1,217	2,057.0
Easton	34,468	Delaware	280,284	do	do		
Erie	115,967	Northampton	169,304	do	do	1,492	1,286.6
Harrisburg	80,339	Erie	175,277	do	do	1,163	1,447.6
Hazleton	36,765	Dauphin	165,231	do	do	158	235.9
Johnstown	66,993	Luzerne	445,109	do	do	627	1,045.9
Lancaster	59,949	Cambria	203,146	do	do		
Lancaster	59,949	Lancaster	196,882	do	do		

Lebanon	25,561	Lebanon	67,103	(1)	(1)		
McKeesport	54,632	Allegheny	1,374,410	Jan. 7, 1930	Mayor-council		
Nanticoke	26,043	Luzerne	445,109	do	Commission		
Newcastle	48,674	Lawrence	97,253	do	Mayor-council		
Norristown	35,853	Montgomery	265,804	Dec. 31, 1930	Burgess-council	275	767.0
Philadelphia	1,950,961	(2)		do	Mayor-council	14,505	743.5
Pittsburgh	669,817	Allegheny	1,374,410	Dec. 31, 1929	do		
Reading	111,171	Berks	231,717	Jan. 7, 1930	Commission		
Scranton	143,433	Lackawanna	310,397	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council	1,509	1,052.1
Sharon	25,908	Mercer	99,246	do	do	216	833.7
Wilkes-Barre	86,626	Luzerne	445,109	Jan. 7, 1930	Commission		
Wilkesburg	29,539	Allegheny	1,374,410	(1)	(1)		
Williamsport	45,729	Lycoming	93,241	Jan. 7, 1930	Commission	181	395.8
York	65,254	York	167,135	do	do	480	868.7
Rhode Island:							
Central Falls	25,898	Providence	540,016	June 30, 1930	Mayor-council		
Cranston	42,911	do	540,016	do	do	271	631.5
Newport	27,612	Newport	41,668	do	do		
Pawtucket	77,149	Providence	540,016	do	do	821	1,064.2
Providence	252,981	do	540,016	do	do	3,541	1,399.7
Woonsocket	49,376	do	540,016	do	do	492	996.4
South Carolina:							
Charleston	62,265	Charleston	101,050	Dec. 31, 1930	(1)	1,568	2,421.9
Columbia	50,211	Richland	87,667	do	(2)		
Greenville	29,154	Greenville	117,009	do	(1)	636	2,181.5
Spartanburg	28,723	Spartanburg	116,323	(2)	(1)		
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	33,362	Minnehaha	50,872	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission	402	1,205.0
Tennessee:							
Chattanooga	119,798	Hamilton	169,497	Sept. 30, 1929	do	2,058	1,717.9
Johnson City	25,080	Washington	45,805	(1)	(1)		
Knoxville	105,802	Knox	155,992	Sept. 30, 1930	Council-manager	1,740	1,645.5
Memphis	253,143	Shelby	306,482	Dec. 30, 1930	Commission		
Nashville	153,866	Davidson	222,854	do	Mayor-council	1,742	1,197.8
Texas:							
Amarillo	43,132	(Potter	46,080	Dec. 31, 1929	(1)		
Austin	53,120	Randall	7,071	do	do		
Beaumont	57,732	Travis	77,777	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager	1,125	2,117.9
Corpus Christi	27,741	Jefferson	133,391	June 30, 1930	Council-commission-manager	1,019	1,765.1
Dallas	260,475	Neuces	51,779	(1)	(1)		
El Paso	102,421	Dallas	325,691	Apr. 30, 1930	Commission		
Fort Worth	163,447	El Paso	131,597	Feb. 28, 1930	do	2,828	2,761.2
Galveston	52,938	Tarrant	197,553	Sept. 30, 1930	Council-manager	4,048	2,476.6
Houston	292,352	Galveston	64,401	June 30, 1930	Commission	599	1,131.5
Laredo	32,618	Harris	359,328	Dec. 31, 1930	do	9,921	3,393.5
Laredo	32,618	Webb	42,128	do	Mayor-council		

See footnotes at end of table.

POPULATION, FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND PART I OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE IN AMERICAN CITIES OVER 25,000 IN POPULATION—continued

City and State	City population	County	County population	End of fiscal year	Form of city government	Part I offenses known to the police, 1930	
						Number of offenses	Per 100,000 population
Texas—Continued.							
Port Arthur.....	50,902	Jefferson.....	133,391	(1)	(1).....	310	609.0
San Angelo.....	25,308	Tom Green.....	36,033	(1)	(1).....		
San Antonio.....	251,542	Bexar.....	292,533	May 31, 1930	Commission.....	7,169	3,086.2
Waco.....	52,848	McLennan.....	98,982	Sept. 30, 1930	do.....		
Wichita Falls.....	43,690	Wichita.....	74,416	Mar. 31, 1930	Mayor-council.....	407	933.6
Utah:							
Ogden.....	40,272	Weber.....	52,172	(1)	(1).....	709	1,760.5
Salt Lake City.....	140,267	Salt Lake.....	194,102	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission.....	3,454	2,462.5
Virginia:							
Lynchburg.....	40,661	Campbell.....	22,885	do.....	Council-manager.....	426	1,047.7
Newport News.....	34,417	Lynchburg City.....	40,661	do.....	do.....	593	1,723.0
Norfolk.....	129,710	Warwick.....	8,829	do.....	do.....	4,189	3,229.5
Petersburg.....	28,564	Newport News City.....	34,417	do.....	do.....	711	2,489.2
Portsmouth.....	45,704	Norfolk.....	30,082	do.....	do.....	572	1,251.6
Richmond.....	182,929	Norfolk City.....	129,710	June 30, 1930	do.....		
Roanoke.....	69,206	Dinwiddie.....	18,492	Dec. 31, 1930	do.....		
Washington:		Petersburg City.....	28,564	do.....	do.....		
Bellingham.....	30,823	Norwalk.....	30,082	Jan. 31, 1931	Mayor-council.....		
Everett.....	30,587	Portsmouth City.....	45,704	Dec. 31, 1930	do.....		
Seattle.....	365,583	Richmond City.....	182,929	Jan. 31, 1931	Mayor-council.....		
		Roanoke.....	35,289	Dec. 31, 1930	Council-manager.....	602	869.9
		Roanoke City.....	69,206	do.....	do.....		
		Whatcom.....	59,128	do.....	do.....		
		Snohomish.....	78,861	do.....	do.....		
		King.....	463,517	Dec. 31, 1929	do.....	10,992	3,006.7

Spokane.....	115,514	Spokane.....	150,477	Dec. 31, 1930	Commission.....	3,489	3,020.4
Tacoma.....	106,817	Pierce.....	163,482	Dec. 31, 1929	(2).....	2,635	2,446.8
West Virginia:							
Charleston.....	60,408	Kanawha.....	157,667	June 30, 1930	Mayor-council.....		
Clarksburg.....	23,866	Harrison.....	78,567	(2)	Council-manager.....	139	481.5
Huntington.....	75,572	Cabell.....	90,786	June 30, 1930	Mayor-commission.....		
Parkersburg.....	29,623	Wayne.....	31,206	(2)	Commission.....	369	1,245.7
Wheeling.....	61,659	Wood.....	56,521	June 30, 1930	do.....		
Wisconsin:		Ohio.....	72,077				
Appleton.....	25,267	Coutagamie.....	62,790	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council.....	75	296.8
Eau Claire.....	26,287	Eau Claire.....	41,087	do.....	Commission.....	162	616.3
Fond du Lac.....	26,449	Fond du Lac.....	59,883	do.....	(2).....		
Green Bay.....	37,415	Brown.....	70,249	do.....	Commission.....		
Kenosha.....	50,262	Kenosha.....	63,277	do.....	Mayor-council.....	286	569.0
La Crosse.....	39,614	La Crosse.....	54,455	do.....	do.....		
Madison.....	57,899	Dane.....	112,737	do.....	do.....	796	1,374.8
Milwaukee.....	578,249	Milwaukee.....	725,263	do.....	do.....	8,075	1,396.5
Oshkosh.....	40,108	Winnebago.....	76,622	do.....	do.....	216	538.6
Racine.....	67,542	Racine.....	90,217	do.....	do.....	196	290.2
Sheboygan.....	39,251	Sheboygan.....	71,235	do.....	do.....	332	845.8
Superior.....	36,113	Douglas.....	46,553	(1)	(1).....	802	2,220.8
West Allis.....	34,671	Milwaukee.....	725,263	Dec. 31, 1930	Mayor-council.....	554	1,597.9

¹ Not studied.

² Data not furnished.

³ City and county coextensive.

⁴ City.

⁵ Parish.

⁶ City coextensive with 5 counties which are boroughs of city.

⁷ Figures given in this report have been adjusted to the calendar year 1929.

⁸ Figures given in this report have been adjusted to the calendar year 1930.

TABLE 2.—Per capita cost of criminal justice in Rhode Island, 1920-1929 (exclusive of towns)

Year	Cost			Year	Cost		
	Amount ¹	Per capita	In- dex ²		Amount ¹	Per capita	In- dex ²
1920.....	\$1,819,792.64	\$3.02	100.0	1920.....	\$2,618,452.20	\$4.00	132.5
1921.....	1,894,843.04	3.09	102.3	1927.....	2,692,637.36	4.06	134.4
1922.....	1,968,963.96	3.17	105.0	1928.....	2,790,890.96	4.16	137.7
1923.....	1,986,420.87	3.16	104.6	1929.....	2,942,774.69	4.33	143.4
1924.....	2,185,443.43	3.43	113.6				
1925.....	2,362,578.35	3.66	121.2	Average....	2,326,269.75	3.61	119.5

¹ From Table 1, supra.
² On the basis of 1920=100.0.

The figures for Rhode Island are not, as has been pointed out,³ representative State figures, for the reason that Rhode Island is not a typical State. They are included in this report (a) because they are the only anywhere nearly complete State figures available, and (b) because they are the only figures available which cover a substantial period of years and show the variation in the costs of criminal justice over such a period.

³ See p. 247, supra, note 17.

APPENDIX H

THE COST OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN RHODE ISLAND, 1920-1929

The only study of the cost of criminal justice covering an entire State which it was possible to arrange as part of the present investigation was one for Rhode Island.¹ This study, made under the supervision of Prof. H. A. Phelps, of Brown University,² covered the State government, and all counties and all incorporated cities in the State for the 10-year period 1920 to 1929, inclusive. It did not include the town governments. While 30.8 per cent of the population of Rhode Island reside in towns, the criminal justice functions of the towns are limited, so that the figures in the following tables may, it is believed, be regarded as almost complete.

Table 1 gives aggregate criminal police, prosecution, criminal court, penal institution, and probation and parole costs for the State and its municipal subdivisions, exclusive of towns, for the 10-year period ending in 1929.

TABLE 1.—Cost of criminal justice in Rhode Island, 1920-1929 (exclusive of towns)

Year	Criminal police	Prosecution	Criminal courts	Penal institutions	Probation and parole	Total
1920.....	\$1,284,295.35	\$27,211.41	\$169,468.10	\$328,261.62	\$10,556.07	\$1,819,792.64
1921.....	1,448,469.08	28,926.19	173,214.45	234,207.94	9,935.38	1,894,843.04
1922.....	1,501,626.13	28,951.72	175,259.42	249,369.54	13,757.15	1,968,963.96
1923.....	1,573,275.25	31,608.18	179,219.65	188,340.40	13,977.39	1,986,420.87
1924.....	1,602,646.35	33,396.78	177,728.01	360,855.23	10,816.40	2,185,443.43
1925.....	1,738,755.17	36,909.50	207,988.20	362,455.81	16,469.67	2,362,578.35
1926.....	1,789,051.73	40,309.17	217,308.85	536,428.22	35,356.23	2,618,452.20
1927.....	1,978,056.13	39,524.08	226,255.36	401,577.08	47,124.71	2,692,537.36
1928.....	2,061,714.77	41,085.24	227,098.93	404,734.01	50,258.01	2,790,890.96
1929.....	2,208,748.39	38,244.02	225,951.27	410,416.60	59,414.41	2,942,774.69
Average.	1,718,663.84	34,616.63	197,949.29	347,673.45	27,366.55	2,326,269.75

Table 2 gives per capita costs of criminal justice for the State and indicates how such costs have increased over the 10-year period ending in 1929.

¹ See p. 247, supra, note 16.
² See p. 505, supra.

END