

handle
with care



LIBRARY
JOHN AMY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

REPORT
OF THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE

OF
The Board of Aldermen
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

APPOINTED AUGUST 5, 1912

TO INVESTIGATE
THE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Submitted
JUNE 10, 1913

Spec
Coll.
HV
7597
. E3
1913
C.2



CONTENTS.

PREFACE.	PAGE
Accusation of police corruption by Herman Rosenthal—his murder—Lieut. Becker indicted and convicted—Resolution and Committee of Board of Aldermen to investigate Police Department.....	1
INTRODUCTION.	
Counsel and sessions—administrative—methods responsible for corruption and inefficiency—preliminary legislative report—District Attorney Whitman—the Bureau of Municipal Research and the Citizens Union assist—Commissioner and members of department refuse to waive immunity?..	2
FINDINGS.	
I.—Commissioner Waldo unfit and incompetent—failed to prevent blackmail and extortion—accused men self-investigated—warned as to subordinates—lax discipline—no accurate information as to conditions—complaints not followed out—officers coddled—pensions—lieutenant's members—fines illegally remitted—reinstatements illegal—criminals on force—pension burdens increased—detective bureau made inefficient—squads and "line up" abolished—photo records destroyed—inadequate reports—vindictive spirit in dismissals.....	3, 4
Recommendation that he be removed.....	5
II.—Gambling and prostitution, as police problems—Mayor and Commissioner unable to suppress gambling—widespread blackmail by police—made possible by weakened discipline and improper administrative methods—lack of checks—self-investigation—ignorance of conditions—complaints suppressed and resented—police testimony not checked up—recommendations—extortion by police—payment of toll—Becker and the vice squad, Mary Goode, George Sipp, Fox, inspectors and other witnesses—Commissioner's opinion of department—police as witnesses—paid to "throw" cases—degree of enforcement.....	5-9
III.—Administrative methods employed for enforcement of laws against gambling and prostitution—responsibility on inspectors and squads under Commissioner—no checks—information as to conditions—system worthless—not complied with—bureau for handling—complaints ignored or self-investigated	9-15
IV.—Excise—Sunday selling of liquor—recommendation.....	15
V.—Detective bureau—organization—corruption—administrative inefficiency—shifting personnel—squads abolished—"line up"—records—reports—homicide cases—recommendations	15-19
VI.—Surgical Bureau—organization—duties—private practice—salaries—records—residence—office hours—inspection of station houses—attention of force—recommendations	19-21

CONTENTS—Continued.

	PAGE
VII.—Traffic squad	21
VIII.—Bridge Squad	22
IX.—Tenement House Squad—recommendations.....	22
X.—Health Department Squad—recommendations.....	22
XI.—Boiler Squad—recommendations.....	22
XII.—Central Office Squad.....	22, 23
XIII.—Organization and personnel of Police Department—conclusions and recommendations—home rule essential—civilian commissioners, term eight years—removable at will after charges and hearing—salary—greater number of deputies—fewer inspectors—salary of patrolmen—Commissioner—tenure of office reason for weakness—discipline—morale—relations to Mayor—Deputy Commissioners—organization duties—recommendations—inspectors—chief inspector—duties—recommendations—organization—unit of administration. Captains—organization—duties—recommendations. Lieutenants and sergeants—organization—duties. Patrolmen—organization—duties—salary—economic condition—platoon system—fixed post. Matrons—duties	23-29
XIV.—Matters affecting general welfare of force—appointments—Commissioner and Civil Service Commission—standard of former—recommendation. School of recruits—importance—recommendations. School for detectives—importance—recommendations. Promotions—regulations—standards. Trial and punishment—regulations—recommendations. Reinstatements—by courts—by Commissioner—charter—of sergeants—remission of fines—pensions—station houses	29-39

APPENDICES.

Appendix A—Gambling and prostitution.....	40-70
Appendix B—Home study of patrolmen.....	70-79
Appendix C—Personnel and Civil Service features of Police Department....	79-105
Appendix D—Distribution of force.....	105-121
Appendix E—School for recruits	122-126
Appendix F—Policemen in courts	126-127
Appendix G—Surgical Bureau	128-135
Appendix H—Outages	135
Appendix I—Preliminary legislative report	136-139

APPENDIX A.

Tables I.-IV.—Information furnished Commissioner.....	40-51
Tables V.-XIII.—Method of handling complaints.....	51-67
Table XIV.—Activity in enforcement.....	68, 69

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF POLICE DEPARTMENT.

New York, N. Y., June 10, 1913.

The undersigned members of the Special Committee appointed on August 5, 1912, by the Board of Aldermen of New York City to investigate the Police Department, submit the following report:

Preface.

During the early part of July, 1912, officers of the Police Department were openly accused of protecting from prosecution persons violating the law, and sharing in the profits of their crime. This accusation was made in a daily newspaper by Herman Rosenthal, a well known professional gambler. The charge was promptly taken up by the District Attorney of New York County, who summoned Rosenthal to his office. Preparations were made for an investigation by the Grand Jury, and it was announced in the daily press that Rosenthal would appear before the District Attorney on July 16, 1912, prepared to substantiate his charge.

Rosenthal was shot down by four assassins on a well-lighted thoroughfare, a few feet off Broadway, on the morning of July 16. Although several police officers were in the immediate vicinity, the murderers made their escape in an automobile without interference. The fact that Rosenthal was shot within a few hours of the time at which he was to testify against police officers, and the bold manner in which the murder was committed, at once created a widespread belief that police officers had instigated the crime.

Shortly thereafter Charles Becker, a Police Lieutenant, was indicted for the murder of Rosenthal. Becker had been entrusted with the enforcement of the laws against gambling, and enjoyed the confidence of his superior officers. He was later convicted of instigating this murder and sentenced to death.

The murder of Rosenthal caused intense public excitement and indignation. A sharp challenge of the morale and efficiency of the Police Department was made on all sides. The need was felt for a thorough investigation into the general administration and personnel of the department—important matters not within the scope of the criminal prosecutions directed against individuals, which at once had been begun by the District Attorney.

The Board of Aldermen on August 5, 1912, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a special committee of nine members elected to the Board of Aldermen, the first named to be chairman, be appointed, authorized, empowered and directed to inquire whether the laws and ordinances of The City relating to the Police Department of The City of New York are being faithfully observed, and whether the duties of the officers of such department are being faithfully discharged, and to examine and report whether there are any unnecessary, inefficient or unfit employees of said department; and generally in respect of any and all matters which will conduce to the orderly and economical administration of the affairs of the Police Department aforesaid; and that for the purpose of such inquiry such committee shall have all the powers and authority possessed by the Board of Aldermen to conduct such inquiry, including any and all powers that may be conferred upon a committee appointed pursuant to section 54 of the Greater New York Charter."

On the same day the following committee was appointed: Henry H. Curran, Chairman; Ralph Folks, Robert F. Downing, James Hamilton, O. Grant Esterbrook, W. Augustus Shipley, Frank L. Dowling, Francis P. Kenney and James J. Smith.

Introduction.

Immediately after its appointment the committee organized and selected Robert F. Downing as its secretary. It retained Emory R. Buckner as its chief counsel, and Messrs. Nathan A. Smyth, Charles S. Guthrie, William A. Moore and Louis Lande as associate counsel. Because of other duties Messrs. Smyth and Guthrie afterwards resigned and Harold S. Deming was thereupon retained as associate counsel.

The Committee has held 80 public sessions in the Aldermanic Chamber in City Hall, beginning September 10, 1912, and ending March 27, 1913. It has received the testimony of 224 witnesses, and has examined, through its investigators, tens of thousands of documents on file in the Police Department and elsewhere. The record of the proceedings before the Committee consists of 4,800 printed pages. A total sum of \$40,000 was appropriated to meet the expenses of the investigation.

Early in the investigation the Committee became convinced that corruption and inefficiency in the Police Department are in large part due to administrative methods which make intelligent direction and accountability impossible. It determined that it could best perform its duty by making the administration of the department its principal subject of study. Corruption in the department has been recurrently shown by investigation for many years. It is apparent that mere occasional exposure is not the remedy for police evils. It has been the aim of the Committee not only to expose the individual grafter, but also to examine the causes which make grafting possible.

We have received testimony showing many specific instances of corruption and participation in crime upon the part of the police, from which many convictions have since resulted. This testimony emphasized the need and pointed the direction for a constructive inquiry.

On March 11, 1913, the Committee made a Preliminary Legislative Report. This report dealt only with matters requiring legislative enactment or repeal. It was made in advance of this final report that it might be available before the legislature finally adjourned. This Preliminary Report will be found hereto attached.

The Committee has been assisted in its work by the co-operation of Honorable Charles S. Whitman, District Attorney of New York County, in assigning one of his assistants, J. Robert Rubin, to aid our counsel. This assistance facilitated prompt prosecution and conviction of police officials accused before us. A detailed statement of indictments and convictions obtained by the District Attorney during the progress of our investigation appears later in this report.

The Committee has also been substantially aided in the details of its administrative inquiry by the Bureau of Municipal Research. This non-official organization was enabled by special contribution from a private source to place at the service of the Committee, without charge, many expert assistants.

The Citizens Union also rendered assistance to the Committee by collecting for it important statistical data.

To our amazement, many members of the department refused to sign formal waivers of immunity, and insisted upon claiming any freedom from prosecution which might arise from the giving of incriminating testimony. It seems incredible that members of the department should refuse to testify before a committee of the Board of Aldermen unless permitted to do so without waiving immunity from prosecution. Even those police officers whom witnesses before us had directly charged with extortion, burglary and robbery, refused to make any explanation or denial of the charges unless allowed to do so without waiving immunity. We might very naturally have expected a Police Commissioner to take drastic action in the case of any officer refusing to waive immunity. To our great astonishment, however, the Police Commissioner himself was the first so to refuse, upon the ground that our asking him to waive immunity was a "gratuitous insult." He thus furnished a safe

precedent for the protection of grafters and others on the force who for reasons best known to themselves gladly followed his example.

The roll of members of the department refusing to waive immunity is as follows:

Commissioner Rhinelander Waldo, Deputy Commissioner George S. Dougherty, head of the Detective Bureau; Winfield R. Sheehan, Secretary to the Commissioner; Inspector Dennis Sweeney (since convicted), Captain Thomas W. Walsh (since convicted), Captain Dominick Henry, Captain William H. Kinsler, Lieutenant William W. Duggan, Lieutenant John Glynn, Detective Joseph Daley, Patrolman Henry Resmeyer, Patrolman Arthur Carmack, Patrolman Joseph Michaelson.

Our findings and recommendations follow herewith under appropriate headings.

The Present Police Commissioner.

We have become convinced that the present Police Commissioner, Rhinelander Waldo, is incompetent and unfit to perform the duties of his office. Many of the existing evils of the Department can be directly traced to his inefficiency and administrative blunders. The evidence before us, which will be discussed in detail in later sections of this report, shows conclusively his incapacity to administer the Department, in that:

1. He has failed to exercise his powers or to employ the means at his command to prevent a wide-spread system of blackmail and extortion by certain of his subordinates.

2. He has permitted to be given to the very men accused, for their own information, letters charging them with graft, without making independent investigation. No better protection could well be afforded criminal Policemen than the privilege of self-investigation.

3. He has refused to heed repeated warnings against personally selected subordinates who were at the time betraying him and the City.

4. He has neglected to discipline those Inspectors who have been proven either inefficient or significantly inactive. Raids over their heads by Headquarters vice squads have not resulted in reprimand, demotion, or other action.

5. He has neither secured nor made serious effort to secure from his subordinates accurate information concerning crime conditions in the city. The files of the Department contain inaccurate and misleading reports in great number, although the facts could readily have been ascertained.

6. He has made it possible for commanding officers to conceal from him valuable information by permitting them to make any disposition they choose of complaints made to them by citizens.

7. He has not controlled but coddled the superior officers of the Department. For example:

- (a) He has established a pension board, composed of the presidents of the Captains', Lieutenants', Sergeants' and Patrolmen's associations to advise him concerning the disposition of each pension application. These men pass upon the pension applications of the members of their own associations.

- (b) At the request of the Lieutenants he has removed the numbers from their badges. As a result, it is no longer possible for a citizen to report by number any one of the 600 Lieutenants in the city.

- (c) He has remitted the fines imposed by his predecessor upon 42 commanding officers, but in no instance has he remitted a fine imposed by his predecessors upon a Patrolman. The remission of these fines was contrary to law and expressly against an opinion of the Corporation Counsel, on file at Police Headquarters at the time.

- (d) He has reinstated, without court proceedings, many officers dismissed by his predecessors. Some of these reinstatements were contrary to the opinion of the Corporation Counsel on file in the Department, clearly illegal, and since nullified

by the courts upon a taxpayer's complaint. Other reinstatements, though not illegal, were wholly without justification. In some cases they were made by the Commissioner after the courts had held the dismissals justified.

8. He has appointed to the Force many men who had sworn falsely upon their applications. He has done this in some cases against the specific recommendations of his Deputy Commissioners. He revealed his low standard for Policemen when he declared before us his willingness to appoint to the Force any man who had secured acquittal on any criminal charge, including murder, without reference to the circumstances or technical reasons for such acquittal.

9. He has increased at an alarming rate the already heavy burden of Police pension demands, surpassing in this respect all previous Commissioners for the same period of time. He has admitted that he has placed undesirable members of the Force upon pensions instead of upon charges.

10. He has seriously impaired the efficiency of the Detective Bureau by

(a) Too frequently changing the personnel of the Bureau; using the Bureau for individual reward and preferment rather than for developing detective ability.

(b) Abolishing the Headquarters Squad and the squads specializing in particular crimes, such as pocket picking, black hand outrages, etc.

(c) Discontinuing the morning "line up" of suspicious persons.

(d) Ordering the destruction of thousands of photographs of professional criminals.

(e) Failing to require adequate reports from Detectives. The system of records is now so defective that the Commissioner has given erroneous and wholly misleading statistics upon the work of the Detective Bureau in his latest annual report.

11. He has shown a vindictive spirit, inimical to the efficiency and morale of the Department. To illustrate:

(a) He dismissed from the Force Lieutenant John F. Stanton, in charge of the Bureau of Investigation of Applicants under former Commissioners, after Stanton had testified before us that many men appointed by Commissioner Waldo were of bad character, as shown by Stanton's official investigation. Within a few days after Stanton testified to these facts, a member of the Detective Bureau, named Oliver, made a charge of attempted extortion against Stanton, alleging that this crime was committed more than three years before. Oliver had formerly been Commissioner Waldo's chauffeur and had been promoted to the Detective Bureau by him. No adequate explanation was given for the delay of three years in making complaint. Stanton was tried upon this charge by First Deputy Commissioner McKay and dismissed from the Department by Commissioner Waldo. We examined all the witnesses who had testified at Stanton's trial, and it was clearly apparent that Stanton was innocent of the charge, and that his dismissal was the result of the Commissioner's wrath.

(b) Patrolman Otto Nikly was fined fifteen days' pay by Commissioner Waldo for being off post. Deputy Commissioner Dillon testified that this was an unusually heavy punishment, "a heart-breaking fine." Nikly, believing that he had been unjustly fined, employed counsel and contested the legality of the Commissioner's action. More than a year later, the case being undecided, Nikly's counsel raised a technical point, showing by the records the inaccuracy of the Commissioner's answer in the case. The Commissioner immediately rescinded his action fining Nikly, reconsidered the original charge of being off post, and dismissed him from the Department.

12. He has given no assistance or genuine co-operation to those charged with the duty of investigating conditions in the Department. On the contrary, he has sought to obstruct and hinder such investigation and has apparently resisted the disclosure of the actual facts. He has refused us reasonable access to the files of the Department. He has excluded our investigators from the various bureaus of the Department, and

permitted them to examine documents only upon separate and specific requisition. He has denied us any general inspection of the records. He has prohibited members of the Department from giving any information to our counsel or investigators except under subpoena upon our witness stand.

Recommendation.

Public interest requires the immediate removal of Commissioner Waldo. We recommend that the Board of Aldermen request the Mayor to relieve The City of New York from a Police Commissioner who, by temperament and conduct, has shown himself unfit to occupy his office.

GAMBLING AND PROSTITUTION.

Conclusions—Recommendations.

Discussion of Special Topics:

1. Extortion by Policemen.
2. Policemen in the Courts.
3. Degree of Enforcement.
4. Administrative Methods Employed in Enforcement:
 - (a) Organization.
 - (b) Information as to Conditions
 - (c) Method of Handling Complaints.

Gambling and Prostitution.

We have considered these subjects only as they involve police problems under present laws. We have not studied them as moral questions. Such investigation would have been beyond the scope of the resolution under which the Committee was appointed.

Conclusions.

We have arrived at the following conclusions after hearing much testimony and thoroughly examining the records of the Department. These conclusions are later discussed in detail:

1. Although the present Mayor and Police Commissioner have endeavored to enforce laws against gambling, their efforts have not been effective.
2. It has been their policy to enforce laws against prostitution only where outward conditions were disorderly or upon persistent complaint.
3. There has been widespread blackmail levied by police officials upon the keepers of gambling and disorderly houses.
4. This extortion has been made possible by weakened discipline and a failure to employ proper administrative methods. We readily understood the alliance between Policemen and violators of the law when our investigation revealed the following:
 - (a) A total failure effectively to check the work of police officials and to discipline those officers shown to be neglectful of their duties.
 - (b) The Commissioner's stubborn confidence in the integrity of men selected by him to supervise this work.
 - (c) A system of referring letters charging officers with misconduct and crime to the very men accused, for their own information.
 - (d) The Commissioner's lack of information concerning actual conditions.
 - (e) Ability of Inspectors and Captains to keep important complaints from the Commissioner and his Deputies.
 - (f) Faulty methods of handling complaints sent to the Commissioner.
 - (g) A hostile attitude toward citizen complainants.
 - (h) No supervision over testimony of Policemen in the courts.

Recommendations.

1. To enforce effectively laws against gambling and prostitution and to reduce to a minimum police corruption, the administrative changes recommended elsewhere

in this report are essential. These include a more secure tenure for the Commissioner, an increase in the number of his Deputies, the abolition of the inspection districts and the establishment of the precinct as the police unit.

2. Headquarter's "vice" squads, operating under the Commissioner's personal direction, should be employed. These squads should be used more effectively than at present to check the efficiency and activity of commanding officers.

3. A small secret service squad, composed of men other than Policemen, should be employed by the Commissioner to secure evidence against corrupt police officials.

4. A system of reports should be devised to give the Commissioner in consolidated form accurate information concerning vice conditions in the City.

5. A central bureau should be installed for the effective disposition of all complaints received from citizens.

6. The testimony of Policemen in courts should be closely watched, and thorough investigation should follow contradictory statements and suspicious loss of memory.

Extortion by Policemen.

It has been testified before us that practically all of the proprietors of gambling and disorderly houses in the City have been compelled to make regular monthly payments to certain members of the Police Department for the privilege of conducting their illegal business; that these payments range from \$50 to more than \$200 per month in the case of disorderly houses, and, in the case of gambling houses, that the payments vary in accordance with the profits of the business done, sometimes running to very large amounts.

Shortly after taking office the present Commissioner organized a "vice" squad, with Lieutenant Charles Becker in charge. Becker operated directly from headquarters, under the personal direction of the Commissioner. Among other duties, he was entrusted with the enforcement of laws against gambling. In the preface of this report mention is made of the murder of Herman Rosenthal after his public accusation that Becker had been receiving a percentage of the profits of his gambling house. Becker was later convicted of this murder and sentenced to death. We have discovered that the Commissioner and the Mayor were repeatedly warned of Becker's disloyalty and corruption, not only by other City officials, but also by numerous written complaints.

The Commissioner not only failed to investigate these serious charges but issued a general order to the entire force complimenting Becker upon his work.

Mary Goode, frankly admitting herself to have been the keeper of a disorderly flat, willingly came before us as a witness to protest against police extortion. She testified that she had been compelled to pay certain police officials or their representatives \$50 to \$60 per month for the privilege of conducting her business. Some of these payments were made after the Rosenthal murder, and, indeed, during our investigation. She further stated that all women engaged in similar business with whom she was acquainted made regular payments to the police. Mrs. Goode was specific in her testimony, mentioning by name members of the Department, who since have been indicted.

George A. Sipp testified before us that while proprietor of the Baltic Hotel he was compelled to pay to members of the Police Department \$100 a month. This money was paid to various Patrolmen sent by an Inspector or Captain. For a few years prior to his sale of the hotel in the autumn of 1910 the money was paid by him regularly to Patrolman Eugene Fox.

Sipp further testified that after he sold the Baltic Hotel he acted as an intermediary between the purchasers and certain police officials, receiving from the former \$100 monthly, which he paid to Fox.

In the autumn of 1911 Sipp desired to purchase another hotel in the same inspection district. He asked Fox if this would be satisfactory to Inspector Sweeney.

After receiving through Fox the Inspector's consent, the purchase was completed and renovation begun. Fox later reported to Sipp that the Inspector had changed his mind, because the new location was near a disorderly hotel which enjoyed the fullest protection and would brook no competition. Sipp then refused longer to collect money from the Baltic Hotel for the police.

Patrolman Fox thereafter collected directly from the cashier of the hotel, Thomas J. Dorian. Dorian testified before us reluctantly, but with apparent truthfulness. He had had no quarrel with police officials, had never been arrested, and was brought before us against his will. He corroborated Sipp as to the payment of money to certain police officials through Sipp. He further testified that from the autumn of 1911 down to the very moment of his appearance before us, December 12, 1912, he had paid Patrolman Fox \$50, monthly, the amount then levied upon this resort by the police. It was obvious from the testimony and surrounding circumstances that the Baltic Hotel was a house of assignation.

Miss Mary Coleman, a member of the New York bar, testified before us that she had been active in attempting to suppress vice in the 43d precinct; that there were many disorderly resorts in that precinct running openly without the slightest police interference. She further stated that she had witnessed the passing of money to police officers by men connected with disorderly hotels, in one instance almost at the doors of the station house. Her complaints to Captain Thomas W. Walsh were unheeded.

We received other testimony showing the collection of money by the police from violators of the law, which it seems unnecessary to recite in detail.

Immediately following the testimony of these witnesses before us, Patrolman Fox was arrested and Sipp subpoenaed to appear against him. Inspectors Sweeney and Murtha and ex-Inspectors Thompson and Hussey thereupon bribed Sipp to flee and Fox to conceal the truth. Sipp fled from the State, but returned at the request of the District Attorney. Fox confessed, corroborating Sipp in every detail. He declared that he had acted as the agent of Captain Thomas W. Walsh in collecting money from those permitted to violate the law. Walsh pleaded guilty to this charge and accused his inspector, Dennis Sweeney, of sharing in the profits of this system of official extortion.

Inspectors Sweeney and Murtha and ex-Inspectors Thompson and Hussey were at once indicted for bribery and for conspiracy to secure the flight of Sipp and to prevent Fox from telling the truth. They were tried, convicted and sent to prison.

Patrolman John J. Hartigan, employed by Inspector Sweeney in executing this conspiracy, swore falsely concerning it before the Grand Jury, and has since been convicted of perjury and sent to prison.

The following is a complete list of persons indicted during the progress of our investigation as a result of the prompt action taken by the District Attorney after the exposures made before us:

Former Inspector Dennis Sweeney, convicted of conspiracy, sent to prison for one year.

Former Inspector Dennis Sweeney, 13 indictments; extortion and bribery; awaiting trial.

Former Inspector James E. Hussey, convicted of conspiracy; sent to prison for one year.

Former Inspector James E. Hussey, two indictments; bribery; awaiting trial.

Former Inspector John J. Murtha, convicted of conspiracy; sent to prison for one year.

Former Inspector John J. Murtha, two indictments; bribery; awaiting trial.

Former Inspector James F. Thompson, convicted of conspiracy; sent to prison for one year.

Former Inspector James F. Thompson, two indictments; bribery; awaiting trial.

Captain Thomas W. Walsh, extortion; confessed; awaiting sentence.
 Sergeant Peter J. Duffy, six indictments; extortion; awaiting trial.
 Patrolman Eugene F. Fox, extortion; confessed; awaiting sentence.
 Patrolman Thomas F. Robinson, extortion; convicted; sent to prison from six to ten years.
 Patrolman John J. Hartigan, perjury; convicted; sent to prison two and one-half to three and one-half years.
 Patrolman John Skelly, extortion; awaiting trial.
 Patrolman William J. Smith, extortion; awaiting trial.
 Patrolman Victor Meyer, extortion; awaiting trial.
 Patrolman Thomas Heaney, extortion; awaiting trial.
 Patrolman Charles E. Foye, perjury before the Committee; awaiting trial.
 Edward J. Newell, counsel to Sipp; two indictments; bribery, confessed; sentence suspended.
 David Meyer, subornation of perjury; awaiting trial.
 Charles Dubelier, subornation of perjury; awaiting trial.
 Ashley Shea, bribery; confessed; awaiting sentence.
 Emanuel Maas, extortion; awaiting trial.
 Sol. Wolf, extortion; awaiting trial.

We believe the exposures made disclose only a small fraction of the corruption existing in the Department. In the very nature of things the whole truth on such a subject cannot be ascertained. We have received sufficient evidence of criminal connection between the Police and violators of the law to become convinced that a large percentage of the Force having to deal with gambling and prostitution have participated in the spoils collected from these fertile sources of graft.

In view of these indictments and disclosures it is astonishing to note that on September 20, 1912, Police Commissioner Waldo, testifying before us, declared, "There is nothing wrong with the Police Department except public clamor."

Policemen as Witnesses in Court.

That Policemen have received sums of money for testifying in such manner as to produce acquittals and discharges has been stated to us by many witnesses. So common is this practice that it is colloquially known as "throwing" a case, or as a "turn out." Indeed, even where Police officers have regularly collected "protection money" it has been customary for them to make arrests at intervals and then, after receiving additional money demanded by them, to give only such testimony as would necessarily result in a discharge or acquittal. Sipp testified that this sort of arrest was known in the Department as a "friendly collar"; that convictions never resulted from such arrests, but that the employer of the persons arrested was called upon to pay to the Police a sum of money, generally \$200, in each case. These so-called "friendly collars" have been frequently arranged, according to witnesses, in order to make some show of activity and thereby "cover" an Inspector or Captain.

The records show that in the case of some Inspectors convictions have resulted in less than 2 per cent. of arrests made under their supervision in the enforcement of laws against gambling and prostitution. Other officials in charge of squads engaged in enforcing these laws have secured convictions in over 50 per cent. of their arrests. We have found no indication that the Commissioner has caused investigation to be made of this surprising and suspicious ratio, although he has on many occasions condemned the courts for discharging prisoners in this class of cases. When a Policeman swears specifically in an affidavit to certain facts for the purpose of securing a warrant, and later makes contradictory statements in court, or suffers a loss of memory, thorough investigation should follow. We have not discovered that any such investigations are made. One of the City Magistrates stated before us that the testimony of Police officers in prosecutions for gambling, prostitution and illegal

liquor selling was unreliable. There should be installed in the Department a rigorous supervision over Policemen in the courts.

Degree of Enforcement.

Witnesses have testified that just prior to the Rosenthal murder gambling and disorderly houses were more numerous than at any time for several years.

Former Inspector Hays testified before us that while he was in command of the Fourth Inspection District, commonly known as the "Upper Tenderloin," the Commissioner directed him not to suppress prostitution unless outward conditions were disorderly. This testimony was corroborated beyond any question by the records of the Department. An examination disclosed that for more than six months not a single arrest for prostitution was made in this district, although, as Inspector Hays said, it was matter of common knowledge that hundreds of disorderly houses and flats were contained within it. Inspector Hays talked with the Commissioner almost daily with reference to his general duties, and particularly with reference to the suppression of gambling, but was never criticized for his complete failure to enforce these laws.

Our examination of many Police officers and an exhaustive study of the records of the Department have convinced us that the laws against prostitution have only been enforced by the present Commissioner in cases where outward conditions were openly disorderly and in cases where persistent complaint was made, either by civic organizations or prominent citizens. That this policy has been pursued at the Mayor's direction is apparent from the evidence before us, including the Mayor's own testimony.

ADMINISTRATIVE METHODS EMPLOYED FOR ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS AGAINST GAMBLING AND PROSTITUTION.

Organization.

The responsibility for the enforcement of these laws has been placed upon the sixteen Inspectors in charge of inspection districts and upon special squads working from Headquarters under the personal direction of the Commissioner. The uniformed force, including the Captains, have been relieved from all responsibility for such enforcement. Policemen doing duty in plain clothes are no longer assigned to Captains. The Inspectors have staffs of officers performing duty in civilian clothes to aid them in enforcing the laws under discussion. These men, commonly called "plain clothes men," are selected by the Inspectors themselves, though formally assigned by the Commissioner. We discovered that many of them are officers who for years were assigned to Captains and Inspectors in the same capacity, and are known as veteran "ward men."

The special squads attached to the Commissioner's office, commonly known as "vice" squads, are now three in number. They are in charge of Lieutenants selected by the Commissioner. Their duties are to enforce the laws against gambling and prostitution and to perform other work assigned them. The members of these special squads are chosen by the officers in charge of them, though designated by the Commissioner.

On July 1, 1912, the number of Policemen performing duty in plain clothes attached to the sixteen Inspectors in charge of districts was 118. On the same date the members of the special squads numbered 40. The Inspectors confined themselves to their respective districts, whereas, the special squads covered the entire city. In both cases arrests were made upon the initiative of the commanding officers and at the personal direction of the Commissioner.

It has frequently been stated by the Commissioner that the special squads afford an independent check upon the work of the Inspectors in the enforcement of these

laws. They have not been employed effectively for this purpose. In the first place, they have not been primarily concerned with the enforcement of the laws under consideration. For example, in July, 1911, out of 373 arrests made by the only special squad then in existence, only 31 arrests, or 8 per cent. of the whole, were made for violations of the laws relating to vice. In February, 1912, out of 470 arrests made by the same squad, only 46, or 10 per cent. of the whole, were made for these offenses. In both cases the balance of the arrests, amounting to 90 per cent. of the whole, were made upon charges of disorderly conduct, disturbance of the peace, etc. During the period studied by our investigators, August 1, 1911, to October 1, 1912, there were 3,490 complaints against gambling and disorderly houses received at Police Headquarters. Of this number only 102, or less than 3 per cent. of the whole, were referred to the special squads for investigation and action.

Furthermore, until after the Rosenthal murder, even this small activity by the special squads in the enforcement of these laws was wholly confined to the suppression of gambling.

Since the Commissioner has stated that he uses his special squads as a check upon his Inspectors, one would suppose that disciplinary action would follow gambling raids by them over the heads of Inspectors. Such is not the case. Scores of arrests for gambling were made by the special squads, and, after the Rosenthal murder, many arrests for maintaining disorderly houses. We examined several Inspectors in whose districts such arrests were made, but found none who had been rebuked, demoted, put upon trial, or even asked to explain his apparent inefficiency or suspicious inactivity.

Information as to Conditions.

The present Commissioner has not enforced the rules of the department designed to furnish him accurate information as to conditions throughout the city.

When we began our investigation we shared the general impression that the department maintains secret "police lists" on which could be found every suspected gambling house and disorderly resort in the city. Our examination has shown this impression to be wholly wrong.

The only method employed for regularly informing the Commissioner as to vice conditions is the monthly report by Captains of Precincts on what is known as "Form 29." This report is required by the rules of the department, and is called

"A report for the month ending _____ of houses of prostitution, houses of assignation, bedhouses, poolrooms, places used for lottery or policy purposes, places used for gambling, and *suspicious places*."

"*Note*—This report is to indicate the actual condition of affairs in the precinct for the month to which it pertains."

These reports, if properly prepared, should furnish the Commissioner a complete index of the city's condition at any moment. They would then be of great value as a basis for administrative judgment and action. As at present made, they are incomplete, inaccurate and misleading.

Captains have failed to report as gambling, disorderly or suspicious places many houses in which arrests were repeatedly made for these offenses.

During the period studied by our investigators, August 1, 1911, to October 1, 1912, arrests were made in 703 gambling and disorderly houses in Manhattan. Of these only 228, or about 30 per cent., appeared on Form 29. This failure to make accurate reports was not confined to a few Captains or Inspectors, but was general throughout the city, as is shown in the table hereto attached.

Although Captains had assigned to them no men in plain clothes for purposes of investigation Inspectors frequently referred complaints to them for investigation and report. In numerous cases Captains reported to Inspectors that places complained of were undoubtedly being used for gambling or prostitution, but that no "legal evidence"

could be obtained by them. Yet the captains failed to report such places as suspicious upon Form 29.

During the months referred to the Department received complaints alleging the existence of gambling or disorderly houses in 2,643 different premises. It would be fair to assume that at least a majority of these places complained of would appear on Form 29 as suspicious places. We find that only 229 of the 2,643 places complained of were reported. That many of these complaints were well founded is shown by the arrests made because of them.

We examined many Captains for the purpose of ascertaining the method of making this monthly report. We found no captain who had received instructions as to its preparation. The captains differed widely in their conception of its nature and purpose. Some Captains asserted that they should report only places against which they had obtained legal evidence. Others said that after the obtaining of legal evidence an arrest and suppression of the place would follow, and therefore it should not be reported. Again, some captains declared that they should only report places when denied admission and inspection, while other Captains were of the opinion that no such place should be reported because internal conditions could not be learned.

It soon became evident that this monthly report, as at present prepared, is wholly worthless. The captains by way of defense asserted that the Commissioner received separate reports upon individual arrests. Investigation disclosed, however, that even these separate reports of arrests are inaccurate and receive little or no attention. Out of a total of 800 arrests we have found only 525, or 65 per cent., to have been currently reported. The inaccuracy of individual current reports of arrests throughout the city is shown in the table hereto attached. Moreover, reports of arrests, even though accurate, are of far less value than periodic general reports of suspicious places furnishing a vice map of the city.

Captains appearing before us stated that they had never been censured for inaccuracies in these monthly reports, notwithstanding their demonstrated incompleteness. The Inspector of each district "vouches for the accuracy" of these reports as a matter of routine. We could discover no instance where an Inspector had supplemented or corrected any of these reports although in many cases he had before him abundant evidence of their misleading character.

The regulations of the Department also require patrolmen to report to their Captains all suspected gambling or disorderly houses upon their posts. The rule is as follows:

"Every patrolman will make notes in his memorandum book of all suspicious places on his post, particularly those which may be disorderly or used for gambling, either from the coming and going of men or for other reasons. These notes will be certified by the Lieutenant and reported to the Captain."

We called before us many Patrolmen, chosen at random, in order to ascertain whether this rule is obeyed. We found that several of them had never heard of the regulation, although printed in the book of rules, and none of them had ever obeyed it.

The rigid enforcement of this rule would be of inestimable value to the Commissioner, because every portion of the City is patrolled by some policeman. Captains, in preparing their monthly reports on Form 29 should have before them these reports made by Patrolmen as to conditions upon their posts. The Captains should supplement this information by independent investigation through other officers. They would then be able to give to the Commissioner a monthly report which would register with approximate accuracy the conditions of their respective precincts.

With the information at his disposal which the Commissioner could so easily secure by the enforcement of present rules, he would be in a position to gauge the efficiency and honesty of his subordinates. Without such information he must remain at the mercy of those who have betrayed him.

Method of Handling Complaints.

Although it has been shown that complaints constitute a most valuable source of information, there is no bureau or single official responsible for centralizing their disposition.

Complaints coming to Captains or Inspectors direct from citizens are handled as these officers desire; there is naturally no uniformity of procedure. It is within the whim of the official receiving them to investigate, to file, or even to destroy such complaints. They are rarely if ever forwarded to the Commissioner, nor is he advised in any manner concerning their receipt or disposition. Some Captains testifying before us defiantly claimed the right to destroy any official mail addressed to them by citizens. As practically one-third of the complaints made to the Department are received directly by the Captains and Inspectors, it is obvious that under the present practice these officials are in a position to keep from their Commissioner much valuable information. A definite system of handling such complaints should be installed in the interest of efficiency and discipline.

The same lack of system characterizes the disposition of complaints received at headquarters. We find them referred to various officials by W. R. Sheehan, Secretary to the Commissioner, "by direction of the Police Commissioner." The majority of such complaints are mechanically referred to such officials only for their "information." The balance are sent to them for "investigation and report." Inasmuch as no report is required on most of the complaints, these officials are given the opportunity of keeping from the Commissioner all information concerning their truth. It is extraordinary that out of 3,490 complaints received at headquarters against prostitution and gambling houses during the period of study, only 1,210, or 35 per cent., were referred "for investigation and report." 2,280, or 65 per cent., of the whole were never reported upon at all. Even of the small number reported upon, over 25 per cent. were forwarded from the Mayor's office.

We have found that every complaint forwarded by the Mayor has been referred "for investigation and report." Frequently citizens have sent duplicate complaints, one to the Mayor and one to the Police Commissioner. The latter would arrive at headquarters before the Mayor forwarded the one received by him. Whereas, the complaint received by the Commissioner would be referred to the Inspector involved for his "information," the duplicate afterwards arriving from the Mayor would be promptly sent "for investigation and report." The mere accident of a citizen's addressing the Mayor instead of the Commissioner frequently determined whether or not his complaint was properly investigated.

It does not appear to be the duty of any one to supervise reports on complaints. During the progress of our investigation we found that several complaints referred "for investigation and report" had been in the hands of investigating officers for over six months without explanation, although some of them charged police officers with dishonesty. Averages of excessive time spent in making reports are scheduled in table hereto attached.

As a rule the reports of inspectors and investigating officers are general and indefinite. Their phraseology is stereotyped and frequently meaningless. In reading them the conviction is irresistible that the only purpose of making reports is to show some formal action and disposition of the complaints.

Administrative officials fail to make any use of valuable information frequently contained in complaints. It is fair to state that the attitude of the entire department toward complaints is to dispose of them in as perfunctory and easy a manner as possible. Complainants are frequently regarded as hostile critics rather than as informants or citizens protesting against open violations of the law. The fact that complaints are often inspired by revenge or unsigned does not lessen their value if based upon facts. A former Police Commissioner testified that he had found anonymous complaints to be the most valuable of all.

With scarcely an exception we found no independent investigation of complaints in order to test the honesty and efficiency of the official making the report. Under such a system it is easily possible for false reports to be made repeatedly without the knowledge of the Commissioner.

An inexcusable blunder of the present administration has been the practice of furnishing to the very men accused complaints charging them with corruption. Not only has the Commissioner made it possible for commanding officials to keep from him valuable information concerning conditions, not only has he trusted them to dispose of all complaints received by them without reporting to him, not only has he failed to discipline Inspectors proving inefficient, not only has he failed to make independent investigations to test the accuracy of their reports, not only has he ignored the warnings of high City officials, but so blind has been his confidence in his personally selected subordinates that whenever he has received specific charges of their dishonesty and corruption he has given to them for their own information the very communications which, if independently investigated, might have been employed to drive from the force some of its vicious and criminal members. When Rosenthal was murdered there was an imperative demand by the public for investigation and prosecution. Yet, long before that time the Mayor and Commissioner had in their possession numerous complaints against Becker, Sweeney and other commanding officials which have since been proved true. The complaints against Becker, Sweeney and other Inspectors, Captains, Lieutenants, Sergeants and "plain clothes men" frequently gave in detail facts which could easily have been independently investigated.

Out of a total of 301 complaints charging members of the department with crime, 270 were referred to the men accused or to their immediate superiors involved by inference in the accusation. The Commissioner not only generously sent these charges to the officers involved, but in a large majority of cases did not even ask for an explanation or denial. The records show that 190 of these complaints were sent only for the "information" of the men charged! We have even found one such complaint sent to an accused Inspector "for information and *guidance!*" In the balance of the complaints the Commissioner asked the accused officers to make "investigation and report." This self-investigation by accused officials naturally produced but one result, a verdict of not guilty. Had the so-called "system" in the Police Department been asked to recommend a method of handling complaints against its members it could not have suggested a better scheme for its own protection than that actually employed by the Commissioner himself.

A few illustrations will suffice.

"March 27, 1912.

"Hon. W. J. GAYNOR:

"I would like to have you investigate quietly Lieutenant Becker. He is now collecting more money than Devery, and it is well known to everyone at Police Headquarters. Please do this and you will be surprised at the result. Yours,

HENRY WILLIAMS."

This complaint was forwarded to the Commissioner by the Mayor with the following letter:

"March 28, 1912.

"Sir—I am enclosing to you a letter purporting to be signed Henry Williams. Is it possible to find out who the writer is? I have received a large number of similar letters. Very truly yours,

W. J. GAYNOR, Mayor."

Notwithstanding the fact that the Mayor stated that he had received a large number of similar letters, this complaint, on reaching headquarters, was handled in the following fashion:

"Respectfully referred to Lieutenant Becker for investigation and report. By direction of the Police Commissioner. W. R. SHEEHAN, Secretary."

On the same date, from an entirely different source, the Commissioner received a complaint giving specific information as follows:

"March 27, 1912.

"Dear Sir—I would like to let you know that a gambling house is run wide open under the protection of Jack Rose, Becker's collector, No. 145 West 45th street, run by Herman Rosenthal."

This complaint was handled at police headquarters in the one way least likely to ascertain the truth, as follows:

"Respectfully referred to Lieutenant Becker for remark. By direction of the Police Commissioner. W. R. SHEEHAN, Secretary."

The following letters refer to Inspector Sweeney, who at the time mentioned was in charge of the Sixth Inspection District and who has since been convicted and sent to prison.

"April 9, 1912.

"COMMISSIONER WALDO:

"Dear Sir—At No. 2335 8th avenue, between 125th and 126th streets, over the barber shop, there is is crap and stuss game running for some time. I wrote to you about this place and begged of you to close it up, but as yet nothing has been done, to my sorrow. Can you close this place up? If not, I will make it my business to have a society close it up. My son informs me that a man they call Doty claims to have paid your Inspector (Sweeney) the sum of \$500 for protection. Now show me, by your actions, how far that protection goes. I will not write you any more, but will wait developments. A WOMAN."

When this complaint reached headquarters it received the following treatment:

"Respectfully referred direct to commanding officer Sixth Inspection District (Inspector Sweeney) for investigation and report. By direction of the Police Commisisoner. W. R. SHEEHAN, Secretary."

Inspector Sweeney, after investigating himself, reported to the Commissioner that he had interviewed a man known as "Dotty," who stated that he had not paid money to him or to any other police official. No further investigation was made.

"October 11, 1911.

"Hon. WILLIAM J. GAYNOR, Mayor, New York City:

"Your Honor—I have in my possession a few facts that may interest your Police Department. At 2306 8th avenue three notorious characters maintain a gambling house known as a crap game. Doty is one of the proprietors. He has served six months for picking pockets, and his picture is in the Rogues' Gallery. He has also served two terms for gambling and is now under two indictments for the same offence. Harry Hastings, one of his partners, is a desperate character who carries a gun at all times of the day and night and boasts of his ability to use a revolver. This individual killed a man out West. This fact is not generally known in this city but it should be an easy matter for your detectives to ascertain from which town he migrated and learn from the authorities there his record. The third man is Barney Reed, who boasts of his ability "to make connection and get right" every Inspector of Police as soon as he is transferred to the District wherein they operate. He now states that he "owns" Lieutenant Duffy, Inspector Sweeney's ward man, body and soul. The establishment which they maintain is a crooked one, and many of my customers have been fleeced there. While I heard this from authority which I consider unimpeachable, as it would be impossible to get my informants to testify to this in open court, I refrain from signing my name. In sending this letter to you direct I do not mean to cast any aspersions upon your Police Commissioner, for I have the utmost faith in his integrity, but I felt that communications might fall into the hands of some of his subordinates before he saw it, and the culprits advised of its contents. If some of your detectives, in whom the Commissioner has implicit confidence, can

get evidence against the resort and arrest Harry Hastings without his getting any advance notice of it, the community could easily be rid of a very undesirable person, as they will surely find a revolver on his person, and I understand that is a felony. Yours truly,

JUNIUS."

When this reached headquarters it was disposed of as follows:

"Respectfully referred direct to Commanding Officer Sixth Inspection District (Inspector Sweeney) for investigation and report, by direction of the Police Commissioner.

W. R. SHEEHAN, Secretary."

Inspector Sweeney again investigated himself and made the following favorable report to the Commissioner:

"No such person as Barney Reed is known, nor has he made any connections with me. There is no Lieutenant Duffy attached to any precinct within the Sixth Inspection District, nor have I any ward man at my command.

"DENNIS SWEENEY, Inspector."

It will be noted that the complainant referred to Duffy as a *Lieutenant*. The Inspector failed to inform the Commissioner that, although no *Lieutenant* Duffy was attached to his staff, a *Sergeant* Duffy was.

EXCISE.

There has been little attempt to enforce laws prohibiting the sale of liquor at stated periods. Witnesses have testified before us that Sunday liquor selling in back rooms is general. We sent a group of investigators throughout the City on Sunday, September 8, 1912. Out of 344 saloons visited, 308 were found openly selling liquor. In a majority of cases the bar was exposed and liquor sold only in back rooms. In many cases, however, the liquor was sold over the bar.

In the early part of 1910 the Police Department issued General Order No. 17 with reference to the Liquor Tax Law. In the enforcement of this law all members of the force are forbidden to enter on Sundays and after one o'clock a. m., places licensed to sell liquor. Exception is made in the case of officers specially detailed to secure evidence of illegal sales. The Police Commissioner from time to time details a few officers to secure such evidence.

Recommendation.

The sale of liquor should be regulated by local legislative authority. If the public does not desire the enforcement of certain laws, appeal should be made to the legislative body controlling the matter. The Police Department should have no discretion with reference to the enforcement of law, because the enforcement of all laws must be a Policeman's first duty.

DETECTIVE BUREAU.

The function of this bureau is the detection of crime and the apprehension of criminals. It has nothing whatever to do with the enforcement of laws against gambling, prostitution and the illegal sale of liquor. The special squads attached to headquarters and the staffs attached to Inspectors, principally engaged in the suppression of vice, have no connection with the Detective Bureau. The police phrase, "plain clothes men," is never applied to members of this bureau.

Organization.

The bureau is under the general supervision of the Second Deputy Commissioner. Its executive head is an Acting Inspector stationed at headquarters, who has no other duties.

The City is divided into sixteen detective divisions, with boundaries co-terminous with the inspection districts. Each division is in charge of a member of the bureau known as a Division Commander, who, however, is not responsible to the uniformed Inspector of the district. To each precinct within these divisions are assigned Detec-

tives, with headquarters at the various station houses. The group of Detectives in each station house is under the charge of a member of the bureau known as a Precinct Commander. Although they share the station house with the uniformed force, they are not responsible to the Captain or to any other uniformed officer.

The Detective Bureau has upon an average 500 members, detailed to it from the uniformed force by the Police Commissioner. Of this number 150 are known as "First Grade Detectives," and receive a yearly salary of \$2,250. The remaining members are paid the salaries received by them at the time of their assignment to the bureau.

Corruption in Detective Bureau.

That an alliance exists between some Detectives and criminals, as a result of which the spoils of crime are divided, and that detectives often inspire the commission of crime in order to make arrests, have been proved to our satisfaction.

Benjamin Levy, who had never been convicted of a crime, testified before us that at the request of officials in the Detective Bureau he had often induced criminals to commit burglary in order that they might be arrested. He narrated one such instance in detail, in which he was strongly corroborated by reputable citizens, including an official of an insurance company, a merchant, and others.

Levy testified that in this case Deputy Commissioner Dougherty, in charge of the Detective Bureau, gave him \$25 with which to purchase burglars' tools, and after he succeeded in the burglary paid him \$75 for his "services." City vouchers for these amounts in Levy's favor were found in the Comptroller's office.

Under the direction of Detectives, Levy took the three criminals wanted to a loft adjoining his father's store, where the burglary was committed, with a squad of Detectives waiting nearby. These Detectives arrested the criminals as they walked out of the building, and took from them \$3,500 worth of ostrich feathers, which they had just stolen. There was not the slightest opportunity for them to make away with any of the property.

After locking up the prisoners at the station house, the officers returned to the premises. Levy stated that in his presence they took a quantity of feathers. The owner recovered the goods stolen by the criminals, but the property taken by the Detectives was never seen again. Although the immediate arrest of the criminals resulted in a complete recovery from them of the stolen property, the owner suffered a loss of \$1,500, which was paid by an insurance company with which he carried a policy against burglary. The owner also testified before us that the Detective in charge of this arrest exacted from him \$175 in the back room of a saloon as a "reward for bravery."

Deputy Commissioner Dougherty and others involved were subpoenaed by us and asked to waive immunity before giving their testimony. This they refused, with one exception, and they were not interrogated. Notwithstanding the shocking nature of this testimony and the corroboration received, the Commissioner has taken no action whatever in the premises. It is not surprising that under such lax discipline some Detectives turn thieves.

A reputable merchant from Boston testified before us to the inefficiency of New York Detectives in a case where he had been the victim. In the course of his testimony he swore that a member of the bureau had boasted that he was worth \$90,000 because he knew how to "do business."

Many other accusations of official dishonesty were made before us which it seems unnecessary to recite in detail.

We have not sought merely to expose individual corruption, but have endeavored primarily to seek the cause of so extraordinary a situation.

Administration and Efficiency of Detective Bureau.

Because of the vital importance of the work of the Detective Bureau we have devoted much time to investigating its administration and efficiency. We received

testimony upon this subject from Hon. Norman S. Dike, Judge of the County Court of Kings County, and Hon. Edward Swann, Judge of the Court of General Sessions of New York County, who daily come in contact with Detectives in their courts; from Messrs. Carl C. Nott, James A. Delehanty and Robert Turnbull, members of the District Attorney's staff; from many business and professional men qualified to give information concerning crime conditions of the City; from Second Deputy Commissioner Dougherty, in charge of the bureau; from Inspector Faurot, its executive head, and from many others. We have also received from our investigators an exhaustive report upon the filing system and records of the bureau. To recite the testimony of these witnesses would unduly prolong this report. We therefore summarize in the following conclusions and recommendations the results of our investigation:

Conclusions.

1. The Detective Bureau is inefficient. The ability of a few of its members only emphasizes the incompetence of the majority.

2. There exists a partnership between some detectives and criminals, by which the profits of crime are shared.

3. Incompetent administration and inadequate supervision are primarily responsible for the inefficiency and dishonesty found among detectives.

4. Constant changes in the personnel of the Bureau without apparent reason make impossible effective work. From May 23, 1911, to September 1, 1912, the Commissioner removed from the Detective Bureau 290 men and assigned to it 254 men, without recording any grounds for these continuous transfers. These changes were made without consulting the executive head of the Bureau and against his judgment. It has been testified before us that detectives look upon their assignment as an easy berth. The method of selecting detectives is unscientific. We have discovered no systematic search for detective ability.

5. The abolition of the homicide squad, the Italian squad, the pickpocket squad and other squads specializing in the detection of various crimes, has been detrimental to the work of this branch of the department.

6. The assignment of all detectives to precincts and the failure to have at headquarters any detective squad for special work throughout the city have impaired the efficiency of the Bureau.

7. The destruction of thousands of photographs of unconvicted professional criminals and the abandonment of the practice of photographing prisoners charged with serious crimes have greatly crippled the work of detectives.

8. The discontinuance of the "line up" of prisoners at headquarters before masked detectives has injured the work of the Bureau. This "line up" for many years had been found effective in familiarizing detectives with dangerous criminals. It also had a deterrent effect upon the criminals themselves.

9. There is no system under which the criminal records of persons on trial are furnished in all cases to the presiding judge. Detectives frequently state that their prisoners are first offenders when an inspection of the departmental records would disclose previous convictions.

10. The system of reports and records is wholly inadequate either to furnish information to the Commissioner and his immediate subordinates, or to give them opportunity for proper supervision. As an illustration may be cited the fact that for 1912 the Bureau had no record whatever of 45 homicide cases found in the offices of the Coroners and District Attorneys, including numerous instances in which the defendants had actually been tried and convicted for murder during the year. Since the Detective Bureau omits all records of 45 murders in one year without discovery and correction, little faith can be placed in the accuracy of any of its reports.

11. The system of records is so faulty and poorly supervised that members of the Detective Bureau have no difficulty in withholding from the Commissioner knowl-

edge of crime conditions throughout the city. Many complaints of citizens are suppressed by detectives. They also readily deceive the Commissioner concerning their activities and efficiency. They all too frequently label their failures with "closed" or "disposed of," and their inactivity on progressive cases they account for with "continued effort will be made." So complete is this deception that the Commissioner has given inaccurate and misleading statistics upon the work of the Detective Bureau in his latest annual report.

12. Members of the Detective Bureau should not be assigned to Magistrates' Courts for the purpose of serving warrants issued by the Magistrates on complaints of citizens made directly to the courts. This work for the most part is purely formal, and could easily be performed by civilian process servers or patrolmen. Detectives should be limited to detective work in order to increase their efficiency by experience and education. Moreover, the service of these warrants is used as a false measure of the Bureau's achievements. During 1912 14,000 such warrants were served by detectives. These are so classified as to give the impression of arrests resulting from detective work upon complaints made to the Police Department, whereas in fact they represent no detective work, but are the results of complaints made to the courts.

13. The "School for Detectives" is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Recommendations.

1. The present law empowering the Commissioner to transfer Policemen to and from the Detective Bureau at will should be continued.

2. The reasons for so assigning or removing Detectives should be recorded in detail. This would tend to reduce favoritism, would make the tenure of Detectives more secure, and would be useful for the subsequent guidance of Headquarters officials.

3. Detectives should be chosen only because they show promise of detective skill. The assignment of men to the bureau as a reward for personal bravery or because of favoritism should be stopped forthwith.

4. The personnel of the bureau should be kept as nearly constant as possible. No Policeman can become a Detective without experience. Only those Detectives shown to be inefficient should be removed.

5. The homicide squad, abolished by Commissioner Baker, and the Italian and pickpocket squads abolished by Commissioner Waldo, should be re-established, and other squads should be formed to specialize in the detection of various crimes. The testimony before us of Judges, District Attorneys, and police officials, was emphatic that specialization is essential if the Detective Bureau is successfully to cope with criminals.

6. There should be a detective squad at Headquarters for emergencies and for special work throughout the city. The present system of assigning all Detectives to precincts should be so modified as to combine the advantages of a central squad at Headquarters and of Detectives scattered throughout the precincts.

7. Photographs and identification records should be made of all persons charged with felony who have been held by a Magistrate for action by the Grand Jury, or directly indicted by the latter. Legislation should be enacted to effect this object.

8. The "line up" of prisoners at Headquarters should be re-established in some form in order to familiarize Detectives with the faces and habits of dangerous criminals.

9. The courts and District Attorneys should be furnished criminal records in possession of the department in all prosecutions.

10. Warrants issued by Magistrates should be served by civilian Process Servers or Patrolmen assigned for that purpose. Detectives should be confined to detective duty in order to become experienced and efficient.

11. The system of reports and records in the Detective Bureau must be thoroughly overhauled before any permanent improvement in its work can be expected.

(a) A system of efficiency records should be devised and indexed, by reference to which supervising officials could quickly determine past achievements as well as present assignment and progress of any Detective. These records should make impossible the present practice of often giving to one Detective credit for work performed by a Patrolman or another Detective.

(b) Precinct commanders of Detectives should be required to make records of all complaints received by them and to report to Headquarters action taken in every case. At present many complaints made by citizens in precincts are not recorded or reported.

(c) Cases under investigation should be reported regularly from precincts to Headquarters in sufficient detail to indicate time spent by Detectives, names of all Detectives concerned, names of witnesses interviewed and summary of their evidence, and reasons for action taken or for failure in results. The general assurances of continued effort should give way to specific facts.

(d) In homicide cases such reports should be especially complete and no homicide case should be "closed" without the personal approval of some supervising official.

(e) The reports of precinct and division commanders of Detectives should be so explicit as to afford comparison between the number of complaints received and the number of arrests and convictions resulting therefrom. At present the total number of complaints is set alongside the number of arrests, giving a false impression as to the efficiency of the bureau's action upon such complaints. Many thousands of formal arrests on Magistrates' warrants are now made by the Detective Bureau in cases where no complaints have been lodged with the Police Department.

(f) Consolidation, analysis and indexing of precinct reports should be made at Headquarters. This would secure a more accurate and honest compilation of records than is possible under the present system of leaving such work to the various detective districts.

(g) Competent and thoroughly trained officials at Headquarters should check the accuracy and sufficiency of reports sent from precincts. Daily analyses should clearly tell the story of crime throughout the city and the efficiency of the bureau in meeting it.

12. Detectives in court should be supervised in order that a check may be kept upon the adequate preparation of their cases and the truthfulness of their testimony.

SURGICAL BUREAU.

There are twenty-five Police Surgeons in the Department, one of whom, called Chief Surgeon, is the executive head of the bureau. These Surgeons rank as Inspectors of Police, receive a salary of \$3,500 per annum, and, upon retirement, are entitled to the pensions of retired Inspectors. The City is divided into twenty-four districts, to each of which is assigned a Surgeon. The principal duties of the Surgeons, as prescribed by the rules of the Department, are:

(a) To examine applicants for appointment to the force.

(b) To examine applicants for retirement on pension because of physical disability.

(c) To give medical aid to members of the force upon sick leave, and order their return to duty without unnecessary loss of time.

(d) To recommend to the Police Commissioner for medical examination members of the force in their judgment permanently unfit for police duty.

Police Surgeons are permitted to engage in private practice. It was impossible to ascertain the extent of this practice, as no time records are kept by the bureau, but it has frequently been alleged that they devote the major portion of their time and energy to their private patients. Efficiency in this bureau cannot be secured so long

as Surgeons divide their attention between official duties and private professional work.

A salary of \$3,500 per annum, with a pension of \$1,750 after twenty-five years of service, or, at any time, upon incurring disability, would seem sufficient to secure competent physicians who would devote their entire time to the Department. If not, it would be much better to increase their salaries than to engage men whose attention and interest are so divided. The Surgeons advance the argument that they require private practice to give them sufficiently varied experience. This is readily met by the observation that 10,500 men properly attended would give all the experience needed. The tables prepared by our investigators and hereto attached, show hundreds of diseases to which Policemen are subject, varying from "abscess," at the head of the list, to "worry," at its close. Furthermore, if Surgeons should devote their entire time to official duties, their number could be considerably reduced. If it were found that the medical care of the entire force did not afford the Surgeons sufficient clinical experience, they could be permitted to serve in public hospitals and dispensaries without extra compensation.

The duty of Surgeons to give medical attendance to members of the force does not extend to their families. When serving as family physicians to Policemen, fees are charged. The Police Surgeon, with the rank of Inspector, and with duties principally disciplinary in the way of regulating sick leaves and disability retirements, should have no dealings with Policemen where money is involved. On the one hand, the Policeman will fear to employ an outside physician whom he may prefer, feeling that his Surgeon desires his family practice, and is in a position to be severe with him if he be so inclined. On the other hand, there is a temptation for the Surgeon to be unduly lenient with an officer from whom he receives fees as family physician. Chief Surgeon Palmer testified before us that the practice of attending Policemen's families was considered improper, but he admitted there was no rule against it, and he was unable to state to what extent the twenty-four Surgeons under his control engaged in it.

The conception of their duties as almost wholly disciplinary and the privilege of engaging in private practice have combined to render passive the interest of the Surgeons in the general physical condition of the force. We have been much surprised to find no general medical survey of the force, no comprehensive study of its physical needs, no recommendations to the Commissioner as to the prevention of diseases in general or in individual cases.

The records kept by the Surgical Bureau are incomplete and inadequate. No private physician would record so little information concerning the diagnosis and treatment of his patients as appears upon these records. Even such facts as are recorded by the district Surgeons are not promptly transferred to the personnel cards at Headquarters. The posting of these personnel cards was found to be twelve months in arrears. The reason assigned by the Chief Surgeon for this wasteful delay was lack of sufficient clerical assistance.

Surgeons are not required to live within their districts. Only eleven Surgeons reside in the districts to which they are assigned. In some cases the Surgeon lives twenty-five miles from his district. Inasmuch as a large amount of the "medical attendance" to Policemen is given at the private offices of the Surgeons, the hardship upon the members of the force is apparent. Moreover, Surgeons should be available in cases of emergency.

Surgeons are not required to keep a given number of office hours. Investigation shows that three hours daily constitute the average office hours of the Surgeons. These are not especially set aside for the treatment of Policemen, but are the regular office hours of the Surgeons for all purposes. It was not found that any preference over private patients is given to a Policeman calling at the office of his district Surgeon. Nor must it be assumed that the district Surgeon is spending his time in

calling upon members of the force. The records show that only in rare instances are Policemen given regular and constant medical attention at their homes.

Surgeons have no regular hours of duty at headquarters, nor is any Surgeon assigned there for night duty. In the event of emergency the Surgeon assigned to the district involved is summoned, but there is no rule requiring him to keep within call.

The Surgeons are not even required to make sanitary inspection of station houses. Several years ago such inspection was required, but no one attached to the Surgical Bureau could give any reason why this important work was discontinued. The testimony before us of Mr. Charles Ball, a Sanitary Expert, disclosed shocking sanitary conditions in the sleeping quarters of many station houses.

Tables prepared by our investigators are hereto attached, showing surgical districts, assignment of Surgeons, classification of Policemen's diseases, etc.

Recommendations.

1. Police Surgeons should be required to give their entire time to official duties, and should not be permitted to engage in private practice. They should be rigidly prohibited from receiving fees for professional services rendered Policemen or their families.

2. The salary of the Chief Surgeon should be greater than that of the District Surgeons.

3. If the present salary of District Surgeons be not sufficient to attract competent men willing to devote their entire time and interest to official work, it should be increased.

4. The Surgeons should be required to make a complete physical examination of the entire force at least once a year. This should be done primarily for the purpose of preventing disability by treatment of diseases and defects or weaknesses in early stages.

5. The system of records in the Bureau should be improved. Present personnel cards should be posted to date.

6. The records should show a complete medical history of every member of the force.

7. Details of diagnosis and treatment in every case should appear upon the personnel card record.

8. Charges preferred against Policemen by Surgeons should be entered on the personnel cards.

9. Surgeons should be required to live within their districts.

10. A Police Surgeon should be on duty at headquarters at all hours of the day and night.

11. Surgeons should be required to make monthly sanitary inspection of station houses.

12. Members of the force retired upon disability pensions should be subject to periodical physical examination by the Surgeons in order that if found fit for duty they may be returned to the service. Such examination should be made by Surgeons other than those certifying to the disability at the time of original retirement.

TRAFFIC SQUAD.

This squad regulates the traffic on the public streets. It is composed of 1 Inspector, 3 Captains, 21 Lieutenants, 24 Sergeants, and 449 Patrolmen. Members of the regular force are transferred to and from this squad within the discretion of the Commissioner. No special examination for such appointment is held. The members of this squad are on duty for eight hours, of each day, and are not kept upon reserve. They are especially exempted from the provisions of the three platoon law.

BRIDGE SQUAD.

The Charter provides that the Police Commissioner may assign officers to assist the Department of Bridges in its work. This law should be repealed, although no such assignment has been made for several years. The policing of bridges has been under the direct charge of the Police Department. The Bridge Squad is under the supervision of the Inspector in charge of the Traffic Squad, and is composed of 1 Captain, 2 Lieutenants, and 91 Patrolmen, who are relieved from all other police duty.

TENEMENT HOUSE SQUAD.

Under the provisions of the Charter this squad is assigned by the Police Commissioner to assist the Tenement House Department. It is composed of 1 Sergeant and 13 Patrolmen, who are relieved from all other duty. We recommend the abolition of this squad by law, as the Inspectors in the Tenement House Department are quite competent to discharge the duties now performed by these Policemen.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT SQUAD.

Under the provisions of the Charter this squad is assigned by the Police Commissioner to assist the Health Department. It is composed of 1 Lieutenant, 2 Sergeants, and 50 Patrolmen, who are relieved from all other police duty. We recommend the abolition of this squad by law, as this work should be performed by Inspectors of the Health Department.

BOILER SQUAD.

The Charter places upon the Police Department the duty of inspecting all boilers and licensing Stationary Engineers and Firemen. This squad is composed of 1 Lieutenant and 12 Patrolmen, who are relieved from other police duties. This important work should be placed in charge of a bureau established for the purpose by local authorities. Police Commissioners have repeatedly asked that the Department be relieved from this non-police duty. We so recommended in our Preliminary Legislative Report.

CENTRAL OFFICE SQUAD.

The Central Office Squad is a classification to include various bureaus and groups of officers assigned to headquarters and elsewhere. It comprises the Policemen attached to the Inspectors, the members of the special squads attached to the Police Commissioner, the Bureau of Repairs and Supplies, the School for Recruits, the Telegraph Bureau, the Property Clerk's Office, the clerical staff of the Department, the men assigned to the various public offices of the City, and Messengers, Custodians, and Chauffeurs.

Duties performed by the clerical staff, the men assigned to the Telegraph Bureau, the public offices, the Property Clerk's Office, the Bureau of Repairs and Supplies, and by Messengers, custodians, and Chauffeurs, should be performed by civilian employees. These are not police duties, and it is unfair to ambitious policemen as well as to the Department to assign members of the force to such work.

Special mention should be made of the Bureau of Repairs and Supplies. This Bureau has charge of the purchase of all supplies, the making of all repairs, the purchase and maintenance of all horses and equipment, the operation of the Headquarters Building, and the supervision of all new construction.

The Bureau, though formerly in charge of an Inspector, and later of a Captain, is now administered by a Lieutenant, under the supervision of the First Deputy Commissioner. Five additional Lieutenants and seventeen Patrolmen are detailed to this Bureau, and one hundred and seventy-five civilians are also employed.

The Bureau expends nearly \$1,000,000 annually.

The administrative head of this important Bureau should be a civilian, of business experience, chosen in accordance with Civil Service regulations. The entire staff of the Bureau should be selected in the same manner.

Increased efficiency at less cost and a continuity in administrative policy would thus be secured.

The work of the School for Recruits is discussed in a later section of this report.

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF POLICE DEPARTMENT.

The department has approximately 10,500 members, distributed at the close of 1912 as follows:

Police Commissioner.....	1
Deputy Police Commissioners.....	4
Chief Inspector	1
Inspectors	18
Surgeons	25
Captains	97
Lieutenants	588
Sergeants.....	639
Patrolmen	8,933
Matrons	70
Civilian employees	263

Before discussing in detail each of the above ranks, we give below a summary of our conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions and Recommendations.

1. Control by State legislation over the organization and administration of the department is inimical to efficiency and discipline. The Police Department should be governed by local legislative and executive authorities. Home rule is essential.

2. We approve the present plan of having as the executive head of the department a civilian commissioner appointed by the Mayor. We do not favor the creation of a chief of police chosen from the uniformed force.

3. Frequent changes in the commissionership without adequate cause assigned have seriously crippled administrative efficiency. We believe present laws should be amended to accomplish the following result: The Police Commissioner should be appointed by the Mayor for a term of eight years, but should be removable at the will of the Mayor or the Governor, whenever, in the judgment of either, the public interest so requires. Before the Commissioner is removed, however, he should be apprised of the reasons for his contemplated removal and should be given an opportunity to appear at a public hearing before the Mayor or Governor, as the case may be, to make any explanation or answer he desires and to call witnesses if he chooses. The Mayor or Governor should have the absolute power to remove the Commissioner after such public hearing. No court review of the proceedings should be allowed. Further discussion of this recommendation appears below under "The Police Commissioner."

4. The present salary of the Commissioner, \$7,500, should be increased to \$10,000.

5. The present number of Deputy Commissioners is inadequate. They are not able to give the Commissioner sufficient supervisory assistance. The Charter should be amended so as to enable local authorities to increase the number of Deputy Commissioners as the occasion requires.

6. The inspection district is too large to serve as an administrative unit. The precinct is better adapted to this purpose. Inspection districts should be abolished and the number of Inspectors substantially reduced.

7. The salary paid first year Patrolmen, \$800, is insufficient. They should receive \$1,000 for their first year's service, with an annual increase of \$100 until a maximum salary of \$1,400 is reached.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONER.

The Commissioner is now appointed by the Mayor for a term of five years, but is removable by him or the Governor at will. There have been eight Commissioners since the abolition of the Police Board and the creation of a single headed commissionership, as follows:

Michael C. Murphy.....	1901-1902
John N. Partridge	1902-1903
Francis V. Greene.....	1903-1904
William McAdoo	1904-1906
Theodore A. Bingham.....	1906-1909
William Baker	1909-1910
James C. Cropsey.....	1910-1911
Rhinelanders Waldo	1911-

Commissioner Bingham was removed without charges preferred. The other Commissioners resigned, the reasons for such resignations not being made public. Among these eight Commissioners were military officers, lawyers and business men.

We believe lack of control over the force by the Commissioner to be one of the fundamental weaknesses of the department. One of the principal causes of this lack of control is his brief and uncertain tenure.

With each change of Commissioner have naturally come radical changes in methods of administration involving regulations of the department, the personnel of the deputies, a difference in attitude of the Commissioner towards the force and of the force towards the Commissioner. The effect upon discipline is obvious.

Former Commissioners have testified before us that it takes from one to two years for a Commissioner to become familiar with the complex problems of his office. If a Commissioner is to be successful he must know intimately the personal history and character of all his commanding officers. He must also become thoroughly familiar with the spirit and the ethical standards of the entire force.

Under the present system the force does not respect the Commissioner. Former Commissioner McAdoo, when asked by us as to the attitude of the force towards the Commissioner testified: "They tolerate him; they sometimes feel sorry for him." Former Deputy Commissioner Woods testified: "Most of the Commissioners are birds of passage. The force gets a glimpse of them flying over and hardly has time to determine their species."

Inspectors, Captains and Lieutenants feel more powerful than the Commissioner. They know that they are permanent while he will probably be short-lived. Their belief that any present Commissioner may soon be removed is one of the most serious factors in the present police problem. Their attitude toward the Commissioner makes impossible genuine discipline and effective co-operation.

The Honorable George B. McClellan, for six years Mayor of New York, testified before us as follows:

"The City of New York has a police force in which the rank and file is better than the rank and file of almost any department in the world. The 'system,' so-called, that every man in authority in the city government must have run against time and again, is centralized not in the rank and file of the Department, but among the Inspectors, Captains, the Lieutenants, and possibly the Sergeants * * *. They are thoroughly tainted by the 'system.' They have a false corps spirit. That corps spirit has been hammered into them from the moment they put on the blue coat, and lasts with them till they die or are retired. It is a spirit that preaches the necessity of hanging together—to stand by the man who is a policeman, no matter if he is the worst scoundrel unhung."

The morale and general attitude of the superior officers of the force are important elements in police administration. No Commissioner can succeed unless he

is able to command their respect and secure their genuine support. If this is to be accomplished the commissionership must be more constant in the future than it has been in the past. The Commissioner must feel secure in his position, and, what is of equal importance, the force must realize it. On the other hand, the Mayor's responsibility and power must be continued. Sufficient protection would be afforded a Commissioner if the law required the Mayor or Governor before removing him to apprise him of the reasons for his proposed removal and give him an opportunity at a public hearing to make such explanation or defense as he should desire. After such public hearing the Mayor or Governor should have the absolute power to remove the Commissioner. No review by the courts should be allowed.

Under the plan proposed centralization of power and responsibility in the Mayor would not be impaired. He would still possess the unrestricted power of removal, but would be compelled to assign reasons for his action. A mayor should be willing to take the public into his confidence in so important a matter. If required to grant the Commissioner a public hearing a Mayor would hesitate before removing him for purely personal or political reasons. This provision would also prevent a Mayor from assigning specious reasons for his action.

We recommend a term of eight years, for the following reasons: It is important that the force should believe that the Commissioner will remain in office a number of years and should also believe that he is entirely divorced from politics.

If the term were made co-terminous with that of the Mayor it would be assumed that every Mayor would appoint his own Commissioner. With the approach of each municipal campaign much discussion throughout the force would ensue as to the probability of a change of administration. This would seriously injure efficiency and discipline. The present term of five years was undoubtedly established to avoid this periodical disturbance. That it has failed in its purpose has been due to summary removals and requested resignations.

It has been urged that a Mayor must select his own Commissioner to carry out his policies of administration. But there can be no policy in the preservation of order, the protection of property, and the enforcement of law. The Mayor, the Commissioner, and every member of the force are sworn to enforce all laws. The Commissioner is the sole administrative head of the Department and his duties are so important and exacting that he cannot serve as a political adviser to the Mayor.

If a newly-elected Mayor desires to appoint a Police Commissioner, but can give no reason for removing the one in office, then a new Commissioner should not be appointed.

The law should require the Mayor to hold a public hearing whenever, by a majority vote, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment or the Board of Aldermen shall adopt a resolution calling for the removal of the Police Commissioner and stating reasons therefor. The final and absolute decision upon the question of the removal of the Commissioner should, however, be left with the Mayor.

The Deputy Commissioners.

Four Deputy Commissioners are now provided by law. They are appointed by the Commissioner and are removable by him at will. During the administration of the eight Police Commissioners above referred to, there have been thirty-one Deputy Commissioners.

The Deputies constitute the Commissioner's civilian cabinet. Their efficiency as confidential civilian aides is much impaired by the amount of administrative work necessarily imposed upon them. Additional Deputies are much needed. Some of these Deputies should be entirely relieved from administrative work, in order to render effective assistance to the Commissioner in his supervision of the force.

The duties of Deputies are assigned by the Commissioner. Under the present administration the duties of the Deputies are as follows:

The First Deputy Commissioner is in charge of the uniformed force. He also has under his care the Surgical Bureau, the Telegraph Bureau and the Bureau of Repairs and Supplies, which spends nearly \$1,000,000 per annum.

The Second Deputy Commissioner is in charge of the Detective Bureau and the Property Clerk's office.

The Third Deputy Commissioner conducts the trials of delinquent policemen in the Boroughs of Manhattan, The Bronx and Richmond. He also is in charge of the Pension Fund, the Boiler Squad and the School for Recruits.

The Fourth Deputy Commissioner is in charge of the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens. He conducts trials of delinquent policemen in those two boroughs.

The Chief Inspector.

The Chief Inspector is chosen from the Captains or Inspectors by the Commissioner, and his designation as Chief Inspector is revocable at will. As Chief Inspector he receives the salary of an Inspector. He is at the head of the uniformed force, and corresponds to the former Chief of Police, but he possesses no powers other than those delegated to him by the Commissioner. The jurisdiction and authority of the Chief Inspector are great or small, as the Commissioner elects. The present Chief Inspector has testified that he is in charge of routine matters affecting the uniformed force. He makes no recommendations for assignments or transfers. He has no responsibility in connection with the enforcement of laws against gambling, disorderly houses, or the illegal sale of liquor. The Inspectors do not report to him concerning their activities.

The former Chief of Police possessed certain statutory powers to the exclusion of the Commissioner. He was a subordinate more powerful within the limits of his authority than the Commissioner himself. We have been urged by a few witnesses to recommend the re-establishment of the office of Chief of Police. We are opposed to giving to any subordinate powers which a Commissioner cannot take away.

We believe that the Commissioner can best employ the Chief Inspector as a disciplinary aide in all routine police work by seeking to elevate the position in such manner as will cause the force to regard the Chief Inspector as its uniformed head. His salary should be fixed at an amount somewhat larger than that of other Inspectors.

Inspectors.

There is at present no rank of "Inspector." The Charter provides that the Commissioner may detail, not to exceed nineteen, Captains to act as Inspectors. This detail may be revoked at any time. During the period such captains act as Inspectors they receive an advance in salary. The Acting Inspectors are popularly known as "Inspectors," and are referred to in that manner throughout this report.

The City is divided into sixteen inspection districts, each district comprising two or more precincts. An Inspector is in charge of each district. Thus the jurisdiction of Inspectors is territorial rather than functional. The administrative unit of the department may be said to be the inspection district. The entire supervision of all police work (except that of detectives) in the inspection district is under the direct charge of the Inspector. His duties include disciplinary control over his district and the enforcement of all laws and ordinances, including those against gambling, disorderly houses and the illegal sale of liquor. For the enforcement of these latter laws he is provided with a special staff of Policemen doing duty in plain clothes. Discussion of the Inspectors' activities in this respect appears elsewhere in this report.

We believe the precinct, instead of the inspection district, should be the administrative unit. The inspection district is too large for this purpose and should be abolished. The number of inspectors should be reduced. A few inspectors could be of assistance to the Commissioner by serving upon his personal staff. They could investigate important complaints, become aids to the deputies, act as inspectors at large,

serve in emergencies as commanding officers, and maintain such general supervision of the force as the Commissioner might prescribe.

The present law enabling the Commissioner to appoint Inspectors from among the captains, and revoke such appointments at will, has been the subject of considerable discussion. The majority of former commissioners testifying before us approved this plan. It was declared by others that no Inspector will properly discipline Captains under him because at any moment he may himself become a captain. In our judgment a more permanent tenure for the Commissioner would effectively meet this objection. Furthermore, we believe that a Commissioner should be empowered to select a uniformed cabinet—inspectors, as well as a civilian cabinet—deputies. This he cannot do if the rank of Inspector be made permanent.

Captains.

The inspection districts are divided into precincts, each of which is in charge of a Captain (or a Lieutenant acting as Captain). There are 97 Captains in the Department at the present time. They are promoted from the rank of Lieutenant from an eligible list prepared by the Civil Service Commission after a competitive examination.

The Captains are not now held responsible for the enforcement of laws against gambling and disorderly houses. Their activities in the enforcement of excise laws are confined to observations from the street.

As recommended above, the precinct and not the inspection district should be the administrative unit of the department. Each Captain should then be held strictly accountable for the enforcement of all laws in his precinct, including those against gambling and prostitution. To assist him in this work, there should be assigned to him an adequate staff of Policemen doing duty in plain clothes. This staff should be selected by the Commissioner or one of his Deputies, and not by the Captain himself, since a corrupt Captain would be likely to choose dishonest men to serve as his personal aides.

Lieutenants.

There are at present 588 Lieutenants in the Department. They are promoted from the rank of Sergeant from an eligible list prepared by the Civil Service Commission after a competitive examination. Six Lieutenants, on the average, are assigned to each precinct. The duties of Lieutenants are divided between "desk duty" and patrol. The Lieutenant on "desk duty" is in command of the station house in the absence of the Captain; he "turns out" the men for patrol; reads the orders of the day to each platoon, and assigns the members of the command to their respective posts. In certain cases he is empowered to administer oaths and accept bail. At the desk he takes the pedigree of prisoners when arraigned, records telephone communications and keeps the books of the precinct.

The duty of the Lieutenant on patrol is to supervise Sergeants and Patrolmen.

Lieutenants are also assigned to special duty by the Commissioner, and are frequently transferred to the Detective Bureau.

Sergeants.

There are 639 Sergeants in the Department assigned to the various precincts. They supervise the patrolling of posts.

Sergeants are appointed by the Commissioner from an eligible list prepared by the Civil Service Commission after a competitive examination.

Patrolmen.

There are 8933 Patrolmen in the Department. They are appointed by the Commissioner from an eligible list prepared by the Civil Service Commission after a competitive examination. Discussion upon the selection of Patrolmen appears elsewhere in this report.

The duty of the great majority of Patrolmen is the patrolling of posts. Many Patrolmen, however, are assigned to other duties as follows: Traffic Squad, Detective Bureau, plain clothes duty for Inspectors, plain clothes duty on special squads, Department of Health, Tenement House Department, Telegraph Bureau, Boiler Squad, Attendance at public offices, Doormen, Patrol wagon drivers, Coachmen, Chauffeurs, Hostlers, kennel duty, Engineers and Firemen, bicycle repairers, Clerks, Stenographers, Typewriters, Messengers, Draftsmen, Interpreters.

Many of these duties could be performed by civilian employees with greater efficiency and at less cost to the City. It is unfair to the Patrolman ambitious for promotion to give him little or no police experience. Nor is it fair to the Department to have charged against it five hundred Police officers who are doing work of this character. A table showing work done by members of the Department which should be performed by civilians is hereto attached.

The rank of Patrolman during the first five years of service is divided into seven grades, established by statute. These grades, with their corresponding salaries, are as follows:

Seventh grade, first year's service, \$800 per annum.

Sixth grade, after 1 year's service, \$900 per annum.

Fifth grade, after 2 years' service, \$1,000 per annum.

Fourth grade, after 3 years' service, \$1,150 per annum.

Third grade, after 4 years' service, \$1,250 per annum.

Second grade, after 4½ years' service, \$1,350 per annum.

First grade, after 5 years' service, \$1,400 per annum.

All members of the force are required to purchase and maintain their uniforms and equipment. They are also required to provide and maintain mattresses, pillows, blankets and linen for their beds in station houses, where they are obliged to sleep when on reserve.

In order to learn the economic condition of Policemen during their first two years of service, the committee sent trained women investigators to the homes of 100 Patrolmen. Tables are hereto attached showing (a) minimum equipment and maintenance expense of first year Patrolmen; (b) rent, rooms occupied and number in family; (c) contributions to Police societies and insurance; (d) average minimum and maximum family budgets; (e) interesting answers to selected Police questions.

This investigation showed that the average family budget of first year Patrolmen is \$1,086.12. Of this sum \$237.41 is spent for Police purposes: Equipment, pension fund, benefit societies, station house fees, etc. Inasmuch as the first year Patrolman receives \$800, it is evident that he must incur an indebtedness of nearly \$300 during his first year.

The average family budget of the second year Patrolmen is \$1,093.05. Of this sum, \$198.83 is spent for Police purposes. This budget does not include the repayment of any money borrowed during the first year.

Our investigators found Policemen and their families, during these first two years, exercising rigid economy. Facing a situation where the income is less than the cost of living, with the possibility of illness and misfortune always present, the Policemen and their families are uniformly discouraged. They are frequently in the hands of loan sharks, and are often exploited by installment houses. Under the rules of the department payment of debts can be enforced, and charges for non-payment of debts are frequently made against Policemen.

The Patrolman's increases of salary are generally expended in an attempted discharge of indebtedness, so that there is in reality no increase in his available income. Investigation shows that the average married Patrolman begins his third year of service with an indebtedness of several hundred dollars. At the same time he is only too likely to observe the apparent wealth and ease of some of his superior officers.

We believe the City should provide and maintain comfortable and healthy quarters

for all members of the force on reserve. We disapprove the present system under which Policemen are compelled to provide and maintain their own beds.

The present method of patrol is controlled by mandatory legislation, and is termed the "three platoon system." Under this system the patrolling force is divided into three platoons, and no member of the force can be called upon to patrol more than eight hours in any one day. It is made a misdemeanor for the Commissioner or any commanding officer to take a Policeman from reserve duty except in case of extreme emergency.

Under the present administration the system of patrol as formerly existing has been modified by the establishment of 1323 "fixed posts." These "fixed posts" are established only in certain sections of the City, and are four blocks apart. The system is in operation only during the night hours. Its object is to have a Policeman at a fixed post where he may readily be found. The men thus stationed alternate with Policemen on regular patrol. The "fixed post" system requires an additional number of men, and the sections of the City where it is established are policed at the expense of other sections.

We have prepared a table, hereto attached, showing the area of all precincts, their population, miles of streets, number of patrol posts, average number of Patrolmen for the past four years, and crime statistics for the same period.

Matrons.

There are 70 matrons assigned to the various precincts, who act as custodians of women prisoners. They are members of the uniformed force, subject to all the rules, regulations and benefits of Policemen and receive an annual salary of \$1,000.

MATTERS AFFECTING GENERAL WELFARE OF FORCE.

Appointments.

School for Recruits.

School for Detectives.

Promotions.

Trial and punishment of delinquent policemen.

Reinstatement of dismissed policemen.

Remission of fines.

Pensions.

Sanitary condition of station houses.

Appointments.

The character of the recruit is of vital importance to the efficiency and honesty of the Police Department. He is vested with great power for good or evil. He is called upon constantly to testify in court on behalf of the State. The man who makes a false statement in his application in order to conceal some fact which he thinks may unfavorably affect him, is the kind of man who later will perjure himself upon the witness stand in order to secure a conviction or extort a bribe. Throughout the policeman's service his commanding officers must rely upon his fidelity and trustworthiness. The man who enters the force with a lie upon his lips is the type of man who later will betray his superiors.

Appointments to the force are made by the Police Commissioner from an eligible list prepared by the Civil Service Commission after a competitive mental and physical examination. About 300 patrolmen are appointed during each year. Other ranks are filled by promotion. Appointments are made "on probation" for a period of six months, the Commissioner having the power to refuse permanent appointment to any probationer at the expiration of that time whose services are unsatisfactory or who does not show promise of developing into a competent policeman.

We have found investigation of the character of the men appointed to be wholly inadequate. During the administration of Commissioner Bingham a member of the

force was caught committing a burglary. Investigation disclosed this officer to be an ex-convict. General Bingham thereupon established a bureau of investigation within the Department, whose duty it was to examine into the history of men certified for appointment to the force. This bureau did very efficient work. Its activities disclosed that about 12 per cent. of the men certified for appointment were wholly unfit to become policemen, either because they had sworn falsely upon their applications, or because they were ex-convicts, or because their reputations were bad. This bureau was further developed under Commissioners Baker and Cropsey, but was abolished by Commissioner Waldo immediately upon his taking office. His explanation before us for abolishing so useful a bureau was that such work should be performed by the Civil Service Commission. The president of the Commission testified that the number of men at his disposal for this work was wholly insufficient for any effective investigation.

At the time of its abolition the bureau of investigation had examined into the history of candidates near the head of the list but not yet appointed. From the records of such examination we have discovered that Commissioner Waldo knowingly appointed to the force between 30 and 40 patrolmen who had sworn falsely in their applications in order to conceal previous arrests, indictments, discharges from employment, etc. All of these men had been previously rejected by Commissioner Waldo's predecessor, Commissioner Cropsey. The only explanation we could secure from the Commissioner for making these unfit appointments in the light of the evidence before him, was that investigation of character of candidates should be made only by the Civil Service Commission; that he was not responsible for the character of men certified by that Commission, and that any man placed upon the eligible list was satisfactory to him. The president of the Civil Service Commission testified, however, that many of these men were recertified without investigation at the explicit request of Commissioner Waldo.

It is unnecessary to quote from the record in detail the evidence adduced before us concerning the unfitness of these men to become policemen. A few illustrations will suffice. The facts set forth in the following cases were disclosed by the bureau of investigation in the Police Department and were specifically called to the attention of the Commissioner before appointments were made.

Michael Imbriale swore in a former application that he had never been arrested. Records in the Police Department and specifically called to the attention of Commissioner Waldo, revealed that he had been arrested for shooting and killing a man, indicted, and acquitted; that afterwards he had slashed a boy's throat with a razor, had been arrested and indicted for felonious assault and again acquitted. Commissioner Cropsey, the predecessor of Commissioner Waldo, had refused to appoint Imbriale a patrolman because of his false statements and because of letters from citizens concerning his unfitness. Commissioner Waldo, however, appointed him to the force against the specific recommendation of Deputy Commissioner McKay.

The following testimony given before us by Deputy Commissioner McKay and by his chief, Commissioner Waldo, shows their conception of character requirements for appointment to the force:

"Deputy Commissioner McKay (page 642):

"Q. Then if anybody can escape going to jail he is a good enough policeman for you, is that right? A. Yes, sir; if the complaints against him are dismissed, he is a good enough policeman for me.

"Q. Don't you regard that a very low standard for a police officer? A. I never criticize the courts.

"Q. Don't you know perfectly well that many a man is acquitted because of technical reasons, but still there is evidence of his bad character? A. I do not believe that we would be justified in acting upon that belief.

"Commissioner Waldo (page 655):

"Q. Commissioner Waldo, we were going over, this afternoon, the case of one of your patrolmen, Mike Imbriale, and we have already touched this case before. And I find he was appointed by you on June 28, 1911. We have had, this afternoon, evidence which I do not suppose you would recall of certain protests being made regarding the appointment of Michael Imbriale, whom Commissioner Cropsey had rejected, but whom you appointed after the Civil Service Commission had recertified him, and we find, among other things a letter from the Mayor's office, concerning a complaint which was sent to Chief Inspector Schmittberger, on which he made a report to you. We also find a report of Commissioner McKay. It was the case of an Italian, and it was alleged that he had killed one man and cut the throat of another, although he had been acquitted by the courts on both charges. It was also alleged that he had sworn falsely regarding his ever being arrested. I wonder if you now recall anything at all about the case? A. I do recall appointing Imbriale. I did not remember his name right away, but I recall the circumstances. In this country we have courts to try people who are charged with various crimes.

"Q. I see. A. (Continuing): This man was tried by a properly constituted court, and he was acquitted. Now that is all the concern I have in the matter. Also, he was tried and acquitted of another charge. Now I do not see wherein I should condemn a man for the rest of his life on a charge for which he has been acquitted.

"Q. I don't either, but are you called on to condemn a man or are you called on to give him a gun? A. When a man comes to me who has served six months in the Department, as this man has served, and has had a clean record, and the only thing we could find against him was that he had been tried on two criminal charges and been acquitted according to the law of the land, and I did not see wherein I should punish him. He was certified to me by the Civil Service, as being a proper man to appoint, and in my opinion I was justified in appointing him under those circumstances."

Although a man charged with crime should be given the benefit of every doubt when tried before a jury, we insist that a Police Commissioner should give to the people of the City the benefit of any doubt as to the character of an applicant to join the force.

Joseph Cherico was appointed to the force by Commissioner Waldo on June 12, 1911. Cherico had sworn in his application that he had never been arrested. He had been arrested and convicted for bigamy under the name of Joseph Chiesa on September 17, 1906, with sentence suspended. He had also stated under oath that he had never before made application to join the force, although the records disclosed a former application by him under the name of Joseph Chiesa.

Michael J. O'Brien was appointed to the force by Commissioner Waldo on June 28, 1911, although rejected by his predecessor. He had sworn in his application that he had never been arrested. The records of the Police Department disclosed that he had been arrested and convicted for disorderly conduct upon two occasions.

Dominick Abruzzese was appointed to the force by Commissioner Waldo on June 28, 1911, although rejected by his predecessor. He had sworn in his application that he had never been arrested. The official records disclosed that upon one occasion he had been arrested for keeping a disorderly place and discharged; that on another occasion he had been arrested for disorderly conduct and fined.

Michael J. Benedetto was appointed to the force by Commissioner Waldo on May 15, 1912, although he had been rejected by Commissioners Bingham, Baker and Cropsey. The records show that he had made a false statement in his application with reference to his employment.

Patrick J. Dunne was appointed to the force by Commissioner Waldo on June 28, 1911, although rejected by his predecessor. He had stated in his application that

he had never been engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquors. Investigation showed that he had been a bartender and owner of a saloon for many years. When confronted with these facts, he admitted to former Commissioner Cropsey that he had lied under oath.

Samuel Hirsch was appointed to the force on June 28, 1911, by Commissioner Waldo although he had been rejected by Commissioners Bingham, Baker and Cropsey. He had made a false statement in his application with reference to his employment, evidently to cover up the fact that he had been dismissed from a railroad under a serious charge.

To state in detail many similar cases would unduly prolong this report. The facts regarding them may readily be ascertained by reference to our record or to the files of the Police Department.

Recommendation.

We recommend that investigation by the Civil Service Commission into the character of applicants for appointment be supplemented by independent investigation under the direction of the Police Commissioner.

THE SCHOOL FOR RECRUITS.

Immediately upon appointment all Patrolmen are assigned to the school for recruits for a period of four weeks. At this school they receive instruction in the following subjects: Laws and ordinances, general police duties, pistol practice, humane handling of prisoners, semi-military maneuvers.

The School for Recruits should be employed for the two-fold object of training men for police service and of weeding out those unfit for police duty, the Commissioner having the power to refuse permanent appointment to any recruit at the end of his six months' probation.

The period of instruction, consisting of four weeks, is entirely too brief for adequate preparation for police service or for determination of fitness of men for permanent appointment.

The Instructors are selected from the uniformed force by the Police Commissioner, without regard to previous teaching experience or training. Class room instruction is given in the form of lectures, which are dull and perfunctory. Recruits are not required to make notes or discuss any specific problems. They display little interest and rarely ask questions. Twice a week they are assigned to precincts for short patrol duty with other Policemen. The Captains scatter them about promiscuously, for there are no Patrolmen specially trained for coaching recruits. A recruit is quite as likely to be assigned to a new member of the force as an old one, and it is matter of chance whether he be turned over to an honest or dishonest officer. The regular instructors do not supplement class room teaching by practical field work or experimentation.

Recommendations.

The length of the school term should be increased to the full probationary period of six months. The teaching staff should include skillful and experienced civilian instructors, employed specifically for the purpose, and devoting their entire time to the work. For instruction in practical police duty members of the force should be assigned.

Records of the work of each recruit should be carefully kept. Specific daily lessons should be assigned and every recruit held to account for mastering such assignment. Frequent written and oral tests should be required. A vastly different spirit is exhibited by the recruits in their drill, their pistol practice, and their control of prisoners, than in their other courses of study.

The school should provide adequate instruction in laws and ordinances, practical police work, pistol practice, military drill, humane handling of prisoners, first aid to the injured, actual work in precinct, English and report writing, moral standards in conduct, organization of city government, and presentation of evidence in court.

SCHOOL FOR DETECTIVES.

In addition to the School for Recruits, the Department maintains a School for Detectives, in charge of an Inspector. The course of study includes instruction in methods of criminal identification, the Bertillon descriptive portrait and finger prints.

The lecture method is used, supplemented by illustrated charts, photographs and stereopticon views. The course consists of 25 sessions of one hour each. There are no records kept showing the character of work done by the members of the school. No written examinations or tests of any kind are required. Attendance at this school is discretionary with Detectives.

Recommendations.

All newly assigned members of the Detective Bureau should be required to attend this school.

They should be subjected to written and oral tests upon the subjects taught, and should be required to give practical demonstration of their ability to utilize the knowledge acquired.

PROMOTIONS.

Promotions are made by the Police Commissioner from eligible lists prepared by the Civil Service Commission as a result of competitive examinations and consideration of individual records in the Department. Promotions are made from the rank of Patrolman to Sergeant, Sergeant to Lieutenant, and Lieutenant to Captain. There is at present no rank of Inspector. Captains may be detailed to act as Inspectors, but this detail can be revoked at any time. While so acting as Captain is popularly known as an "Inspector." A Captain cannot be reduced to the rank of Lieutenant, nor can a Lieutenant be reduced to the rank of Sergeant. A Sergeant may be reduced to the rank of Patrolman after trial upon charges, this reduction being one form of punishment provided by law.

Under the law the Commissioner has the right to promote one officer from each group of three upon an eligible list, rejecting the other two if he desires, without assigning reasons therefor. The policy of the present administration is to promote as well as to appoint all members of the force in numerical order from eligible lists, the Commissioner exercising no discretion. It has been stated that the object of such a policy is to eliminate political interference and rumors of graft.

Former Commissioners have testified before us that a Commissioner should be permitted to exercise the discretion which the law gives him, promoting if he chooses only one officer from each group of three upon the list. They state that many Policemen can pass written examinations who have not the ability to command men; that many men secure positions upon the eligible lists whose reputations are bad, but against whom no "legal" evidence has been obtained. A distinction may well be made between original appointment and subsequent promotion. If the Civil Service Commission and the Police Department should cooperate in the investigation of the character of applicants to join the force, there should be no difficulty in agreeing upon the rejection of questionable candidates. In the case of promotions, however, there are so many elements in the wise selection of commanding officers that written examinations and individual records do not necessarily afford an adequate test.

Individual records of members of the Department are at present inadequate. Careful and intelligent experimentation should be made in the establishment of efficiency records. Under the present system, if an officer has not been punished, his record is perfect. Conspicuous acts of bravery receive credit in the preparation of eligible lists for promotion, but this practice is hardly fair to members of the force whose assignments do not afford adequate opportunities for saving life or stopping runaways, nor does it necessarily follow that a brave man will make a good superior officer.

Examinations for promotion are not held with sufficient frequency. Promotion

lists should not continue longer than from one to two years. An examination of the age of the various lists for promotion since 1901 is instructive:

For the rank of Captain, the first list was in force 15 months, the second 4 years, the third 3 years and 10 months, and the fourth list, still in force, is now 2 years and 8 months old.

For the rank of Lieutenant the first list continued in force for 2 years, the second for 8 months, the third for 2 years and 8 months, the fourth for 4 years, and the fifth, still in force, is 3 years old.

For the rank of Sergeant the first list was in effect for 19 months, the second for 4 years, and the third for 4 years.

The result of continuing an eligible list for a long period is to promote men near the bottom of the list. To permit four years to pass without holding an examination for promotion and making a new list therefrom is simply to block the promotion of efficient men. Frequent examinations would have the beneficial result of selecting men from the head of the list.

Recommendations.

1. We believe the Commissioner should be permitted to exercise the right given him by law to promote from eligible lists one man out of each group of three. He should be required to file in the Police Department full reasons for refusing to promote any officer upon such lists.

2. We recommend that promotion examinations be held with greater frequency. No eligible list should be permitted to continue for a greater period than one or two years.

3. A system of individual efficiency records should be established. These records should be so devised as to register affirmatively efficient work upon the part of members of the force.

TRIAL AND PUNISHMENT OF DELINQUENT POLICEMEN.

No member of the force can be dismissed or fined except by the Police Commissioner, and then only after trial upon written charges before the Commissioner or one of his Deputies. A Policeman on trial may be represented by counsel if he desires. He has the right to call witnesses in his defense as well as to cross-examine witnesses testifying in support of the charges against him. If found guilty, he may be dismissed from the Department by the Commissioner or fined in an amount not exceeding the equivalent of thirty days' salary. In the case of a Sergeant, punishment may take the form of demotion to the rank of Patrolman. A dismissed Policeman has the right to a court review of the proceedings resulting in his dismissal. A member of the Department who has been fined may also seek a court review of his trial upon securing the consent of the Commissioner.

Recommendations.

1. The trial and punishment of delinquent Policemen should be regulated by local legislative and executive authorities. At present these matters are controlled in detail by State legislation. Existing laws should be amended to accomplish the following results:

- (a) The Commissioner should be given the right to delegate to a Deputy Commissioner or to any member of the uniformed force, power to conduct trials and impose punishment upon delinquent Policemen. The Commissioner should have the right to revoke or modify any such punishment within thirty days from the time of its imposition. Although the law now provides that the Commissioner may delegate the power to conduct a trial to a Deputy Commissioner, he himself must find the delinquent guilty or not guilty and impose the punishment. Heretofore it has been the practice for the Commissioner to read the minutes only in cases of dismissal. In cases where fines were imposed he has accepted the recommendation of the trial Deputy Commissioner without reading the minutes. During 1911, two

thousand three hundred and eighty-eight members of the Department were either fined or reprimanded. The Commissioner, under an opinion recently rendered by the Corporation Counsel, must now read the minutes in every case and personally impose the punishment. This places too much administrative routine upon him. If the Commissioner were given the right to delegate to any Deputy or to any member of the uniformed force the power to conduct trials and impose punishment, he would be relieved of much of this unnecessary burden. The provision that the Commissioner should have the power to modify or revoke the sentence of a Deputy Commissioner or member of the uniformed force would give sufficient protection to the Policeman and would prevent any subordinate from possessing more power than the Commissioner himself. The recommendation that this right of delegation be extended to members of the uniformed force as well as to Deputy Commissioners is offered because a Commissioner may very well desire to establish a system of trial by Captains and Inspectors for minor offenses. The Commissioner should have the right in his discretion to withhold any fine imposed in monthly installments.

(b) A Commissioner should have the power to suspend Policemen without pay pending investigation of alleged misconduct and trial of charges. If the charges be dismissed, no pay should be forfeited. Under the present law a Commissioner has no right to suspend without pay until the service of written charges. If the charges are sustained, pay can be forfeited under the present law only from the time of suspension, after written charges have been served, and not from the time of suspension before such service of written charges.

(c) The present law directing a Commissioner to provide two places for trials of Policemen, each including certain Boroughs, should be repealed. This is a matter of administrative routine which should be entirely within the discretion of the Commissioner.

(d) As recommended under "Promotions," individual efficiency records should be devised. A system of merits and demerits should be created. In many cases punishment by demerits would be fully as effective and more humane than the imposition of fines.

REINSTATEMENT OF DISMISSED POLICEMEN.

As already stated, no member of the Department can be dismissed except by the Police Commissioner, and then only after trial upon charges before the Commissioner or one of his deputies. After a member has been dismissed, he may seek reinstatement by (a) applying to the courts for a review of the proceedings resulting in his dismissal; or (b) making application to the Mayor for a rehearing of the charges by the Police Commissioner. This latter course is not open in certain cases mentioned below.

Reinstatement by the Courts.

The present right of dismissed policemen to seek redress in the courts has been the subject of discussion for many years. We have received divergent opinions of former Commissioners, Mayors, and experts upon it. We have caused to be made an exhaustive study of all court proceedings by dismissed policemen for the past fourteen years. We find that since 1899, six hundred and eighty-three dismissed policemen have sought reinstatement through the courts. For this entire period only forty-six cases were decided adversely to the Police Department. In twenty-six of these the dismissals were held to have been contrary to the weight of evidence. Twenty decisions were based upon serious irregularities of procedure, which could easily have been avoided by better observance of rules of law. This emphasizes the desirability of appointing a lawyer as the Trial Deputy Commissioner. Former Commissioners testifying before us were unanimous upon this point.

The right to a court review is a protection to honest members of the force.

Any policeman who fearlessly performs his duty necessarily makes enemies who are only too willing to injure him. If the Commissioner were vested with arbitrary power of dismissal, injustice would more likely result than under the present system which requires sworn testimony in support of charges. The arguments usually advanced against the preservation of this substantial right have less force when it is realized that reinstatements by the courts have been so few.

Reinstatement by the Police Commissioner.

Section 1543 A of the Charter provides:

"Upon written application to the Mayor by the person aggrieved, setting forth the reasons for demanding such rehearing, the Police Commissioner * * * shall have the power in his discretion to re-hear the charges upon which a member * * * has been dismissed, unless such dismissal was for insubordination, conduct unbecoming an officer or member, cowardice, or intoxication."

This Charter provision should be repealed. The right of a dismissed policeman to appeal to the courts affords him ample protection against injustice. The above section empowers the Mayor and Police Commissioner, in effect, to reverse the decisions of the courts and of former Commissioners. It opens the door to personal importunity and political expediency.

The present Commissioner has reinstated many dismissed policemen. These reinstatements have been of three classes:

1. Members of the Department dismissed by former Commissioners for "conduct unbecoming an officer." The reinstatements of this class were in violation of law and expressly contrary to the opinion of the Corporation Counsel on file in the Police Department at the time. This opinion, dated November 7, 1910, contains the following paragraph:

"The trial of delinquent policemen as conducted by you or one of your deputies is of a judicial character and a finding of guilty therefor, whether the punishment be a fine or dismissal terminates your power over the proceeding, and it makes no difference whether the determination was made by you or your predecessor in office."

The Corporation Counsel then calls attention to the exception provided by section 1543 A of the Charter, and concludes his opinion as follows:

"In cases of dismissal from the force you may become vested with such power providing the person aggrieved makes a written application to the Mayor setting forth his reasons for demanding such re-hearing, but the application cannot be entertained where a member of the uniformed force was dismissed for insubordination, conduct unbecoming an officer, cowardice, or intoxication."

That the Commissioner knew of this opinion and realized its effect is shown by the fact that the language above quoted is set forth in letters by the Commissioner and his deputies in cases where applications for rehearing were denied.

After these facts were disclosed before us, a citizen brought a taxpayer's suit to have these reinstatements declared illegal. This suit has been successful, and the Commissioner's action has been declared to have been in violation of law.

2. Policemen dismissed by the Commissioner and later reinstated by him without compliance with the provisions of section 1543 A above quoted, there being no applications to the Mayor for rehearsings and no rehearsings actually conducted. The Commissioner stated before us that his power to reinstate any man dismissed by himself was based upon his "inherent right." These reinstatements were also clearly in violation of law and directly contrary to the opinion of the Corporation Counsel above cited.

3. Members of the force dismissed by former Commissioners, but upon charges

other than "insubordination, conduct unbecoming an officer, cowardice, or intoxication." These reinstatements were made after applications to the Mayor for rehearing, and although not illegal, were without justification and injurious to efficiency and discipline.

It is unnecessary to discuss these reinstatements in detail. The facts can readily be ascertained by reference to our record or to the files of the Police Department. One case may be cited to illustrate the methods employed in effecting these reinstatements:

Patrolman Thomas F. Campbell was dismissed from the Department by Commissioner Partridge in 1902 after trial upon charges of neglect of duty. Captain Miles O'Reilly discovered Campbell and other officers gambling in the rear room of a saloon at an early morning hour when they should have been on post. After his dismissal Campbell caused his case to be reviewed by the Appellate Division of the First Department. The action of Commissioner Partridge was sustained. Campbell then carried his case to the Court of Appeals and was again defeated. He afterwards secured the passage of a bill permitting a rehearing of his case. This was vetoed as special legislation. Thereafter, section 1543 A above quoted was enacted. Campbell admitted before us that this act was passed in the interest of a number of dismissed policemen, including himself.

Campbell later secured Mayor McClellan's consent to a rehearing by the Police Commissioner. The Commissioner at that time, General Bingham, denied his application. He renewed his effort to secure reinstatement during the administration of Commissioner Baker, who succeeded General Bingham. His application was again denied. Commissioner Waldo, however, wrote the Mayor asking permission to rehear Campbell's case, and after securing it, directed Deputy Commissioner Dillon to conduct a rehearing. Deputy Commissioner Dillon discussed the case with Campbell, read the minutes of the original trial, and wrote a memorandum recommending Campbell's reinstatement. No minutes were taken of this "rehearing." No witnesses were called. Although the Captain who had originally preferred charges against Campbell and had testified against him was still in the Department, he was not summoned nor was any statement taken from him. Commissioner Waldo reinstated Campbell upon the memorandum of Deputy Commissioner Dillon. Thus, Patrolman Campbell, after being off the force for nine years and after being defeated in the highest court of the State, was restored to duty. The flat contradiction between the opinion of the court and the memorandum of Deputy Commissioner Dillon is illuminating. Mr. Dillon is an Inspector on leave of absence while acting as a Deputy Commissioner.

Appellate Division—Mr. Justice Ingraham:

"There is no question but that the evidence justified the decision of the Commissioner. I have read over all of this testimony and the effect that it has produced is that I am quite satisfied with the decision arrived at by the Commissioner, and think he was fully justified in finding these officers guilty."

(99 A. D., 410.)

The Court of Appeals affirmed the decision of the Appellate Division without opinion (180 N. Y., 542).

The "rehearing" in Campbell's case is typical of rehearings by the present Commissioner. We have been unable to find a single case where minutes of the rehearing were taken, where any witnesses were sworn, or where any of the persons appearing on the original trial were summoned.

Deputy Commissioner Dillon:

"It does not appear to me that the case against this man was sufficiently strong to dismiss him from the Police Force. The action of the Supreme Court and later the Court of Appeals, in dismissing him seems to have been on technical grounds. It does not appear to have given any consideration whatever to the testimony in the case."

REINSTATEMENT OF DEMOTED SERGEANTS.

Besides reinstating numerous dismissed policemen, the present Commissioner has undertaken to "reinstale" two demoted Sergeants.

Dennis Healey was demoted from the rank of Sergeant to the rank of Patrolman by Commissioner Bingham in 1907 after trial upon charges. He appealed to the courts, but the action of the Commissioner was sustained.

Michael O'Loughlin was demoted from the rank of Sergeant to that of Patrolman by Commissioner Cropsey in 1911 after trial upon charges.

Commissioner Waldo "reinstated" both Healey and O'Loughlin to the rank of Sergeant after a "rehearing" of the charges against them conducted by Deputy Commissioner Dillon. No minutes of these "rehearings" were taken nor were any witnesses called except the demoted officers.

The "reinstatement" of these two officers to their former rank was without warrant of law and contrary to the opinion of the Corporation Counsel on file in the Department.

When these cases were called to the attention of the Civil Service Commission, it directed the reduction of these officers to the rank of Patrolman upon the ground that their "reinstatement" by Commissioner Waldo was illegal. Healey brought a mandamus proceeding in an effort to sustain his "reinstatement" by Commissioner Waldo. As was to be expected, the court held that the action of Commissioner Waldo in reinstating Healey to the rank of Sergeant "had no warrant in law"

REMISSION OF FINES.

The present Commissioner has remitted fines imposed by his predecessors upon forty-two commanding officers, ranging from Inspector to Sergeant. Up to the conclusion of our investigation of this subject, we had been unable to discover a single Patrolman who had been similarly favored. The remission of these fines was in violation of law and directly contrary to an opinion of the Corporation Counsel on file in the Police Department at the time.

This opinion, dated November 7, 1910, contained the following paragraph:

"The trial of delinquent Policemen, as conducted by you or one of your deputies, is of a judicial character, and a finding of guilty therefor, whether the punishment be a fine or dismissal, terminates your power over the proceeding, and it makes no difference whether the determination was made by you or your predecessor in office."

As we have already pointed out, this opinion was known to the Commissioner and his deputies. We found in the files of the Department a memorandum prepared for Deputy Commissioner Dillon by one of his subordinates in which the language of this opinion is set forth, and numerous cases are cited to support it. This memorandum was prepared before the fines mentioned were remitted.

The present Commissioner even violated the law after receiving the following warning from the Civil Service Commission:

"April 23, 1912.

"Honorable RHINELANDER WALDO, Police Commissioner:

"Sir—An opinion of the Corporation Counsel holds that a Commissioner of Police or other Department is without power to re-try a police or other officer, dismissed or punished for delinquency, or to modify a sentence previously imposed, this being true with respect to a Commissioner reviewing his own prior determination as well as a Commissioner reviewing the acts of his predecessor in office."

After receiving this letter, the Commissioner remitted some fines which had been imposed upon commanding officers of the Department by his predecessors, and he also reinstated Policemen whom he had previously dismissed.

PENSIONS.

We have given especial attention to the subject of police pensions, realizing its great importance to the taxpayers of the City. We assigned to this work a trained corps of experts who have not yet completed their task. Final tables are now being prepared, and we hope to be able to make a special report upon this topic in the near future. We ask that the Committee be continued until this special report can be made.

SANITARY CONDITION OF STATION HOUSES.

The Committee caused to be made a sanitary inspection of station houses. The expert making this inspection reported shocking conditions in many of the buildings. Sleeping quarters were frequently found poorly lighted, inadequately heated, ill ventilated, and overcrowded. While some of the station houses are improperly constructed, the unsanitary conditions are also due to inefficient administration. None of the buildings examined was equipped with adequate fire-fighting apparatus or necessary fire-escapes and exits. The exact conditions found, building by building, can readily be ascertained by a reference to our record.

We recommend that the reports of our investigators be transmitted to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for use of its Budget Committee. Unsanitary station houses are indefensible.

LEGISLATIVE NEEDS.

Attention is called to our preliminary report on legislation, hereto attached. Respectfully submitted,

HENRY H. CURRAN,
O. GRANT ESTERBROOK,
JAMES HAMILTON,
RALPH FOLKS,
ROBERT F. DOWNING,
EMORY R. BUCKNER, Counsel.

APPENDICES.

- Appendix A—Gambling and Prostitution.
- Appendix B—Home Study of Patrolmen.
- Appendix C—Personnel and Civil Service Features of Police Department.
- Appendix D—Distribution of Force.
- Appendix E—School for Recruits.
- Appendix F—Policemen in Courts.
- Appendix G—Surgical Bureau.
- Appendix H—Outages.
- Appendix I—Preliminary Legislative Report.

APPENDIX A.

Gambling and Prostitution.

Tables I-IV.—Information Furnished Commissioner.

Tables V-XIII.—Method of Handling Complaints.

Table XIV.—Activity in Enforcement.

Table I.

Summary Showing Number of Places at Which Arrests or Raids Were Made Compared with Number of Places Reported on the Monthly Report of Suspicious Places—Form No. 29.

	Places Reported on the Monthly Report, Form 29.	Places at Which Arrests Were Made.	Places at Which Arrests Were Made Reported on Form 29.		Places at Which Arrests Were Made Not Reported on Form 29.		No. of Times Arrests Were Made at Places Not Reported.
			Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	
Houses of Prostitu- tion or Assigna- tion and Disor- derly Places—							
District No. 1.....	18	132	13	9.8	119	90.2	130
District No. 2.....	17	41	15	36.6	26	63.4	33
District No. 3.....	96	109	58	53.2	51	46.8	68
District No. 4.....	41	80	18	22.5	62	77.5	80
District No. 5.....	3	8	8	100.0	11
District No. 6.....	9	42	5	11.9	37	88.1	39
Total	184	412	109	26.5	303	73.5	361

Table

Summary Showing Number of Places against Which Complaints Were Made Suspicious Places—

	No. of Places Reported on Form 29.	No. of Places against Which Com- plaints Were Made.	Places against Which Complaints Were Made Reported on Form 29.	
			Number.	Per Cent.
Houses of Prostitution or Assignment and Disorderly Houses—				
District No. 1.....	18	441	17	3.8
District No. 2.....	17	157	11	7.0
District No. 3.....	96	488	74	15.1
District No. 4.....	41	169	16	9.5
District No. 5.....	3	86	3	3.5
District No. 6.....	9	146	1	.7
Total	184	1,487	122	8.2

	Places Reported on the Monthly Report, Form 29.	Places at Which Arrests Were Made.	Places at Which Arrests Were Made Reported on Form 29.		Places at Which Arrests Were Made Not Reported on Form 29.		No. of Times Arrests Were Made at Places Not Reported.
			Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	
Gambling Houses or Places—							
District No. 1.....	36	73	27	37.0	46	63.0	52
District No. 2.....	45	88	42	47.7	46	52.3	51
District No. 3.....	15	51	13	25.5	38	74.5	48
District No. 4.....	48	45	22	48.9	23	51.1	27
District No. 5.....	6	11	6	54.5	5	45.5	5
District No. 6.....	12	23	9	39.0	14	61.0	15
Total	162	291	119	41.0	172	59.0	198
Total Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gambling Houses—							
District No. 1.....	54	205	40	19.5	165	80.5	182
District No. 2.....	62	129	57	44.2	72	55.8	84
District No. 3.....	111	160	71	44.4	89	55.6	116
District No. 4.....	89	125	40	32.0	85	68.0	107
District No. 5.....	9	19	6	31.6	13	68.4	16
District No. 6.....	21	65	14	21.5	51	78.5	54
Grand Total ..	346	703	228	32.4	475	67.6	559

II.

Compared with Number of Places Reported on the Monthly Report of Sus-
Form No. 29.

Places against Which Complaints Were Made Not Reported on Form 29.		Places Not Reported against Which There Were Three or More Complaints.		Places Not Reported against Which There Were Two Complaints.		Places Not Reported against Which There Was One Complaint.	
Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	% of Places Not Reported.	Number.	% of Places Not Reported.	Number.	% of Places Not Reported.
424	96.2	61	14.4	83	19.6	280	66.0
146	93.0	29	19.9	44	30.1	73	50.0
414	84.9	41	9.9	65	15.7	308	74.4
153	90.5	18	11.7	29	19.0	106	69.3
83	96.5	4	4.8	14	16.9	65	78.3
145	99.3	3	2.1	16	11.0	126	86.9
1,365	91.8	156	11.4	251	18.4	958	70.2

	No. of Places Reported on Form 29.	No. of Places against Which Com- plaints Were Made.	Places. against Which Complaints Were Made Reported on Form 29.	
			Number.	Per Cent.
Gambling Houses or Places—				
District No. 1.....	36	347	26	7.5
District No. 2.....	45	211	40	19.0
District No. 3.....	15	247	11	4.5
District No. 4.....	48	104	21	20.0
District No. 5.....	6	98	3	3.0
District No. 6.....	12	149	6	4.0
Total	162	1,156	107	9.3
Total Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gam- bling Houses—				
District No. 1.....	54	788	43	5.5
District No. 2.....	62	368	51	13.9
District No. 3.....	111	735	85	11.6
District No. 4.....	89	273	37	13.6
District No. 5.....	9	184	6	3.3
District No. 6.....	21	295	7	2.4
Grand Total	346	2,643	229	86.7

Table
Summary Showing Number of Places Reported Monthly
(Manhattan)

No. of District.	No. of Different Places Reported.	Character of Places.	1912.									
			September.	August.	July.	June.	May.	April.	March.	February.	January.	
1			Borough of									
	54	Disorderly	2	3	5	5	7	7	9	10	10	
	86	Gambling	3	2	13	14	13	13	15	17	16	
	140		5	5	18	19	20	20	24	27	26	
2	40	Disorderly	1	4	9	8	
	62	Gambling	1	..	2	3	3	33	
	102		1	..	3	7	12	41	

Places against Which Complaints Were Made Not Reported on Form 29.		Places Not Reported against Which There Were Three or More Complaints.		Places Not Reported against Which There Were Two Complaints.		Places Not Reported against Which There Was One Complaint.	
Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	% of Places Not Reported.	Number.	% of Places Not Reported.	Number.	% of Places Not Reported.
321	92.5	54	16.8	52	16.2	215	67.0
171	81.0	35	20.5	64	37.4	72	42.1
236	95.5	9	3.8	37	15.7	190	80.5
83	80.0	4	4.8	13	15.7	66	79.5
95	97.0	5	5.3	14	14.7	76	80.0
143	96.0	11	7.7	17	11.9	115	80.4
<u>1,049</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>734</u>	<u>70.0</u>
745	94.5	115	15.4	135	18.1	495	66.5
317	86.1	64	20.2	108	34.1	145	45.7
650	88.4	50	7.7	102	15.6	498	76.6
236	86.4	22	9.3	42	17.8	172	72.9
178	96.7	9	5.1	28	15.7	141	79.2
288	97.6	14	4.9	33	11.4	241	83.7
<u>2,414</u>	<u>91.3</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>448</u>	<u>18.5</u>	<u>1,692</u>	<u>70.1</u>

III.

on Form 29, August, 1910, to September, 1912, Inclusive.
and Bronx).

1911.												1910.				
December.	November.	October.	September.	August.	July.	June.	May.	April.	March.	February.	January.	December.	November.	October.	September.	August.
11	11	13	17	15	15	14	18	23	23	20	15	14	17	22	20	11
17	17	20	18	16	18	24	33	35	35	33	29	32	30	31	28	23
28	28	33	35	31	33	38	51	58	58	53	44	46	47	53	48	34
8	11	10	10	10	18	23	17	19	15	15	14	14	12	9	9	2
30	27	28	30	29	30	30	32	31	37	37	36	32	31	28	28	..
38	38	38	40	39	48	53	49	50	52	52	50	46	43	37	37	2

No. of District.	No. of Different Places Reported.	Character of Places.	1912.								
			September.	August.	July.	June.	May.	April.	March.	February.	January.
3	169	Disorderly	9	47	46	45	42	37	47	48	50
	54	Gambling	1	1	1	..	4	1	4	2	1
	223		10	48	47	45	46	38	51	50	51
4	47	Disorderly	30	29	14	16	16	16	16	16	15
	64	Gambling	19	15	6	6	8	9	9	7	6
	111		49	44	20	22	24	25	25	23	21
5	3	Disorderly	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	8	Gambling	3	4	4	4	5	3	3
	11		..	3	6	7	7	7	8	6	6
6	14	Disorderly	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	7
	33	Gambling	1	..	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
	47		3	3	4	4	4	4	5	6	9

Borough

7	10	Disorderly
	10	Gambling
	20	

Summary, Borough of Manha

	327	Disorderly	43	85	70	71	70	66	81	90	93
	307	Gambling	24	18	25	27	31	31	39	34	61
	634		67	103	95	98	101	97	120	124	154

Brooklyn, Queens

Borough of

8	43	Disorderly	18	23	23	19	7	1	1	2	..
	18	Gambling	2	2	..	3	3	3	1	1	1
	61		20	25	23	22	10	4	2	3	1
9	7	Disorderly	1	2	2
	32	Gambling	1	..	1	1	..	1	1	1
	39		..	1	..	1	2	2	3	1	1

1911.												1910.				
December.	November.	October.	September.	August.	July.	June.	May.	April.	March.	February.	January.	December.	November.	October.	September.	August.
55	54	54	57	66	76	83	86	100	100	94	88	86	86	81	86	74
..	1	1	23	26	29	33	32	19	19	21	21	19	17
55	55	54	57	66	77	106	112	129	133	126	107	105	107	102	105	91
14	14	13	13	13	12	12	12	11	11	10	10	10	11	9	9	8
2	3	1	2	27	24	26	22	14	17	17	14	17	12	11	15	9
16	17	14	15	40	36	38	34	25	28	27	24	27	23	20	24	17
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	5	3
6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	8	6	3
8	8	8	9	8	11	9	9	10	10	7	6	4	4	5	4	4
3	3	3	4	10	8	9	11	12	10	11	11	14	11	8	9	4
11	11	11	13	18	19	18	20	22	20	18	17	18	15	13	13	8

of Bronx.

..	..	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	1
..	1	2	4	2	2	5	..
..	..	1	1	2	1	1	2	5	3	6	9	1

ttan (for all districts therein).

99	101	101	109	115	135	144	145	166	162	149	136	128	130	126	128	99
55	54	55	57	85	84	114	126	123	137	133	109	114	105	99	99	53
154	155	156	166	200	219	258	271	289	299	282	245	242	235	225	227	152

and Richmond.

Brooklyn.

..	2	4	2	3	4	5	5	5	6	6	7	7	12	12	10	6
1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	7	6	3
1	4	5	3	4	5	7	7	9	10	10	11	10	15	19	16	9
..	..	1	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
2	1	2	2	2	12	18	17	18	10	11	12	2	2	3	1	1
2	1	3	2	2	14	21	20	20	12	12	13	2	2	4	1	1

No. of District.	No. of Different Places Reported.	Character of Places.	1912.								
			September.	August.	July.	June.	May.	April.	March.	February.	January.
10	13	Disorderly	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	15	Gambling	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
	28		5	7	5	6	5	5	5	5	5
11	9	Disorderly
	6	Gambling
	15	
15	34	Disorderly	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
	12	Gambling	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	46		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
16	2	Disorderly	1	..	1	1
	1	Gambling	1	1	1
	3		..	1	2	1	1	1
Borough											
12	20	Disorderly	7	8	8	8	8	7	4	4	5
	13	Gambling	1	1	2	1
	33		8	9	10	9	8	7	4	4	5
Borough of											
13	2	Disorderly
	..	Gambling
	2	
Summary, Borough of Brooklyn											
	108	Disorderly	21	28	27	22	13	7	6	5	3
	84	Gambling	7	8	5	10	8	7	6	6	6
	192		28	36	32	32	21	14	12	11	9
Summary for the City (Boroughs of Manhattan,											
	467	Disorderly	71	121	105	101	91	80	91	99	101
	414	Gambling	32	27	32	38	39	38	45	40	67
	881		103	148	137	139	130	118	136	139	168

1911.													1910.				
December.	November.	October.	September.	August.	July.	June.	May.	April.	March.	February.	January.		December.	November.	October.	September.	August.
4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	1	1		1	1	3	3	..
5	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	5		6	5	3	2	..
9	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	5	5	5	6		7	6	6	5	..
..	..	4	4	4	5	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	1
..	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	1	1		2	2
..	..	4	6	6	8	5	5	5	2	2	1		2	2	1	3	1
1	1	1	1	1	3	6	4	2	4	4	5		5	5	11	24	22
1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	3	6	4		4	5	5	4	..
2	2	2	2	3	6	7	5	3	7	10	9		9	10	16	28	22
..
..
..

of Queens.

6	7	7	14	14	15	13	13	9	7	4	5		5	5	4	3	3
1	4	6	6	1	1	2	1		..	1	3	2	..
7	7	7	18	20	21	13	13	10	8	6	6		5	6	7	5	3

Richmond.

..	2	2
..
..	2	2

(for all districts therein).

5	5	14	11	12	18	21	18	13	14	13	14		13	18	28	40	29
9	9	7	9	10	23	27	27	29	22	26	26		17	17	18	13	4
14	14	21	20	22	41	48	45	42	36	39	40		30	35	46	53	33

Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens and Richmond).

110	113	123	135	141	168	180	179	190	183	166	155		147	154	162	175	132
65	63	62	70	101	113	141	153	153	160	162	138		135	125	122	119	57
175	176	185	205	242	281	321	332	343	343	328	293		282	279	284	294	189

Table III-a.

Summary Showing Places Reported on Form 29 by Number of Continuous Months Reported Prior to August, 1912.

Borough of Manhattan.

Dis- trict.		Months.									
		To- tal.	25	22-24	19-21	16-18	13-15	10-12	7-9	4-6	3 and under
1	Disorderly House..	5	3	..	1	1
	Gambling House...	13	3	5	1	4
	Total	18	6	..	1	1	5	1	4
3	Disorderly House..	46	5	3	3	3	4	15	..	3	10
	Gambling House...	1	1
	Total	47	5	3	3	3	4	15	..	3	11
4	Disorderly House..	14	6	1	3	..	2	2
	Gambling House...	6	1	5	..
	Total	20	6	1	3	..	2	2	1	5	..

Table

Summary Showing Incompleteness in Reports of Arrests or Raids in Houses

	Number of Arrests or Paids Reported.			Same Arrests Reported on Activity in Current Report and Reports.
	Total.	Report. On Activity	In Current to Police Reports Commissioner.	
Arrests or Raids in Houses of Prostitu- tion, Assignment and Disorderly Places—				
District No. 1.....	132	107	81	56
District No. 2.....	59	54	42	37
District No. 3.....	129	94	59	24
District No. 4.....	93	84	66	57
District No. 5.....	11	..	11	..
District No. 6.....	42	35	32	25
Total.....	466	374	291	199
Arrests or Raids in Gamb- ling Houses or Places Used for Gambling—				
District No. 1.....	105	86	68	49
District No. 2.....	76	46	49	19

Dis- trict.	Months.										
	To- tal.	25	22-24	19-21	16-18	13-15	10-12	7-9	4-6	3 and under	
5	Disorderly House.	3	3	
	Gambling House..	3	2	1	
	Total	6	3	2	1	
6	Disorderly House.	2	2	
	Gambling House..	2	2	
	Total	4	2	2	
Borough of Manhattan Summary.											
	Disorderly House.	70	14	4	10	5	6	18	..	3	10
	Gambling House..	25	3	2	1	..	6	6	7
	Total	95	17	4	10	7	7	18	6	9	17
City Summary.											
	Disorderly House.	111	14	8	11	5	7	18	1	7	40
	Gambling House..	36	3	2	..	3	2	..	7	6	13
	Total	147	17	10	11	8	9	18	8	13	53

IV.

of Prostitution or Assignment, Disorderly Places and Gambling Houses.

Arrests Reported on Activity Report.			Arrests Reported in Current Reports.		
Not Reported in Current Reports.	Reported Only as Previous Arrests.	Total Not Reported in Current Reports.	Not Reported on Activity Report.	Previous Arrests Not Reported on Activity Report.	Total Not Reported on Activity Report.
38	13	51	14	11	25
16	1	17	3	2	5
30	40	70	14	21	35
26	1	27	7	2	9
..	11	..	11
10	..	10	7	..	7
120	55	175	56	36	92
16	21	37	5	14	19
6	21	27	15	15	30

	Number of Arrests or Raids Reported.			Same Arrests Reported on Activity in Current Report and Reports.
	Total.	Report. On Activity	In Current to Police Reports Commissioner.	
District No. 3.....	56	39	36	19
District No. 4.....	52	44	39	31
District No. 5.....	18	13	18	13
District No. 6.....	27	10	24	7
Total.....	<u>334</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>138</u>
Total Arrests in Houses of Prostitution, Etc., and Gambling Houses—				
District No. 1.....	237	193	149	105
District No. 2.....	135	100	91	56
District No. 3.....	185	133	95	43
District No. 4.....	145	128	105	88
District No. 5.....	29	13	29	13
District No. 6.....	69	45	56	32
Grand Total..	<u>800</u>	<u>612</u>	<u>525</u>	<u>337</u>

- Notes—(a) The meaning of the term “arrests” as used in this and other tables is individuals arrested.
- (b) The “activity report” referred to is a report prepared by the commanding by Commissioner Waldo. It purported to show the activity of the de
- (c) The term “previous arrests” refers to arrests which were not reported to correspondence as “previous arrests.”

Table

Summary Showing by Whom Complaints Were Received at

	Complaints Received at Headquarters.				
	Direct.	Per Cent.	For-warded by Mayor.	For-warded by Other Officials.	Total.
Complaints Against Houses of Prostitution, Assignation and Disorderly Places—					
District No. 1.....	514	..	51	20	585
District No. 2.....	138	..	10	7	155
District No. 3.....	647	..	104	141	892
District No. 4.....	215	..	14	11	240
District No. 5.....	83	..	20	8	111
District No. 6.....	113	..	21	7	141
Total.....	1,710	80	220	194	2,124

Arrests Reported on Activity Report.			Arrests Reported in Current Reports.		
Not Reported in Current Reports.	Reported Only as Previous Arrests.	Total Not Reported in Current Reports.	Not Reported on Activity Report.	Previous Arrests Not Reported on Activity Report.	Total Not Reported on Activity Report.
5	15	20	13	4	17
13	..	13	6	2	8
..	5	..	5
3	..	3	11	6	17
43	57	100	55	41	96

54	34	88	19	25	44
22	22	44	18	17	35
35	55	90	27	25	52
39	1	40	13	4	17
..	16	..	16
13	..	13	18	6	24
163	112	275	111	77	188

synonymous with the word "entry," or "raid," and does not refer to the number of officers of the various inspection districts and submitted to the Aldermanic Committee partment with respect to houses of prostitution and gambling houses. the Commissioner at the time they were made, but are mentioned in later reports or

V.

Headquarters and by Whom Referred to Investigating Officers.

By Whom Received.						By Whom Referred.						
Com-missioner.		First Deputy.		Chief Inspector.		Secretary to the Com-missioner.		First Deputy.		Chief Inspector.		Other Dis-position.
Num-ber.	Per Cent.	Num-ber.	Per Cent.	Num-ber.	Per Cent.	Num-ber.	Per Cent.	Num-ber.	Per Cent.	Num-ber.	Per Cent.	
545	..	21	..	19	..	525	..	40	..	19	..	1
153	..	1	..	1	..	143	..	10	..	2
781	..	82	..	29	..	818	..	28	..	43	..	3
211	..	14	..	15	..	207	..	11	..	19	..	3
103	..	3	..	5	..	100	..	5	..	6
132	..	5	..	4	..	131	..	5	..	5
1,925	91	126	6	73	3	1,924	91	99	5	94	4	7

	Complaints Received at Headquarters.				
	Direct.	Per Cent.	For-warded by Mayor.	For-warded by Other Officials.	Total.
Complaints Against Gambling Houses—					
District No. 1.....	466	..	42	27	535
District No. 2.....	203	..	15	5	223
District No. 3.....	164	..	20	28	212
District No. 4.....	114	..	7	2	123
District No. 5.....	100	...	8	1	109
District No. 6.....	150	..	11	3	164
Total.....	1,197	88	103	66	1,366
Total Complaints Against Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gambling Houses—					
District No. 1.....	980	..	93	47	1,120
District No. 2.....	341	..	25	12	378
District No. 3.....	811	..	124	169	1,104
District No. 4.....	329	..	21	13	363
District No. 5.....	183	..	28	9	220
District No. 6.....	263	..	32	10	305
Grand Total.....	2,907	83	323	260	3,490

* Of this number, 8 were not referred, 1 was referred by Second Deputy, 17 app

Table

Summary Showing in Detail How Complaints Received

	Total No. of Complaints.
Complaints against Houses of Prostitution, Assignment and Disorderly Places—	
District No. 1.....	585
District No. 2.....	155
District No. 3.....	892
District No. 4.....	240
District No. 5.....	111
District No. 6.....	141
Total	2,124

By Whom Received.						By Whom Referred.						
Com- missioner.		First Deputy.		Chief Inspector.		Secretary to the Com- missioner.		First Deputy.		Chief Inspector.		Other Dis- posi- tion.
Num- ber.	Per Cent.	Num- ber.	Per Cent.	Num- ber.	Per Cent.	Num- ber.	Per Cent.	Num- ber.	Per Cent.	Num- ber.	Per Cent.	
509	..	10	..	16	..	454	..	24	..	53	..	4
201	..	12	..	10	..	188	..	19	..	15	..	1
188	..	11	..	13	..	175	..	10	..	21	..	6
108	..	8	..	7	..	100	..	9	..	12	..	2
92	..	7	..	10	..	84	..	11	..	9	..	5
151	..	6	..	7	..	139	..	10	..	14	..	1
1,249	91	54	4	63	5	1,140	84	83	6	124	9	19
1,054	94	31	3	35	3	979	87	64	6	72	6	5
354	93	13	3	11	4	331	88	29	8	17	4	1
969	87	93	9	42	4	993	90	38	3	64	6	9
319	88	22	6	22	6	307	84	20	6	31	9	5
195	89	10	5	15	6	184	84	16	7	15	7	5
283	92	11	4	11	4	270	88	15	5	19	6	1
3,174	91	180	5	136	4	3,064	88	182	5	218	6	*26

arently were referred to special squads by verbal instructions.

VI.

at Headquarters Were Referred to Investigating Officers.

Referred by the Secretary to the Commissioner.							
Total.		For Information.		For Investigation.		For Investigation and Report.	
Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Total.	Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Secretary.	Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Secretary.	Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Secretary.
525	410	10	105
143	103	1	39
818	475	14	329
207	146	61
100	60	40
131	81	50
1,924	91	1,275	66	25	1	624	33

	Total No. of Com- plaints.
<hr/> Complaints against Gambling Houses—	
District No. 1.....	535
District No. 2.....	223
District No. 3.....	212
District No. 4.....	123
District No. 5.....	109
District No. 6.....	164
Total	1,366
<hr/> Total Complaints against Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gambling Houses—	
District No. 1.....	1,120
District No. 2.....	378
District No. 3.....	1,104
District No. 4.....	363
District No. 5.....	220
District No. 6.....	305
Grand Total	3,490

<hr/> Complaints against Houses of Prostitution, Assignment and Disorderly Places—	
District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	
Total	

<hr/> Complaints against Gambling Houses—	
District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	
Total.....	

Referred by the Secretary to the Commissioner.							
Total.		For Information.		For Investigation.		For Investigation and Report.	
Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Total.	Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Secretary.	Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Secretary.	Num- ber.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Secretary.
454	343	8	103
188	146	2	40
175	126	49
100	58	2	40
84	56	28
139	84	1	54
<u>1,140</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>813</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>28</u>
979	87	753	77	18	2	208	21
331	88	249	76	3	79	24
993	90	601	60	14	1	378	39
307	84	204	66	2	101	33
184	84	116	63	68	37
270	88	165	61	1	104	39
<u>3,064</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>2,088</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>938</u>	<u>31</u>

Referred by the First Deputy.							
Total.		For Information.		For Investigation.		For Investigation and Report.	
Number.	Per Cent. of Total.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by First Deputy.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by First Deputy.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by First Deputy.
40	5	35
10	10
28	10	18
11	6	1	4
5	5
5	5
<u>99</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>
24	24
19	6	13
10	3	1	6
9	9
11	1	10
10	3	7
<u>83</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>83</u>

Total Complaints against Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gambling Houses—	
District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	
Grand Total	

Complaints against Houses of Prostitution, Assignation and Disorderly Places—	
District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	
Total	

Complaints against Gambling Houses—	
District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	
Total	

Total Complaints against Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gambling Houses—	
District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	

Referred by the First Deputy.							
Total.		For Information.		For Investigation.		For Investigation and Report.	
Number.	Per Cent. of Total.	Number.	Per Cent. of These Referred by First Deputy.	Number.	Per Cent. of These Referred by First Deputy.	Number.	Per Cent. of These Referred by First Deputy.
64	6	5	8	59	92
29	8	6	20	23	80
38	3	13	35	1	2	24	63
20	6	6	30	1	5	13	65
16	7	1	6	15	94
15	5	3	20	12	80
182	5	34	18	2	1	146	81

Referred by the Chief Inspector.								
Total.		For Information.		For Investigation.		For Investigation and Report.		
Number.	Per Cent. of Total.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Chief Inspector.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Chief Inspector.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Chief Inspector.	Other Disposition.
19	3	2	14	1
2	1	1
43	11	1	31	3
19	11	2	6	3
6	2	3	1
5	2	3
94	4	27	29	11	11	56	60	7
53	8	15	30	4
15	2	3	10	1
21	14	7	6
12	5	7	2
9	1	8	5
14	1	5	8	1
124	9	30	25	24	19	70	56	19
72	6	11	15	17	24	44	61	5
17	4	2	11	4	25	11	64	1

District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	

Grand Total	
-------------------	--

* Of this number, 8 were not referred, 1 was referred by Second Deputy, 17 appar

Table
Summary Showing Action on

Complaints Against Houses of Prostitution, Assignment and Disorderly Places—

District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	

Total	
-------------	--

Complaints Against Gambling Houses—

District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	

Total	
-------------	--

Total Complaints Against Houses of Prostitution, Etc., and Gambling Houses—

District No. 1.....	
District No. 2.....	
District No. 3.....	
District No. 4.....	
District No. 5.....	
District No. 6.....	

Grand Total.....	
------------------	--

Referred by the Chief Inspector.								
Total.		For Information.		For Investigation.		For Investigation and Report.		Other Disposition.
Number.	Per Cent. of Total.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Chief Inspector.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Chief Inspector.	Number.	Per Cent. of Those Referred by Chief Inspector.	
64	6	25	39	1	1	38	60	9
31	9	16	52	2	6	13	42	5
15	7	2	13	4	27	9	60	5
19	6	1	5	7	37	11	58	1
218	6	57	26	35	16	126	58	*26

ently were referred to special squads by verbal instructions.

VII.

Complaints Received at Headquarters.

Number of Complaints Received at Headquarters.					To Whom Referred.				
Anonymous.		Signed.		Total.	District Inspectors.		Special Squads.		Not Referred.
No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.		No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	
469	116	585	577	8
122	33	155	155
779	113	892	859	30	3
189	51	240	230	7	3
85	26	111	111
115	26	141	140	1
1,759	82.8	365	17.1	2,124	2,072	97.5	46	2.1	6
495	40	535	517	18
194	29	223	214	9
212	212	201	11
101	22	123	118	3	2
88	21	109	103	6
145	19	164	155	9
1,235	90.4	131	9.6	1,366	1,308	95.9	56	4.0	2
964	86.1	156	13.9	1,120	1,094	97.7	26	2.3
316	84.6	62	16.4	378	369	97.6	9	2.4
991	89.8	113	10.2	1,104	1,060	96.0	41	3.7	3
290	79.9	73	20.1	363	348	95.9	10	2.8	5
173	79.5	47	20.5	220	214	97.3	6	2.7
260	85.2	45	14.8	305	295	96.7	10	3.3
2,994	85.8	496	14.2	3,490	3,380	96.3	102	2.9	8

	How Referred.						
	For Information.		For Investigation.		Investigation and Report.		Not Stated.
	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	
<hr/>							
Complaints Against Houses of Prostitution, Assignment and Disorderly Places—							
District No. 1.....	418	12	154	1
District No. 2.....	103	2	50
District No. 3.....	496	15	378	3
District No. 4.....	163	3	71	3
District No. 5.....	62	3	46
District No. 6.....	81	2	58
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	1,323	62.2	37	1.7	757	35.6	7
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Complaints Against Gambling Houses—							
District No. 1.....	351	23	157	4
District No. 2.....	154	5	63	1
District No. 3.....	143	1	62	6
District No. 4.....	63	2	56	2
District No. 5.....	57	1	46	5
District No. 6.....	88	6	69	1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	856	51.2	38	2.7	453	33.1	19
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Complaints Against Houses of Prostitution, Etc., and Gambling Houses—							
District No. 1.....	769	68.7	35	3.1	311	27.8	5
District No. 2.....	257	68.0	7	1.9	113	29.9	1
District No. 3.....	639	57.9	16	1.4	440	30.8	9
District No. 4.....	226	62.2	5	1.4	127	35.0	5
District No. 5.....	119	54.1	4	1.8	92	41.8	5
District No. 6.....	169	55.4	8	2.6	127	41.6	*1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Grand Total..	2,179	62.4	75	2.1	1,210	34.7	26

Action on Complaints.						Days Elapsed Between Receipt of Complaint and Date of Return.			
Raids or Arrests.		Investigations But No Evidence.		No Report Submitted.		On Those Referred for Information and Investigation.			
No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No.	Per Cent.	No Action.	On Those Referred for Information.	On Those Referred for Report.	Average.
16	142	427
7	46	102
48	808	33	3
21	88	128	3
8	44	59
..	58	83
100	4.7	1,186	55.8	832	39.1	6
18	143	374
12	60	151
18	187	7
7	68	46	2
5	47	57
1	67	96
61	.4	572	41.8	731	53.5	2
34	3.0	285	25.4	801	71.6	..	34.31	21.49	30.77
19	5.1	106	28.1	253	66.8	..	15.15	12.82	14.46
66	5.1	995	90.1	40	3.1	3	15.54	17.11	16.18
58	16.0	156	43.0	174	47.9	5	16.37	14.53	15.71
13	5.9	91	41.4	116	52.7	..	16.31	13.23	15.00
1	.3	125	41.0	179	58.7	..	8.49	14.2	10.87
161	.3	1,758	50.4	1,563	44.8	8	22.23	16.98	20.42

Table VIII.

Summary Showing Total Number of Complaints Received at Headquarters, District and Precinct Offices and Number on Which Reports Were Not Made.

	Total No. of Com- plaints Received at All Offices.	No. of Complaints Received at Head- quarters on which Reports Were Not Made.	No. of Complaints Received at Dist. and Prec. Offices on which Reports Were Not Made to Headquarters.	Total No. of Complaints on Which Reports Were Not Made.	
				Number.	% of Total Received.
Complaints Against Houses of Prostitu- tion, Assignment and Disorderly Places—					
District No. 1.....	1,017	427	432	859	84
District No. 2.....	320	102	165	267	83
District No. 3.....	1,013	33	121	154	15
District No. 4.....	274	128	34	162	59
District No. 5.....	125	59	14	73	58
District No. 6.....	175	83	34	117	67
Total	2,924	832	800	1,632	56
Complaints Against Gambling Houses—					
District No. 1.....	704	374	169	543	77
District No. 2.....	712	151	489	640	90
District No. 3.....	321	7	109	116	36
District No. 4.....	143	46	20	66	46
District No. 5.....	126	57	17	74	59
District No. 6.....	229	96	65	161	70
Total	2,235	731	869	1,600	72
Total Complaints Against Houses of Prostitu- tion, etc., and Gamb- ling Houses—					
District No. 1.....	1,721	801	601	1,402	81
District No. 2.....	1,032	253	654	907	88
District No. 3.....	1,334	40	230	270	20
District No. 4.....	417	174	54	228	55
District No. 5.....	251	116	31	147	59
District No. 6.....	404	179	99	278	69
Grand total	5,159	1,563	1,669	3,232	62

Table IX.

Summary Showing Action on Places Against Which Complaints Were Made.

	Places Against which Complaints Were Made.	Places at which Raids or Arrests Were Made Subsequent to Complaint.	Places Investigated, But No Evidence Found.	Places on Which No Action or Investigation Was Reported.	
				Number.	Per Cent.
Houses of Prostitution, Assignment and Dis- orderly Places—					
District No. 1.....	354	40	115	199	56.2
District No. 2.....	112	12	37	63	56.2
District No. 3.....	431	41	366	24	5.6
District No. 4.....	149	21	64	64	42.8
District No. 5.....	76	6	34	36	47.1
District No. 6.....	120	4	52	64	53.3
Total	1,242	124	668	450	35.9
Gambling Houses or Places—					
District No. 1.....	314	27	104	183	58.3
District No. 2.....	157	30	46	81	51.6
District No. 3.....	161	17	141	3	1.8
District No. 4.....	95	11	51	33	34.8
District No. 5.....	88	5	43	40	45.5
District No. 6.....	123	6	51	66	53.7
Total	938	96	436	406	43.3
Total Houses of Prosti- tution, etc., and Gambling Houses—					
District No. 1.....	668	67	219	382	57.2
District No. 2.....	269	42	83	144	53.5
District No. 3.....	592	58	507	27	4.6
District No. 4.....	244	32	115	97	39.8
District No. 5.....	164	11	77	76	46.3
District No. 6.....	243	10	103	130	53.5
Grand total	2,180	220	1,104	856	39.3

Table X.

Summary Showing Number of Complaints against Places at Which Arrests or Raids Were Made.

Places at Which Arrests or Raids Were Made Subsequent to Complaints Received at Headquarters.	Places Shown by Number of Complaints Against the Places.					
	1 Com-plaint.	2 Com-plaints.	3-6 Com-plaints.	7-10 Com-plaints.	Over 10 Com-plaints.	
	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	
	<hr/>					
Houses of Prostitution, Assignation and Disorderly Places—						
District No. 1....	40	12	10	14	3	1
District No. 2....	12	7	3	2
District No. 3....	41	16	6	14	4	1
District No. 4....	21	5	7	8	..	1
District No. 5....	6	3	2	1
District No. 6....	4	3	1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	124	46	29	39	7	3
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Gambling Houses or Places—						
District No. 1....	27	7	2	13	2	3
District No. 2....	30	21	6	3
District No. 3....	17	7	5	4	..	1
District No. 4....	11	9	..	2
District No. 5....	5	4	..	1
District No. 6....	6	2	1	2	1	..
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	96	50	14	25	3	4
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gambling Houses—						
District No. 1....	67	19	12	27	5	4
District No. 2....	42	28	9	5
District No. 3....	58	23	11	18	4	2
District No. 4....	32	14	7	10	..	1
District No. 5....	11	7	2	2
District No. 6....	10	5	2	2	1	..
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Grand Total.	220	96	43	64	10	7

Table XI.

Summary Showing Number of Complaints Against Places Which Were Investigated,
But No Evidence Found.

	Places Investi- gated, But No Evidence Found.	Places Shown by Number of Complaints Against the Places.				
		1 Com- plaint.	2 Com- plaints.	3-6 Com- plaints.	7-10 Com- plaints.	Over 10 Com- plaints.
		Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.
Houses of Prostitu- tion, Assigna- tion and Disorderly Places—						
District No. 1....	115	76	21	15	1	2
District No. 2....	37	26	6	5
District No. 3....	366	255	50	44	7	10
District No. 4....	64	40	12	12
District No. 5....	34	21	10	1	2	..
District No. 6....	52	43	6	3
Total	668	461	105	80	10	12
Gambling Houses or Places—						
District No. 1....	104	56	28	17	2	1
District No. 2....	46	28	13	4	1	..
District No. 3....	141	107	29	5
District No. 4....	51	40	6	5
District No. 5....	43	32	9	2
District No. 6....	51	35	11	5
Total	436	298	96	38	3	1
Total Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gam- bling Houses—						
District No. 1....	219	132	49	32	3	3
District No. 2....	83	54	19	9	1	..
District No. 3....	507	362	79	49	7	10
District No. 4....	115	80	18	17
District No. 5....	77	53	19	3	2	..
District No. 6....	103	78	17	8
Grand Total.	1,104	759	201	118	13	13

Table XII.

Summary Showing Number of Complaints Against Places on Which No Reports Were Made to Headquarters.

	Places on Which No Reports Were Made to Headquarters.	Places Shown by Number of Complaints Against the Places.				
		1 Com- plaint.	2 Com- plaints.	3-6 Com- plaints.	7-10 Com- plaints.	Over 10 Com- plaints.
		Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.
Houses of Prostitution, Assignation and Disorderly Places—						
District No. 1....	199	152	35	12
District No. 2....	63	51	8	4
District No. 3....	24	22	..	2
District No. 4....	64	54	4	6
District No. 5....	36	30	5	1
District No. 6....	64	61	3
Total	450	370	55	25
Gambling Houses or Places—						
District No. 1....	183	148	25	9	1	..
District No. 2....	81	74	5	2

Table
Summary Showing Action

	Officers Accused.				Total.
	Inspector.	Captain or Lieutenant.	Ser-geant or Patrol-man.	General Officer Not Specified.	
District No. 1.....	14	14	13	67	108
District No. 2.....	1	8	5	18	32
District No. 3.....	8	15	16	54	93
District No. 4.....	3	2	1	16	22
District No. 5.....	..	5	1	11	17
District No. 6.....	2	1	7	8	18
Special Squads.....	..	11(b)	11
Total	28	56	43	174	301

*Included with those investigated are all those referred for information, on which,
(a) By Detective Bureau.

(b) Of the 11, 8 were complaints accusing Lieutenant Becker.

	Places on Which No Reports Were Made to Headquarters.	Places Shown by Number of Complaints Against the Places.				
		1 Com- plaint.	2 Com- plaints.	3-6 Com- plaints.	7-10 Com- plaints.	Over 10 Com- plaints.
		Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.
District No. 3....	3	3	5	2
District No. 4....	33	32	1
District No. 5....	40	35	4	1
District No. 6....	66	60	5	1
Total	406	452	40	13	1	..
Total Houses of Prostitution, etc., and Gam- bling Houses—						
District No. 1....	382	300	60	21	1	..
District No. 2....	144	125	13	6
District No. 3....	27	25	..	2
District No. 4....	97	86	5	6
District No. 5....	76	65	9	2
District No. 6....	130	121	8	1
Grand Total.	856	722	95	38	1	..

XIII.

Taken on Graft Complaints.

How Referred.			How Investigated.*				
For Informa- tion or In- vestigation. No Report Requested.	For In- vestigation and Report.	Not Referred.	Auto- Investi- gation.	By Superior Officers.	By Special Squads.	By Inspector.	Not In- vesti- gated.
82	26	..	12	93	3
18	10	4	..	27	1(a)	..	4
55	32	6	8	77	2	..	6
14	8	..	3	14	5
8	9	14	3
11	7	..	2	15	1
2	8	1	4	1	..	4	2
190	100	11	29	241	15	4	12

with few exceptions, no reports were made.

Table

Summary Showing Activity of Inspectors' Squads and Special Squads

	No. of Entries.	Total Num- ber of Arrests.	Disposition by Magistrates.		
			Discharged.	Convicted.	Held.
Gambling Houses—					
Inspection Squads:					
District No. 1.....	51	128	102	..	26
District No. 2.....	33	147	80	36	31
District No. 3.....	11	25(<i>a</i>)	10	..	11
District No. 4.....	14	53(<i>b</i>)	34	..	13
District No. 5.....	1	3	3
District No. 6.....	4	8	3	..	5
District No. 7.....	1	15	..	15	..
District No. 8.....	4	13	6	..	7
District No. 9.....	5	20	17	..	3
District No. 10.....	1	1	1
District No. 11.....	7	16	8	..	8
District No. 12.....	7	19	3	8(<i>e</i>)	8
District No. 17.....	1	8	..	7	1
Total Inspectors' Squads..	140	456	263	66	117
Total Special Squads.....	132	523	203	1	315
Special Squad No. 1.....	76	269	120	1	148
Special Squad No. 2.....	20	105	15	..	90(<i>f</i>)
Special Squad No. 3.....	9	26	4	..	22
Special Court Squad.....	1	2	2
C. O. Squad.....	7	29(<i>g</i>)	18	..	10
Detective Bureau	19	92(<i>h</i>)	44	..	45
Disorderly Houses—					
Inspectors' Squads:					
District No. 1.....	130	176(<i>i</i>)	31	69	75
District No. 2.....	84	105(<i>j</i>)	8	15	80(<i>j</i>)
District No. 3.....	150	152	3	1	148
District No. 4.....	98	160	72	36	52
District No. 6.....	40	48	10	22	16
District No. 7.....	7	7	1	..	6
District No. 8.....	25	69	36	8	25
District No. 9.....	2	2	2
District No. 10.....	3	8	3	3	2
District No. 11.....	9	10	10(<i>m</i>)
District No. 12.....	3	15	5	8	2
District No. 15.....	5	5	5

XIV.

Between June 1, 1911, and August 1, 1912, and Disposition of Arrests Made.

Combined Disposition by Special Sessions, Grand Jury and General Sessions.				Summary Total.		
Number of Cases.	Dis- charged.	Convicted.	Pending.	Total No. Discharged.	Total No. Convicted.	Per Cent. of Convictions to Total Dispositions.
25	23	2	1	125	2	1.57
30	21	9	1	101	45	30.82
11	6	5	..	20	5	20.00
13	12	1(c)	..	52(b)	1(c)	1.89
3	3	3
5	3	2	..	6	2	25.00
..	15	100.00
6	2	4	1(d)	8	4	38.46(1)
2	2	..	1	19
1	1	1
4	3	1	4	11	1	8.33
6	3	3	2(e)	6	11	68.42(1)
1	1	1	7	87.50
107	80	27	10	353	93	21.38(1)
277	206	71	25	414	84	16.87
142	117	25	6	237	26	9.88
64	31	33	13	47(f)	45	48.91
18	14	4	4	18	4	18.18
..	2
10	5	5	..	24	5	17.24
43	39	4	2	86	4	4.44
75	25	50	1(i)	56	119	68.18(1)
77	16	61	4(k)	25(k)	76	76.19(1)
139	8	131	9(l)	11	132	92.62(1)
52	24	28	..	96	64	40.00
16	5	11	..	15	33	68.75
6	1	5	..	2	5	71.43
25	15	10	..	51	18	26.09
2	1	1	..	1	1	50.00
2	..	2	..	3	5	62.50
9	3	6	..	4(m)	6	60.00
2	..	2	..	5	10	66.66
5	3	2	..	3	2	40.00

	No. of Entries.	Total Num- ber of Arrests.	Disposition by Magistrates.		
			Discharged.	Convicted.	Held.
District No. 16.....	2	5	..	3	2
District No. 17.....	7	7	7
Total Inspectors' Squads..	565	769	169	165	432
Total Special Squads.....	13	23	2	4	17

Notes (1) Cases of bond forfeiture have been credited to "total number convicted" in figuring percentage table.

(2) Squad No. 1 was organized June 2, 1911, squad No. 2 on January 9, and squad No. 3 on May 15, 1912.

(3) The amount of special squad activity in disorderly house arrests was so small that only the total is shown here.

(4) Two arrests by detective bureau and central office squad in disorderly houses are included with the number credited to special squads.

(a) Four discharged on a writ by Supreme Court.

(b) Six not held at station house.

(c) Arrest made by patrolman attached to precinct.

(d) Bond forfeited by one.

(e) Bond forfeited by two.

(f) Disposition of two not given; twelve fined \$25.00; one acquitted, not stated by whom, and three still pending.

(g) One not held at station house.

(h) Three not held at station house.

(i) Bail forfeited by one.

(j) Bond forfeited by two.

(k) Bond forfeited by two. One discharged by Supreme Court without trial.

(l) Bail forfeited by six. Disposition not given for one.

(m) One discharged by Supreme Court.

APPENDIX B.

Home Study of First and Second Year Patrolmen.

Table I—Family Budget First-Year Patrolman.

Table II—Police Department Expense of First-Year Patrolman.

Table III—Family Budget Second Year Patrolman.

Table IV—Domestic Statistics of First and Second-Year Patrolmen.

Table V-VIII—Domestic Statistics of Patrolmen Above Fifth Year.

Table IX—Answers to Selected Questions.

Combined Disposition by Special Sessions,
Grand Jury and General Sessions.

Summary Total.

Number of Cases.	Dis- charged.	Convicted.	Pending.	Total No. Discharged.	Total No. Convicted.	Per Cent. of Convictions to Total Dispositions.
2	..	2	5	100.00
7	5	2	..	5	2	28.57
419	106	313	14	277	478	63.84(1)
17	2	15	..	4	19	82.61

Table I.

Table Showing Average, Minimum and Maximum Family Budgets of First-Year Patrolmen.

Expenditures for	Average Budget. Family 3.7.	Per Cent.	Minimum Budget Family 2.	Maximum Budget. Family 4.
Family purposes :				
Rent	\$174 88	20.50	\$180 00	\$240 00
Food	393 85	46.40	197 00	482 40
Clothing	60 98	7.21	60 00	250 00
Fuel and light.....	55 15	6.50	46 00	45 00
Furniture	11 79	1.40	12 00
Insurance	26 26	3.10	1 65
Health	38 61	4.55	24 00
Contributions	10 36	1.20	19 20
Recreation and amusement.....	7 68	.90
Reading matter	8 34	.98	12 00	7 85
Miscellaneous	60 71	7.18	61 80	105 00
Total	\$848 71	100.00	\$556 80	\$1,187 10
Police purposes :				
Uniform and equipment.....	120 14	120 14	120 14
Meals away from home.....	73 72	72 00	180 00
Pension fund	16 00	16 00	16 00
Fines, benefit societies, station house fees, etc.....	27 54	21 00	9 00
Total	\$237 41	21.6	\$229 14	\$325 14
Total for all purposes..	\$1,086 12	\$785 94	\$1,512 24

Table II.

Minimum Expenses of Every First-Year Patrolman.

(As Given by Mr. Bates of the Bureau of Equipment, 300 Mulberry St.)

Uniform.

Overcoat	\$25 00 and up
Winter trousers	6 50 and up
Winter blouse	16 75 and up
Summer serge suit.....	12 50 and up
Winter cap	1 75
Summer cap	1 47
Total	\$63 97

Station House Equipment.

Single mattress	\$5 00
4 sheets at 78c.....	3 12
2 spreads at \$2.25.....	4 50
4 pillow cases at 30c.....	1 20
2 double blankets at \$5.....	10 00
1 comforter	3 00
1 pillow	2 25
Bed making for year.....	9 00—*\$12 00 yr.
Shoe shines for year.....	9 00
Laundering bed linen.....	9 00—*\$12 00 yr.
Ice	50
Lead pencils	05
Total	\$56 62 or \$62 62

Equipment.

Leather belt	\$1 70
Cord and tassel.....	45
Locust night stick.....	30
Billet	33
Rawhide straps	10
Whistle	35
Nippers and holder.....	50
Revolver and cartridges.....	12 50
Plates for clubs.....	08
Cap devices	20
Precinct numbers	24
Buckskin gloves	1 50
White gloves (3 pairs).....	60
Total	\$18 85

Rubber Goods.

Rubber cap cover.....	\$0 40
Rubber cap cape.....	35
Rubber coat	3 75
Rubber boots	3 50
Rubber holster	20
Total	\$8 20

*12 is selected as the average because the majority of Patrolmen pay \$1 a month for bed making and \$1 a month for laundry.

Recapitulation.

Uniform	\$63 97
Equipment	18 85
Rubber goods	8 20
Station house equipment.....	62 62
Pension fund, 2 per cent.....	16 00
Total	\$169 64

Table III.

Table Showing Average, Minimum and Maximum Family Budgets of Second-Year Patrolmen.

Expenditures for	Average Budget. Family 3.7	Per Cent.	Minimum Budget. Family 2.	*Maximum Budget. Family 4.
Family purposes:				
Rent	\$205 25	23.0	\$198 00	\$240 00
Food	403 82	49.0	165 50	512 00
Clothing	66 87	7.5	50 00	128 00
Fuel and light.....	53 83	6.0	33 00	68 00
Furniture	21 09	2.4	79 50	6 00
Insurance	25 33	2.8	12 00	75 40
Health	29 24	3.2	90 00	42 00
Contributions	10 42	1.2	7 20	17 40
Recreation and amusement.....	8 12	.9	24 00
Reading matter	8 62	.9	6 00	11 44
Miscellaneous	61 61	6.9	46 80	47 72
Total	\$894 22	100.0	\$713 10	\$1,148 12
Police purposes:				
Uniform and equipment.....	\$67 17	\$60 00	\$29 75
Meals away from home.....	70 67	124 35	126 00
Pension fund.....	18 00	18 00	18 00
Fines, benefit societies, station house fees.....	42 99	53 00	53 60
Total	\$198 83	19.0	\$255 35	\$227 35
Total for all purposes.....	\$1,093 05		\$968 45	\$1,375 47

* Aunt of Patrolman is wealthy and helps whenever necessary. Father has used \$300 of previous savings.

Table IV.

Schedule Showing for 74 \$800 and \$900 Families Relation Between Rent Paid, Number in Family (Boarders Included), and Number of Rooms Occupied.

Rent. Per Mo.	Number in Family.						Number Rooms Occupied.				
	2	3	4	5	6	Total	3	4	5	6	Total
\$9 00.....	1	1	..	2	2	2
10 50.....	..	2	1	3	1	2	3

Rent. Per Mo.	Number in Family.						Number Rooms Occupied.				
	2	3	4	5	6	Total	3	4	5	6	Total
11 00.....	2	..	1	3	1	2	3
11 50.....	1	1	1	1
12 00.....	1	1	3	1	..	6	2	4	6
12 50.....	1	1	1	1
*13 00.....	..	1	1	..	1	3	..	3	3
13 50.....	1	1	1	1
14 00.....	1	1	1	1	..	4	4	4
14 50.....	1	1	..	1	1
*15 00.....	2	5	1	3	1	12	1	8	2	1	12
*15 50.....	1	1	..	1	1
16 00.....	1	2	4	1	..	8	..	4	4	..	8
16 50.....	1	1	..	1	1
17 00.....	2	1	2	5	..	4	1	..	5
†18 00.....	1	..	2	2	1	6	..	4	2	..	6
†19 00.....	2	1	..	3	3	..	3
19 50.....	..	1	1	1	1
†20 00.....	2	2	..	4	..	2	2	..	4
21 00.....	..	1	1	..	1	1
22 00.....	1	1	1	1
24 00.....	..	1	1	..	1	1
25 00.....	1	1	2	..	1	..	1	2
*26 00.....	1	1	1	..	1
*30 00.....	1	1	1	..	1
*32 00.....	1	1	1	1
Total.....	15	16	24	12	7	74	15	39	16	4	74

For this group of 74 families:

Total rent paid, \$1,196.

Average rent per month, \$16.16.

Number paying \$16 and under, 46 or 60 per cent.

Number paying over \$16, 28 or 40 per cent.

Total number of persons, 276.

Average number persons to a family, 3.7.

Number families under 4 persons, 31 or 42 per cent.

Number of families 4 persons and over, 43 or 58 per cent.

Total number of rooms occupied, 305.

Average number of rooms to a family, 4.

Number of families occupying 4 rooms, 39 or 52.7 per cent.

Number of families occupying less than 4 rooms, 15 or 26.2 per cent.

Number of families occupying more than 4 rooms, 20 or 27 per cent.

Number of rooms to a person, 1.1.

* Indicates 1 family having boarders; †two families having boarders.

Thirty-three of the above apartments are without baths.

With one exception, baths are not found in any apartments renting for less than \$15 a month; 6 of the \$15 apartments are without baths, and 2 of the \$16 apartments.

Table V.

Schedule Showing for 16 \$1,400 Families Relation Between Rent Paid, Number in Family (Boarders Included), and Number of Rooms Occupied.

Rent per mo.	Number in Family.								Number of Rooms Occupied.					
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total.	3	4	5	6	7	Total.
\$15.00	1	1	1	1
16.00	1	1	1	1
18.00	1	1	1	1
20.00	1	..	3	4	1	2	1	4
21.00	1	1	1	1
22.50	1	1	1	..	1
*24.00	1	1	..	2	1	..	1	2
25.00	1	1	2	2	..	2
27.00	1	1	1	1
29.00	1	1	1	1
30.00	..	1	1	1	..	1
Total	1	1	9	2	1	1	1	16	8	6	2	16

For this group of 16 families:

Total rent paid, \$356.50.

Average rent per month, \$22.28.

Number paying \$22.50, 1 or 6.2%.

Number paying \$22.50 and under, 8 or 50%.

Number paying \$22.50 and over, 7 or 43.7%.

Total number of persons, 72.

Average number of persons to a family, 4.5.

Total number rooms occupied, 90.

Average rooms to a family, 5.6.

Number of rooms to a person, 1.2.

* Indicates boarder.

Table VI.

Schedule Showing Contributions to Benefit and Insurance Societies.

Salary.	Benefit Societies.					Insurance.			
	No. An- swer- ing.	No. Be- long- ing.	Per Cent.	Total Contribu- tions.	Av. Contribu- tion.	No. Pay- ing.	Per Cent.	Total Contribu- tions.	Av. Contribu- tion.
\$800	63	19	36½	\$387.60	\$16.85	54	85.7	\$1,556.93	\$28.83
900	21	16	71½	321.20	20.07	19	90.4	517.58	27.24
1,400	24	23	96 "	1,606.22	69.83	24	100	1,527.07	63.63
Total	108	58	53.7	\$2,315.02	\$39.91	97	89.8	\$3,601.58	\$37.12

Table VII.
Amounts Contributed to Churches by 108 Patrolmen's Families.

Salary.	No. Answering.	No. Contributing.	Per Cent.	Total Contributions.	Average Contribution.
\$800	63	48	78	\$539.14	\$11.23
900	21	18	85.7	183.80	10.21
1,400	24	21	88	386.54	18.47
Total	108	87	85.5	\$1,009.48	\$13.30

Table VIII.
Distribution of Children Among 106 Families.

	\$800 65 Families.		\$900 22 Families.		\$1,400 19 Families.		Total 106 Families.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Families having no children.....	17	26	3	13.2	1	5.2	21	19.8
Families having 1 child.....	16	24.6	7	31.8	3	15.7	26	24.5
Families having 2 children.....	22	33.8	9	40.9	9	47.2	40	37.7
Families having 3 children.....	8	12.3	2	9.0	3	15.7	13	12.1
Families having 4 children.....	2	3.3	1	4.5	2	10.5	5	4.7
Families having 6 children.....	1	5.2	1	.9
Total number of children in each group	92	53.8	35	20.4	44	25.7	171	
Average No. children to a family.	1.4		1.6		2.3		1.6	
Average No. children to a family, based on families having children	1.9		1.8		2.4		2	

Table IX.
Suggestions Made by Patrolmen.

Patrolman in Colored Section:

What chance has a cop without a club against a couple of mad niggers?

Mounted Patrolman in Van Cortlandt Park Complains:

Four men watching nothing at night.

Great help if salaries were paid semi-monthly.

If Patrolmen are not to be properly paid, there should at least be a loan fund established where money could be borrowed at very low rate of interest. This might be done by some wealthy man, a Morgan or a Rockefeller.

If we get the \$200 increase and 14 days' vacation every year, I'll be satisfied—that's enough.

Great improvement in matter of extra duties during present administration—more extra duties now come out of reserve time.

Five platoon system better than present one.

Fixed post ridiculous; City losing Patrolmen this way. We don't need more men, but different plan. Two men covering one post does not prevent burglaries. Decrease in burglaries not due to fixed post, but to conditions.

Fixed post makes a monkey out of a cop.

Mr. Waldo surely does not know how he is punishing his men with the fixed post.

The 40th Precinct is known as "the old man's home"—a young fellow has no chance there.

There are too many old men on the job—they don't try to raise it any. Men could co-operate together to make things better. Now, you're not a man—you have to appear a dummy, the more stupid you look, the better you get along.

City should supply bed and pay for bed making. Widows of Patrolmen should do this work at the station houses.

Station houses should be cleaner—some beds "walk."

"What is Effect of Fines on Family?"

Impoverish family.

Pay this way more than once.

Serious.

Thirty days' fine last year meant that we had to go two months without salary, and hence borrowed.

Indebtedness.

Very serious. Seems unjust to make family suffer also.

Punish man—not family.

Punish man—extra duties.

Very serious; 15 days' fine takes the nerve out of you. This way you are punished three times and you know your chances of promotion are killed.

Harder than ever to get on.

Terrible.

Make conditions desperate.

Sufficiently punished already by standing on fixed post for eight hours.

Heavy fines punish and impoverish the family, placing the family in debt from which it is hard to recover.

Comes out of family—debt.

Act of charity to abolish fines.

Very great hardship. Seems to be only way.

No fines—too serious on family when pay is so small.

No fines as yet, but dread to think of such a punishment.

Fine system fierce.

So much less for family.

Fined? I suppose I'd be more in debt.

"Should a Patrolman Do Duty in His Home Precinct?"

Yes.

Preferable because he is more familiar with conditions; more regularly at home; better health.

Nearer home—more anxious to keep his home neighborhood good—better to be arrested by a friend than by a stranger if done right.

In his own old home precinct, likes it because he knows his people and gets lots of excitement.

Gets more time at home. Is more interested in his own neighborhood and will, therefore, want to keep it good.

Save time going and coming from post.

Brings him nearer home and he loses less of his own time.

Advantage to wife who will then have Policeman home oftener.

Yes—more time to self.

Yes—more time at home with family.

Home precinct. Know it better—get home oftener—just as strict with neighbors as strangers.

Better cop in own precinct—takes more interest.

No difference that she can see.

Policeman would do his duty wherever stationed.

No—

No. The boys around would impose on him. If he had to arrest any of them their mothers would be down on him and that would make it very hard for him.

Nice to be near home, but not in own precinct.

No. Would rather be somewhere else. You don't like to be too hard on your friends.

Not right at home, but near enough to get home quickly.

Perhaps hard to be strict where man is familiar, but it is good to be near home so as to save time going and coming.

Would like being nearer home, but thinks neighbors would take liberties.

Wife: Would like it because husband would be home oftener.

Husband: Difficult doing duty among neighbors.

No. Can't make friends behave when cutting-up. Better cop where not known.

More authority in strange district.

Better authority in a strange precinct.

Home precinct "makes bum of Policeman." Better away from home because he gets too much for nothing and expects to get more.

Home precinct would save time, but better to be in adjoining one.

Hard to do duty among friends—wouldn't like it.

Might be harder in home precinct.

Best to be where no one knows you. If anything is done in home precinct friends would say: "O, Jones will let a fellow off easy."

Friends take advantage of you.

Table
Civil Service Examinations for

Date of examination.....	{ Mar. 16 } { Sept. 8 } 1898.	Nov. 26, 1900.	Aug. 27, 1902.
	June	May	Dec.
Date of promulgation.....	16, 1899.	13, 1901.	24, 1901.
Number of applicants.....	1,770	5,547	4,503
Number taking examination	1,048	3,261	2,738
Number on list.....	251	823	351
Number failing to get on list.....	797	2,438	2,387
Number on list but not appointed.....	23	53	17
Number appointed 1st year	186	502	334
Rating of last	74.64	77.21	71.34
Number appointed 2d year but with rating higher than last appointed 1st year.....	10	0	0
Number appointed 2d year.....	42	268	0
Rating of last.....	73.87	70.69	0
Lowest rating	70.64	70.69	71.34
Highest rating	94.20	91.87	87.14
Number not appointed but with rating higher than last	20	53	0

Table
Percentage of Candidates Passing Examinations for

Date.	June 16, 1899.	May 13, 1901.	Dec. 24, 1902.	July 17, 1903.	Dec. 30, 1904.
Took examination	1,048	3,261	2,738	2,812	520
Passed	251	823	351	942	341
Percentage passing	24	25	13	33	65

Likely to be too lenient to those he knows; those who know him are likely to impose on acquaintance.
 Better away. Might be more lenient in home precinct.
 Better in another precinct.
 No—friends impose on you.
 Hard to enforce the law where known. Can't be as strict. Wouldn't like to be in uniform where known.
 Depends on how familiar he is with neighbors; makes no difference to him, but thinks it might be embarrassing.
 Men should be in strange surroundings. Neighborly feeling prevents good services.
 Plesanter to be near home, but gives Patrolman more authority to be in other territory.

APPENDIX C.

Personnel and Civil Service Features of Police Department.

Tables I-II.—Examinations for Patrolmen.

Table III.—Examinations for Officers.

Table IV.—Promotions and Demotions of Inspectors.

Table V.—Service of Patrolmen.

Table VI.—Service of Officers.

Table VII.—Personnel of Force, 1898-1912.

Table VIII.—Fines of Patrolmen.

Table IX.—Fines of Officers.

I.

Patrolmen in New York City.

June 10, 1903.	Oct. 20, 1903.	June 1, 1905.	Sept. 12, 1906.	Jan. 22, 1908.	Apr. 13, 1909.	May 10-12, 1910	Aug. 1, 1911.	Oct. 24, 1912.
July 17, 1903.	Dec. 30, 1904.	Aug. 23, 1905.	Jan. 12, 1907.	Apr. 3, 1908.	May 24, 1909.	June 18, 1910.	Oct. 2, 1911.	Jan. 13, 1913.
4,308	1,994	6,191	5,815	3,665	3,663	1,997	3,035	3,229
2,812	520	1,502	1,938	1,452	1,099	757	1,327	1,236
942	341	1,169	1,460	989	921	638	1,037	650
1,870	179	333	478	463	178	119	290	586
51	34	102	161	140	117	73	112	...
666	307	895	1,118	802	799	408	771	List not
78.56	71.87	76.25	82.35	74.22	70.01	78.57	78.54	completed
3	0	0	6	6	5	36	3	"
225	0	172	181	47	5	157	154	"
71.09	0	71.92	75.60	72.38	76.95	70.80	70.65	"
71.09	71.87	70.03	75.60	70.00	70.01	70.80	70.65	"
91.48	92.53	92.79	97.55	94.76	94.65	93.70	95.06	96.33
51	0	0	0	140	117	73	112	0

II.

Patrolmen of the New York City Police Force.

Aug. 23, 1905.	Jan. 12, 1907.	April 3, 1908.	May 24, 1909.	June 18, 1910.	Oct. 2, 1911.
1,502	1,938	1,452	1,099	757	1,327
1,169	1,460	989	921	638	1,037
77	75	68	83	84	78

Table
Examinations for Officers of the

Civil Service Examinations of Candidates for:	Sergeants Formerly Roundsmen.			Lieutenants Formerly		
	May 3, 1902. Sept.	Dec. 29, 1903. Apr.	May 19, 1908. Jan.	Nov. 17, 1899. Dec.	Oct. 1, 1902. Dec.	Mar. 4, 1903. Aug.
Date of examination.....	3, 1902. Sept.	29, 1903. Apr.	19, 1908. Jan.	17, 1899. Dec.	1, 1902. Dec.	4, 1903. Aug.
Date of promulgation.....	12, 1902.	26, 1904.	13, 1909.	26, 1900.	19, 1902.	20, 1903.
Number of applicants.....	1,845	2,323	3,352	278	269	171
Number examined	1,821	2,065	3,195	278	252	163
Number on list.....	251	986	1,793	229	94	89
Number failing to get on list	1,570	1,079	1,402	49	158	81
Number on list not ap- pointed	3	623	1,392	170	3	15
Number appointed 1st year	171	12	111	59	91	48
Rating of last.....	78.16	87.04	88.20	83.64	76.74	84.26
Number appointed 2d year but with rating higher than last appointed 1st year	3	0	6	0	0	1
Number appointed 2d year	77	248	30	0	0	25
Rating of last.....	73.75	83.64	87.85	0	0	79.36
Number appointed 3d year	0	41	122	0	0	1
Rating of last.....	0	83.40	86.75	0	0	79.18
Number appointed 3d year but with rating higher than last appointed 2d year	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number appointed 4th year	0	62	138	0	0	0
Rating of last.....	0	82.96	85.60	0	0	0
Highest rating	87.14	89.96	93.60	93.82	89.20	90.90
Lowest rating	73.56	80.00	80.00	70.20	76.46	79.18

Table IV.
Captains Assigned as Inspectors Since April 19, 1907.

Name.	Assigned as Inspector.	Remanded to Captain.	Length of Detail.
Burfeind, Henry W.....	4/19/07	11/ 6/08	1/6
Burns, Joseph	4/19/07	11/ 6/07	0/6
Baldwin, Sylvester D.....	4/19/07	7/ 9/07	0/3
Boettler, Wm. F.....	6/23/09	5/20/10	0/11
Cortwright, M. W.....	4/19/07	2/ 9/09	*1/9
Corcoran, Patrick	11/ 6/08	4/14/09	0/5
Cohen, Henry	8/25/11
Cahalane, C. F.....	8/30/11
Dillon, J. E.....	4/19/07	4/14/09	2/0
Daly, John	4/14/09
Dillon, J. E.....	7/ 6/09	†6/ 6/11	...

* Retd. † On leave of absence while Dep. Com.

III.

Police Force, New York City.

Sergeants.		Captains.				Inspectors.		
Sept. 12, 1905.	Nov. 22, 1909.	Nov. 2, 1899.	Nov. 15, 1901.	Oct. 17, 1906.	June 21, 1910.	Oct. 31, 1899.	Jan. 14, 1903.	Dec. 31, 1906.
Nov. 11, 1905.	Apr. 20, 1910.	Nov. 24, 1900.	June 6, 1902	Dec. 1, 1906.	Sept. 28, 1910.	Mar. 2, 1900.	Feb. 4, 1903.	Jan. 3, 1907.
380	526	173	204	439	422	3	40	60
380	511	173	202	439	350	3	35	55
201	144	117	97	331	112	2	4	24
179	367	56	105	106	238	1	31	31
14	34	96	21	297	25	0	0	19
70	23	21	48	19	48	2	4	5
83.48	83.60	84.84	81.93	82.00	85.84	83.36	84.25
33	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
46	73	0	11	3	15	0	0	0
80.84	80.35	0	81.04	88.24	81.40	0	0	0
26	14	0	17	10	24	0	0	0
80.84	80.00	0	76.49	87.74	80.35	0	0	0
0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0
45	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
80.00	0	0	0	87.78	0	0	0	0
86.24	87.15	94.36	86.81	89.19	87.70	95.94	85.11	87.00
80.00	80.00	70.04	73.88	80.05	80.00	85.84	83.36	80.00

Name.	Assigned as Inspector.	Remanded to Captain.	Length of Detail.
Dooley, R. E.....	5/12/11
Dwyer, J. F.....	8/16/12
Flood, J. F.....	4/19/07	1/21/11	3/9
Farrell, J. J.....	6/13/11
Formoso, C. A.....	8/25/11
Faurot, J. A.....	10/21/12
Grant, Donald	2/15/12	†9/2
Holohan, G. R.....	4/19/07	1/21/11	3/9
Harkins, P. J.....	4/19/07
Hussey, J. E.....	4/19/07	11/ 6/08	1/6
Hogan, W. G.....	4/19/07	6/22/11	4/2
Herlihy, J. D.....	4/14/09
Hussey, J. E.....	9/29/09	3/ 4/11	1/5
Hughes, Edward P.....	6/23/11
Hayes, Cornelius G.....	7/ 6/11	8/16/12	1/1

Name.	Assigned as Inspector.	Remanded to Captain.	Length of Detail.
Kelly, T. J.....	1/20/09
Langan, J. J.....	9/25/07	4/10/08	¶0/6
Linden, J. F.....	4/14/09	3/16/10	0/11
Lahey, W. J.....	5/29/11
McCafferty, James	7/ 1/07	1/27/11	¶3/6
Murtha, J. J.....	3/16/10
McClusky, G. W.....	7/ 9/07	1/21/11	3/6
McClusky, G. W.....	‡5/29/11
Nally, J. F.....	4/19/07	8/19/07	0/4
O'Brien, J. J.....	4/19/07	8/29/10	3/4
O'Connor, J. W.....	11/ 6/07	3/22/08	0/4
O'Reilly, Miles	4/14/08	4/ 1/10	1/11
O'Brien, M. S.....	5/20/10	10/21/12	2/5
Russell, J. H.....	4/19/07	7/ 1/09	2/2
Russell, J. H.....	4/ 1/10	7/ 6/11	1/3
Sweeney, Dennis	4/19/07
Schmittberger, M. F.....	4/19/07
Steinbruck, Max	3/22/08	12/11/08	0/8
Thompson, J. F.....	4/19/07	9/29/09	2/5
Titus, G. F.....	4/19/07
Walsh, Richard	4/19/07	8/29/11	4/4

‡ 2d Det. ¶ Died. March 3, 1913.

Table V.
Service of Patrolmen of the Police Force, New York City.
Compiled December 1, 1912.

1 year.....	875	25 years.....	92
2 years.....	417	26 years.....	65
3 years.....	200	27 years.....	70
4 years.....	544	28 years.....	22
5 years.....	776	29 years.....	26
6 years.....	901	30 years.....	22
7 years	380	31 years.....	12
8 years.....	747	32 years.....	13
9 years.....	313	33 years.....	10
10 years.....	699	34 years.....	3
11 years.....	369	35 years.....	5
12 years.....	244	36 years.....	5
13 years.....	139	37 years.....	9
14 years.....	58	38 years.....	4
15 years.....	20	39 years.....	3
16 years.....	293	40 years.....	1
17 years.....	498	41 years.....	5
18 years.....	164	42 years.....	0
19 years.....	169	43 years.....	2
20 years.....	230	44 years.....	1
21 years.....	173	45 years.....	1
22 years.....	112	46 years.....	1
23 years.....	113	47 years.....	1
24 years.....	106	48 years.....	1

Table VI.

Service Table of Officers in the New York City Police Force, as of December 1, 1912.

	Sergeants.	Lieutenants.	Captains.
Total Number	648	550	97
Total Service	10485 yrs.	12921 yrs.	2340 yrs.
Average Service	16 yrs. 2 mos.	23 yrs. 6 mo.	24 yrs. 1 mo.
Total Service—			
Patrolmen	7704 yrs.	5232 yrs.	674 yrs.
Sergeants	2781 yrs.	3431 yrs.	364 yrs.
Lieutenants	0 yrs.	4258 yrs.	712 yrs.
Captains	0 yrs.	0 yrs.	590 yrs.
Average Service—			
Patrolmen	11 yrs. 10 mo.	9 yrs. 6 mo.	6 yrs. 10 mo.
Sergeants	4 yrs. 4 mo.	6 yrs. 3 mo.	3 yrs. 8 mo.
Lieutenants	0 yrs. 0 mo.	7 yrs. 9 mo.	7 yrs. 6 mo.
Captains	0 yrs. 0 mo.	0 yrs. 0 mo.	6 yrs. 1 mo.
Percentage of Total Service—			
Patrolmen	74%	40.5%	29%
Sergeants	26%	26.5%	16%
Lieutenants	0%	33.0%	30%
Captains	0%	0 %	25%

Length of Service.	Ser- geants.	Lieu- tenants.	Cap- tains.	Length of Service.	Ser- geants.	Lieu- tenants.	Cap- tains.
9 years.....	4	0	0	27 years.....	11	23	7
10 years.....	7	0	0	28 years.....	3	17	7
11 years.....	20	0	0	29 years.....	6	17	5
12 years.....	4	1	0	30 years.....	5	11	2
13 years.....	11	0	1	31 years.....	2	13	3
14 years.....	1	0	0	32 years.....	1	4	0
15 years.....	18	13	2	33 years.....	0	6	1
16 years.....	149	105	7	34 years.....	1	5	3
17 years.....	150	77	12	35 years.....	2	2	1
18 years.....	25	17	3	36 years.....	1	3	1
19 years.....	50	48	3	37 years.....	0	3	1
20 years.....	31	32	2	38 years.....	0	2	0
21 years.....	21	25	5	39 years.....	0	3	1
22 years.....	27	30	3	40 years.....	0	0	0
23 years.....	21	24	5	41 years.....	0	0	1
24 years.....	26	27	7	42 years.....	0	0	0
25 years.....	25	31	6	43 years.....	1	0	0
26 years.....	14	53	7				

Table VI-A.

Relative Length of Service of Captains of the New York City Police Force in Different Grades, as of December 1, 1912.

		Patrolmen.																			
Lieutenants.	Yrs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	0.....						2														
	1.....					2	3	1				2	1								
	2.....				1	2	4	5	5	3	2										1
	3.....		2				1	3	3		2		2	2			1				
	4.....					1		4	1				1								
	5.....			1		4	4	6				1		1		1			1		
	6.....		1				2	1	1	1											
	7.....			1		2	1		1												
	8.....																				
	9.....								1	1		1									
	10.....					1															
	11.....									1							1				
	12.....											1									
	13.....																				
	14.....																				
	15.....																				
	16.....																				
	17.....																				
	18.....																				
	19.....																				

		Sergeants.												
Sergeants.	Yrs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	0.....	1
	1.....	..	1	3	1	..	1	..
	2.....	3
	3.....	..	1
	4.....	..	1	..	4	1	4	1
	5.....	2	..	5	1	2	1
	6.....	2	4	..	1
	7.....	4	2	1
	8.....	1	2	4	..	1	..	1	2
	9.....	..	2	3	1	1
	10.....	3	2	1	..	2	1	1
	11.....	1	1	1
	12.....	..	2	1	1
	13.....	..	1	2	1
	14.....	2	..	1
	15.....	..	1
	16.....	1
	17.....
	18.....
	19.....

		Lieutenants.																			
Captains.	Yrs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	0.....						2	..	1	1	2
	1.....	1	1	3	3	..	3	1	..	1
	2.....					4	2	1	..	2
	3.....			1	..	1	1
	4.....			3	..	1	1	1	2
	5.....	1	4	1	2	..	1	1	..	2	..	1
	6.....					1	..	2
	7.....								1	4	..	3	2
	8.....																				
	9.....									2	1	..	1	1
	10.....						1	..	1	..	3	2	1	1	1
	11.....																				
	12.....				1	1	1	1	1	..	1	..	1	1
	13.....																				
	14.....																				
	15.....											2
	16.....																				
	17.....																				
	18.....										1
	19.....										1	..	1

Table VI-B.

Relative Length of Service of Lieutenants of the New York City Police Force, as of December 1, 1912.

		Patrolmen.																							
Sergeants.	Yrs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
	0.....	
	1.....	1	..	2	3	2	4	2	1	2	1	
	2.....	6	4	1	5	15	4	1	1	1	2	
	3.....	..	1	2	1	3	9	13	9	4	5	2	4	2	1	1	..	2	
	4.....	2	..	1	3	8	19	2	5	2	5	1	1	1	..	2	
	5.....	..	2	2	2	1	18	15	12	22	17	17	10	6	8	7	12	8	..	3	2	1	1	1	
	6.....	2	2	5	7	10	10	23	8	5	4	3	2	3	2	2	2	
	7.....	1	4	2	1	3	9	4	6	6	5	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	
	8.....	2	..	4	4	1	4	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	..	
	9.....	..	1	2	1	1	1	3	8	4	6	2	2	1	1	
	10.....	2	1	..	5	2	1	..	1	
	11.....	1	2	4	1	
	12.....	..	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1	
	13.....	2	..	2	1	1	1	..	1	..	1	
	14.....	1	1	1	
	15.....	6	1	1	1	..	1	
	16.....	1	1	
	17.....	1	
	18.....	
	19.....	

		Patrolmen.																						
Yrs.		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Sergeants.	20.....
	21.....
	22.....
	23.....
	24.....
	25.....
	26.....
	27.....

		Sergeants.																					
Yrs.		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
Lieutenants.	0.....	2	7	1	2	1	
	1.....	9	18	4	7	6	
	2.....	1	13	14	19	4	1	1	1	1	1	
	3.....	3	1	
	4.....	1	13	22	5	2	..	1	..	1	1	
	5.....	1	2	18	52	2	1	..	4	..	2	3	2	1	1	1	
	6.....	4	9	51	18	1	4	7	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	

Table
Relative Length of Service of Sergeants of the New

														Pat
Yrs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Sergeants.	0	1	1	5	1	
	1	3	3	5	3	4	
	2	2	1	5	4	..	
	3	1	
	4	2	3	4	4	..	2	22	
	5	4	11	7	
	6	3	11	2	..	
	7	1	9	23	23	19	19	
	8	
	9	1	7	4	2	1	2	
	10	1	1	1	1	..	
	11	2	1	
	12	1	3	1	1	..	1	
	13	1	1	..	1	
	14	1	1	
	15	1	1	..	2	1	1	
	16	1	
	17	1	..	2	..	1	
	18	1	..	1	..	1	
	19	1	..	2	..	1	1	
	20	2	1	

		Sergeants.																				
Yrs.		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Lieutenants.	7.....	16	34	2	4	..	3	3	1	..	1	..	1
	8.....	2	1	..	1	1	1
	9.....	1	..	7	7	12	6	4	4	2
	10.....	3	2	..	6	6	7	..	4	4	1	..	2	..	1
	11.....
	12.....	4	7	5	3	..	2	..	1	1
	13.....	1
	14.....	1
	15.....	..	2	1	..	1	1	1	1
	16.....	..	3	2	2
	17.....	1	4	3	..	1
	18.....	1
	19.....	2	1	1	1	1
	20.....	1	1	..	2	..	1
	21.....	..	1	1	1	1	2
	22.....	1	1
	23.....
	24.....
	25.....	..	1	..	1
	26.....	1
	27.....	..	1	1	1	1

VI.-C.

York City Police Force, as of December 1, 1912.

rolmen.

	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
..	1	7	14	5	..	4	1	1	..	1	1
2	6	30	24	6	10	6	4	8	7	1	1	1	1
1	20	18	1	5	4	2	1	1	3	..	2	1
9	9	2	6	1	1	1
19	5	8	8	2	4	..	2	2	1
6	4	3	2	1	2	2	6	2	1
..	2	1	3	3	1
19	2	4	9	10	4	3	5	..	1	1
..	1	1	1
..	1	2	1
..	1	..	3	1
..	..	1	1
..
..
..
..	1
..	1	..	1
..
..
..
..
..

Table VII.
Personnel of New York City Police Force—1898 to 1912.

	Inspec- tors.	Cap- tains.	Lieu- tenants.	Serg- eants.	Patrol- men.	Door- men.	Officers.	Men.
Year ending 1898...	10	72	412*	361†	6,396	153	855	6,549
Year ending 1899...	9	73	414*	374†	6,255	160	870	6,415
Year ending 1900...	10	85	400*	386†	6,261	176	881	6,437
Year ending 1901...	14	77	585*	335†	6,222	183	1,011	6,405
Year ending 1902...	12	81	519*	394†	6,393	176	1,006	6,569
Year ending 1903...	15	85	674*	425†	6,655	187	1,199	6,842
Year ending 1904...	15	89	673*	427†	6,776	186	1,204	6,962
Year ending 1905...	16	85	662*	578†	7,135	186	1,341	7,321
Year ending 1906...	14	92	661*	578†	7,179	187	1,345	7,366

Table
Table of Fines

New York Police Force.

Failure to Properly Patrol.

Miscellaneous	
Intoxicated	
Loitering	
Smoking	
Total	

Absence from Post.

Miscellaneous	
Restaurant	
Saloon	
Club Room	
Store	
Riding on Car.....	
Total	

Neglect of Duty.

Miscellaneous	
Failure to Keep Sidewalks Clear.....	
Failure to Report Special Occurrence.....	
Failure to Take Proper Action.....	
Failure to Investigate.....	
Failure to Give Signal.....	
Failure to Prevent Burglary.....	
Failure to Make Arrest.....	
Made Illegal Arrest.....	
Allowed Prisoner to Escape.....	
Failed to Arraign Prisoner in Court.....	
Failed to Present Witness in Court.....	
Total	

	Inspec- tors.	Cap- tains.	Lieu- tenants.	Serg- eants.	Patrol- men.	Door- men.	Officers.	Men.
Year ending 1907...	19	90	625*	584†	7,793	191	1,318	7,984
Year ending 1908...	17	91	606	558	8,391	187	1,272	8,578
Year ending 1909...	19	87	619	585	8,523	191	1,310	8,714
Year ending 1910...	18	87	614	568	8,374	192	1,287	8,566
Year ending 1911...	19	97	624	586	8,585	191	1,326	8,776
Year ending 1912...	18	97	588	639	8,925	191	1,342	9,116
Average....	15	86	578	492	7,304	182	1,171	7,507

* Detective Sergeant and Sergeant changed to Lieutenant.

† Title of Roundsman changed to Sergeant.

VIII. for Patrolmen.

Days. ½	Bingham—Jan. 1 to July 1, 1908.												Reprimanded.	Charges Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
1	88	89	27	4	21	2	2	1
..	..	3	2	..	4	4	2	2
1	53	36	13	..	14	3
..	4	5	..	4	2
2	145	133	42	8	41	9	4	1	..	2	387
1	105	52	25	6	13	2
1	1
..	2	3	4	1	13	10	1
..
..	1	4	3
..	3	1
2	110	56	30	11	30	10	3	252
..	66	13	1	2	2
..	11	1
..	7	5	1
..	1
..	..	2	1
..
..	10	4	4	..	2
..	..	2	2	1
..	..	1	1	1
..	1	2	1
..	1
..
..	96	30	5	2	9	1	3	146

New York Police Force.

Offences Against Citizen.

Assault
Insulting Citizen
Threatening Citizen
Made Illegal Use of Revolver.....
Profanity
Reckless Driving
Graft
Failure to Pay Debt.....

Total

Offences Against Discipline.

Uniform and Equipment.....
Disrespect to Superior.....
Disobedience
Absent from Residence.....
Absent, Special Appointment.....
False Entry in Memorandum Book.....
Made False Statement.....
Negligence
Absent without Leave.....
Absent Outgoing Roll-Call.....
Absent Return Roll-Call.....
Absent Reserve Duty.....
Absent Drill

Total

Entire Total

Total Number of Charges.....

New York Police Force.

Failure to Properly Patrol.

Miscellaneous
Intoxicated
Loitering
Smoking

Total

Absence from Post.

Miscellaneous
Restaurant
Saloon

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Bingham—Jan. 1 to July 1, 1908.												Reprimanded.	Charges Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
..	1	..	2	1	3
..	2	2	4
..	1
..	1
..
..	2
..	..	1	1	2	..	2	1	2
..
..	5	1	3	3	9	2	..	2	1	2	28
..	9	1
..	1	3	1	1
..	7	..	3	..	2	1
..	1	1	1	1	1
..	11	2	3
..	3
..	1	2	1	2	1
..	9	2	1
1	13	1	4	..	4	3	..	2
1	10	5	2	..	1
..	4	2	2	..	2	1
..	1
..	4
2	74	17	15	..	13	1	1	7	2	2	..	1	135
6	430	237	95	24	102	1	1	29	12	5	1	5	447	645	..
..	2,040

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Baker—Jan. 1 to July 1, 1910.												Reprimanded.	Charges Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
..	74	101	13	..	3	3
..	1	2	6	2
2	44	27	4	..	1	1
..	2	3	1
2	120	131	18	1	6	9	2	..	1	290
2	86	106	38	..	11	1
..	6	10	12	2
..	2	11	9	..	10	6	2

New York Police Force.

Club Room
Store
Riding on Car.....

Total

Neglect of Duty.

Miscellaneous
Failure to Keep Sidewalks Clear.....
Failure to Report Special Occurrence.....
Failure to Take Proper Action.....
Failure to Investigate.....
Failure to Give Signal.....
Failure to Prevent Burglary.....
Failure to Make Arrest.....
Made Illegal Arrest.....
Allowed Prisoner to Escape.....
Failed to Arraign Prisoner in Court.....
Failed to Present Witness in Court.....

Total

Offences Against Citizen.

Assault
Insulting Citizen
Threatening Citizen
Made Illegal Use of Revolver.....
Profanity
Reckless Driving
Graft
Failure to Pay Debt.....

Total

Offences Against Discipline.

Uniform and Equipment.....
Disrespect to Superior.....
Disobedience
Absent from Residence.....
Absent, Special Appointment.....
False Entry in Memorandum Book.....
Made False Statement.....
Negligence
Absent without Leave.....
Absent Outgoing Roll-Call.....
Absent Return Roll-Call.....
Absent Reserve Duty.....
Absent Drill

Total

Entire Total

Total Number of Charges.....

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Baker—Jan. 1 to July 1, 1910.												Reprimanded	Charges Dismissed	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
..	1	3	2	..	1
6	19	14	5	..	3	1
..	..	5
8	114	149	66	..	25	10	2	374
..	4	6	3	..	1	1
..	1
1	2	4	1
..	1	1	2	1
..	..	1	1	2
..	..	1
1	5	7	2	..	1
..	1	1	1	..	1	1
..	1	1
..	1
1	1	1
..	1
3	13	20	8	1	8	7	2	62
..	..	1	..	1	1	1	3	1
..	1	1	3	1
..	..	2	1	..	1
..
..
..
..	3
..	..	1
..	1	5	7	1	2	1	4	1	22
1	14	7	2
..	1
..	1	2	2	..	1
..	1
..	9	9	2	..	1
1	..	2
..	..	3	1	..	1	1
..	3	1	1
..	17	11	5	..	3	2
6	21	22	6	1
2	6	4	2	1
..	4	1
..	1	7	1
10	77	69	22	..	6	2	4	190
23	325	374	121	3	47	29	12	..	1	3	270	444	..
..	1,652

New York Police Force.

Failure to Properly Patrol.

Miscellaneous
Intoxicated
Loitering
Smoking

Total

Absence from Post.

Miscellaneous
Restaurant
Saloon
Club Room
Store
Riding on Car.....

Total

Neglect of Duty.

Miscellaneous
Failure to Keep Sidewalks Clear.....
Failure to Report Special Occurrence.....
Failure to Take Proper Action.....
Failure to Investigate.....
Failure to Give Signal.....
Failure to Prevent Burglary.....
Failure to Make Arrest.....
Made Illegal Arrest.....
Allowed Prisoner to Escape.....
Failed to Arraign Prisoner in Court.....
Failed to Present Witness in Court.....

Total

Offences Against Citizen.

Assault
Insulting Citizen
Threatening Citizen
Made Illegal Use of Revolver.....
Profanity
Reckless Driving
Graft
Failure to Pay Debt.....

Total

Offences Against Discipline.

Uniform and Equipment.....
Disrespect to Superior.....
Disobedience

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Cropsey—Oct. 1, 1910, to April 1, 1911.												Reprimanded.	Charges Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
56	122	52	19	1	1
..	..	1	..	1	6	13	6	9	..	2
71	109	53	9
2	17	4	1
129	248	110	29	2	7	13	6	9	..	2	555
80	42	104	25	..	8	2
14	18	12	8	4	3
8	20	21	22	..	11	7	..	2	..	2
5	6	7	1
13	14	7	1
..	2	1
120	102	152	56	4	23	9	..	2	..	2	470
14	10	15	3	..	1
7	8	1
4	7	3	1
..	2	4	2
..	2	2	2
..	..	3	1
8	9	13	5
..	2	..	2
1	3	2	3	1	2	1
..	..	1	4	..	2
..	1
..
34	44	44	20	1	8	1	152
..	1	5	6	3	1
..
..	1	1	1
..	..	1
..
..	3	1
1	2	..	1	..	1	2
4	6	1	7
5	13	8	8	..	8	3	1	2	..	1	49
4	5	2
..	4	3	1	..	2
1	10	8	2	..	2	2

New York Police Force.

Absent from Residence.....	
Absent, Special Appointment.....	
False Entry in Memorandum Book.....	
Made False Statement.....	
Negligence	
Absent without Leave.....	
Absent Outgoing Roll-Call.....	
Absent Return Roll-Call.....	
Absent Reserve Duty.....	
Absent Drill	
Total	
Entire Total	
Total Number of Charges.....	

New York Police Force.

Failure to Properly Patrol.

Miscellaneous	
Intoxicated	
Loitering	
Smoking	
Total	

Absence from Post.

Miscellaneous	
Restaurant	
Saloon	
Club Room	
Store	
Riding on Car.....	
Total	

Neglect of Duty.

Miscellaneous	
Failure to Keep Sidewalks Clear.....	
Failure to Report Special Occurrence.....	

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Cropsey—Oct. 1, 1910, to April 1, 1911.												Reprimanded.	Charges Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
..	1	2	2	..	2
7	12	7	5	..	2	1	1
..	1	1	1
..	..	4	5	..	3
..	9	1	1
10	11	8	9	1	7
26	38	7	2	1	3
4	18	6	1	..	2
3	5	4	1
2	1	1
57	115	54	29	2	24	3	1	285
345	522	368	142	9	70	28	9	13	..	5	600	620	..
..	2,731

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Waldo—July 1, 1911, to July 1, 1912.												Reprimanded.	Charges Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
..	7	8	16	..	35	8	15	1
..	2	4	..	7	..	2
..	31	12	1	..	4
..	5	..	3	..	2
..	43	20	20	..	43	12	15	7	..	3	163
..	12	32	12	..	37	19	22
..	2	2	1
..	4	..	6	5	4	2
..
..	2	..	3	..	7	1	1
..	1	1
..	16	32	20	..	50	28	28	2	176
..	..	2	4	..	2	2
..
..

New York Police Force.

Failure to Take Proper Action.....
Failure to Investigate.....
Failure to Give Signal.....
Failure to Prevent Burglary.....
Failure to Make Arrest.....
Made Illegal Arrest.....
Allowed Prisoner to Escape.....
Failed to Arraign Prisoner in Court.....
Failed to Present Witness in Court.....

Total

Offences Against Citizen.

Assault
Insulting Citizen
Threatening Citizen
Made Illegal Use of Revolver.....
Profanity
Reckless Driving
Graft
Failure to Pay Debt.....

Total

Offences Against Discipline.

Uniform and Equipment.....
Disrespect to Superior.....
Disobedience
Absent from Residence.....
Absent, Special Appointment.....
False Entry in Memorandum Book.....
Made False Statement.....
Negligence
Absent without Leave.....
Absent Outgoing Roll-Call.....
Absent Return Roll-Call.....
Absent Reserve Duty.....
Absent Drill

Total

Entire Total

Total Number of Charges.....

Days. $\frac{1}{2}$	Waldo—July 1, 1911, to July 1, 1912.												Reprimanded.	Charges. Dismissed.	Total Charges.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	15	20	25	30			
..	2
..	1
..	1	..	1	..	2
..	4	1	10	..	2
..
..	4
..	2
..	1
..
..
..	5	3	17	..	9	6	1	41
..	30	26	7	..	2	2	..	1	..	2
..	1	1	..	1	..	1
..	1
..	1
..	1
..
..
..	30	26	7	..	5	4	..	2	..	3	77
..	1	1
..
..	3	1	1
..	2	..	2	..	3	1
..	3	4
..	1	1	1
..	..	2	1
..	1	1	1
..	8	13	8	..	11	4	1	1
..	28	20	12	..	3
..	3	4	5	..	2	1
..	2	7	4	..	1
..
..	47	47	33	..	28	9	3	2	169
..	141	128	97	..	135	59	46	13	..	7	94	337	..
..	1,057

Table IX.

Table of Fines for Sergeants, Lieutenants and Captains—N. Y. City Police Force.

	Day ½	1908. Bingham, Jan. 1st to July 1st.									Reprimanded Charges Dismissed	
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30		
Sergeants—												
Intoxicated	1
Smoking
Absent	3	1
Neglect of duty.....	1
Failure to keep sidewalks clear...
Failure to take proper action.....	1
Made illegal arrest.....
Allowed prisoner to escape.....
Assault
Insulted citizen
Graft
Failure to pay debt.....
Defects in uniform and equipment.
Disobedience	2
Failed to make entry in blotter....
Made false statements.....
Negligence
Total	3	4	1	6	6
Total number charges.....	20
Lieutenants—												
Intoxicated	1	..	1
Smoking
Absent	2	1	1	2	1
Neglect of duty.....	..	3	4	2
Failure to take proper action.....
Allowed prisoner to escape.....	1
Assault
Insulted citizen
Graft
Failure to pay debt.....
Disobedience
Failure to make entry in blotter..	..	3	2	..	1
Made false statement.....
Negligence
Reckless driving
Failure to investigate.....
Total	8	8	3	4	..	1	1	26	16
Total number charges	67

	Day ½	1910. Bingham, Jan. 1st to July 1st.									Reprimanded Charges	Dismissed
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30		
Captains—												
Smoking
Neglect of duty.....
Disobedience	1
Failure to make entry in desk blotter.
Made false statements.....
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	1	2	4
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total number charges.....	7

	Day ½	1910-1911. Baker, Jan. 1st to July 1st.										Reprimanded Charges	Dismissed
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30			
Sergeants—													
Intoxicated
Smoking
Absent	1	1
Neglect of duty	1
Failure to keep sidewalks clear...
Failure to take proper action.....
Made illegal arrest.....
Allowed prisoner to escape.....
Assault	1
Insulted citizen
Graft
Failure to pay debt.....
Defects in uniform and equipment.	1
Disobedience
Failed to make entry in blotter...
Made false statements.....
Negligence
Total	1	3	1	3	11	..
Total number charges.....	19	..
Lieutenants—													
Intoxicated
Smoking
Absent

	Day ½	1910. Baker, Jan. 1st to July 1st.										Reprimanded Charges	Dismissed
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30			
Neglect of duty.....	1	1	
Failure to take proper action.....	
Allowed prisoner to escape.....	
Assault	
Insulted citizen	
Graft	
Failure to pay debt.....	
Disobedience	2	
Failure to make entry in blotter..	
Made false statement.....	
Negligence	
Reckless driving	
Failure to investigate.....	
Total	—	—	2	1	1	17	24	
Total number charges.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	45	
Captains—													
Smoking	
Neglect of duty.....	
Disobedience	
Failure to make entry in desk blotter	
Made false statements.....	
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3	
Total number charges.....	5	

	Day ½	1910-1911. Cropsey, Oct. 1st to Apr. 1st.										Reprimanded Charges	Dismissed
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30			
Sergeants—													
Intoxicated	1
Smoking
Absent	1	1
Neglect of duty.....	1
Failure to keep sidewalks clear....	6
Failure to take proper action.....
Made illegal arrest.....	1	..	1
Allowed prisoner to escape.....
Assault

	Day ½	1911 to 1912. Cropsey, Oct. 1st to Apr. 1st.										Reprimanded Charges Dismissed
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30		
Insulted citizen
Graft
Failure to pay debt.....
Defects in uniform and equipment.	2
Disobedience
Failed to make entry in blotter....	1
Made false statements.....	1
Negligence
Total	6	3	2	2	1	2	11	24
Total number charges.....	51
Lieutenants—												
Intoxicated	1
Smoking	2	2
Absent	2
Neglect of duty.....	1	4	2	..	1	2	2	1
Failure to take proper action.....	1
Allowed prisoner to escape.....
Assault
Insulted citizen	2	1
Graft	1
Failure to pay debt.....	..	2	..	1
Disobedience	1	..	1
Failure to make entry in blotter... 1	1	1	4	1	2
Made false statement.....
Negligence	2
Reckless driving	1	..	1
Failure to investigate.....	1	1
Total	2	11	11	4	8	2	3	2	..	2	16	30
Total number charges.....	91
Captains—												
Smoking	1
Neglect of duty.....	1
Disobedience	1	1
Failure to make entry in desk blotter	3
Made false statements.....	1
Total	2	3	1	1	11	8
Total number charges.....	27

	Day ½	1911 to 1912. Waldo, July 1st to July 1st.										Reprimanded Charges	Dismissed
		1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30			
Sergeants—													
Intoxicated
Smoking
Absent	1
Neglect of duty.....	1
Failure to keep sidewalks clear....
Failure to take proper action.....	1
Made illegal arrest.....
Allowed prisoner to escape.....
Assault	1
Insulted citizen
Graft
Failure to pay debt.....
Defects in uniform and equipment..
Disobedience
Failed to make entry in blotter...
Made false statements.....	1
Negligence
Total	1	..	2	1	..	1	10	13	..
Total number charges.....	28	..
Lieutenants—													
Intoxicated
Smoking
Absent	1	1
Neglect of duty.....	1	1	1	1
Failure to take proper action.....	1
Allowed prisoner to escape.....
Assault
Insulted citizen
Graft
Failure to pay debt.....
Disobedience
Failure to make entry in blotter..	1
Made false statement.....
Negligence
Reckless driving
Failure to investigate.....
Total	1	2	2	2	6	24	..
Total number charges.....	37	..

	Day	1911 to 1912. Waldo, July 1st to July 1st.										Reprimanded. Charges Dismissed.
	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	3	5	10	15	20	25	30		
<hr/>												
Captains—												
Smoking	
Neglect of duty	1	
Disobedience	
Failure to make entry in desk blotter	
Made false statements.....	
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Total	1	0 2	
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Total number charges	3	

APPENDIX D.

Distribution of Force.

Table I—Organization and personnel of force as of December 31, 1912.

Table II—Present statistics.

Table III—Civilian duties performed by Policemen.

Table IV.—Post statistics.

Table V—Patrol of other cities.

Table I.

The strength of the Police Department on December 31, 1912, both authorized and actual, was as follows:

	Authorized.	Actual.
Inspectors	19	18
Surgeons	25	25
Captains	97	97
Lieutenants	588	588
Sergeants	639	639
Patrolmen	8,933	8,925
Matrons	70	70
	10,371	10,362

An increase available January 1, 1913, of 454 in the authorized strength of Patrolmen was allowed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, making the present total authorized strength of Patrolmen 9,387 and of the entire force 10,825. Of the 8,925 Patrolmen enrolled on December 31, 1912, the records of the Police Department show that they were assigned as follows on that day:

Duties.	No. of Patrolmen.
On patrol	6,909
At general office.....	188
At public offices.....	19
At borough headquarters.....	3
In Detective Bureau.....	391
In Telegraph Bureau.....	38
With boiler squad.....	11
With tenement house squad.....	12
In school of recruits.....	73
With health squad.....	50
With bridge squad.....	89
With traffic squad	424
With harbor squad.....	32
Doormen, patrol wagon Drivers, Clerks, etc., at precinct and district head- quarters	250
Absent:	
Detailed	30
With leave.....	110
Without leave.....	3

Table

Precinct.	Area Square Miles.	Miles of Street.	Total Population.	Patrol Posts.	Average Length.	Population Per Patrol Posts.
1.....	.33	9.50	3,000	23	.41	130
5.....	.36	12.67	41,000	26	.49	1,577
7.....	.27	11.00	85,000	23	.48	3,696
13.....	.35	7.00	133,000	31	.23	4,290
15.....	.55	15.00	171,000	32	.47	5,344
17.....	.38	12.00	138,000	21	.57	6,571
*1.....	2.14	67.17	571,000	156	.43	3,660
2.....	.30	8.40	10,000	21	.40	476
6.....	.40	7.00	24,000	25	.28	960
8.....	.29	9.50	6,000	24	.40	250
10.....	.32	11.50	46,000	25	.46	1,840
12.....	.17	6.00	35,000	18	.33	1,944
14.....	.50	10.00	59,000	30	.33	1,967
16.....	.30	11.50	21,000	26	.44	808
*2.....	2.28	63.90	201,000	169	.38	1,189
18.....	.81	23.30	65,000	29	.80	2,241
21.....	.56	16.00	63,000	38	.42	1,658
22.....	.66	17.00	71,000	28	.60	2,536
23.....	.43	14.00	19,000	29	.48	655
25.....	.45	11.55	55,000	24	.48	2,292
*3.....	2.91	81.85	273,000	148	.55	1,845
26.....	.93	25.30	107,000	37	.68	2,892
28.....	.94	26.25	91,000	49	.53	1,858
32.....	.84	24.00	96,000	41	.58	2,341
33.....	1.30	44.00	54	.81
*4.....	4.01	119.55	294,000	181	.66	1,624

Duties.	No. of Patrolmen.
Sick	272
Suspended	16
	<hr/> 431
	<hr/> 8,925

The streets of the City were divided into 2,800 patrol posts as follows:

Manhattan	1,038
The Bronx	332
Brooklyn	1,096
Queens	275
Richmond	59

Total	2,800
-------------	-------

In addition, 1,323 fixed night posts were located in the following Boroughs:

Manhattan	768
The Bronx	129
Brooklyn	426

Total	1,323
-------------	-------

II.

Average Number of Patrolmen.				Total Arrests and Summonses.			
1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.
73	77	81	83	1,384	768	1,164	1,066
84	81	77	94	2,888	2,659	1,778	2,219
69	71	67	83	2,456	1,554	1,255	1,505
96	98	90	134	5,813	3,634	2,374	4,434
122	124	112	112	9,133	6,121	4,090	4,998
67	65	58	81	3,386	1,974	1,292	2,149
511	516	491	587	25,060	16,710	11,953	16,371
98	84	92	79	3,514	2,197	2,682	2,398
89	82	84	88	3,662	3,266	2,066	2,076
84	82	84	87	1,192	836	759	950
72	74	77	90	2,569	1,871	1,356	1,698
63	62	60	62	1,734	1,492	806	1,139
82	79	82	108	2,787	2,225	1,387	1,776
80	80	75	92	3,405	2,473	2,570	2,146
568	543	552	606	18,863	14,360	11,626	12,183
124	130	124	102	5,683	5,622	4,020	4,928
75	78	85	134	5,140	5,321	4,343	6,290
80	82	84	98	5,215	4,013	2,868	4,195
65	72	80	100	6,576	3,694	4,206	6,796
78	79	72	86	2,547	3,556	1,609	2,225
422	441	445	520	25,161	21,006	17,046	24,434
107	102	112	132	4,105	3,532	4,880	7,974
105	102	126	176	3,657	2,415	2,150	3,508
103	91	115	101	3,771	1,742	1,330	2,079
108	108	92	78	1,279	943	746	826
423	403	445	487	12,812	8,632	9,106	14,387

Precinct.	Area Square Miles.	Miles of Street.	Total Population.	Patrol Posts.	Average Length.	Population Per Patrol Posts.
29.....	.94	25.00	80,000	36	.69	2,222
31.....	1.00	30.00	136,000	46	.65	2,956
35.....	1.00	24.00	136,000	38	.63	3,579
39.....	.85	25.83	213,000	40	.64	5,325
*5.....	3.79	104.83	565,000	160	.66	3,531
36.....	1.10	27.00	79,000	53	.51	1,491
37.....	1.00	31.00	163,000	52	.60	3,135
40.....	.89	23.90	58,000	37	.65	1,568
42.....	2.67	51.28	27,000	47	1.09	574
43.....	.75	17.00	110,000	35	.48	3,143
*6.....	6.41	150.18	437,000	224	.67	1,951
Manhattan.....	21.54	587.48	2,341,000	1,038	.57	2,255
61.....	1.87	44.50	97,000	50	.89	1,940
63.....	4.30	113.00	145,000	81	1.39	1,790
65.....	3.57	99.00	104,000	76	1.30	1,368
66.....	1.55	37.00	13,000	20	1.85	650
68.....	2.50	58.00	14,000	29	2.00	483
69.....	11.60	92.00	31,000	25	3.64	1,240
77.....	2.94	17.50	3,000	7	2.50	429
74.....	7.00	108.00	10,000	28	3.86	357
79.....	7.00	175.00	14,000	16	10.94	875
*7.....	42.33	744.00	431,000	332	2.24	1,298
Bronx.....	42.33	744.00	431,000	332	2.24	1,298
145.....	1.35	26.00	38,000	30	.86	1,267
146.....	.96	27.60	63,000	43	.64	1,465
147.....	.64	19.16	56,000	28	.68	2,000
148.....	.24	6.66	23,000	13	.51	1,770
149.....	.53	19.21	33,000	38	.51	869
150.....	.41	15.50	31,000	29	.53	1,070
*8.....	4.13	114.13	244,000	181	.63	1,348
154.....	1.64	41.00	87,000	46	.89	1,891
155.....	.97	24.57	57,000	38	.64	1,500
156.....	.94	24.80	48,000	44	.56	1,091
157.....	.49	13.00	30,000	24	.54	1,250
158.....	.64	18.00	68,000	31	.58	2,194
164.....	1.53	44.70	126,000	52	.86	2,423
*9.....	6.21	166.07	416,000	235	.71	1,770
159.....	.76	22.65	50,000	31	.73	1,613
160.....	1.18	34.00	68,000	41	.64	1,659
161.....	1.50	35.00	63,000	32	.83	1,969
162.....	1.80	33.00	48,000	25	1.43	1,920
163.....	1.11	32.00	89,000	29	1.14	3,069
*10.....	6.35	156.65	318,000	158	.99	2,013
151.....	1.11	27.00	45,000	27	1.00	1,667
152.....	1.94	38.64	48,000	35	1.10	1,371
153.....	6.50	139.00	108,000	63	2.52	1,714
165.....	1.69	51.70	113,000	42	1.23	2,690
166.....	3.64	94.00	50,000	13	7.23	3,846
167.....	4.00	125.00	40,000	42	2.12	952

Average Number of Patrolmen.				Total Arrests and Summonses.			
1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.
106	110	107	131	3,573	2,666	2,646	4,637
107	116	129	181	2,895	2,136	1,954	3,373
87	90	93	137	1,700	1,239	1,125	1,258
113	116	128	150	5,652	4,309	4,336	4,997
413	432	457	599	13,820	10,350	10,061	14,265
153	156	198	251	5,427	4,134	3,607	3,349
.....	185	2,628
107	113	129	178	2,667	1,515	1,333	1,637
.....	150	330
108	115	128	140	4,879	4,100	3,595	4,306
368	384	455	904	12,973	9,749	8,535	12,444
2,705	2,719	2,845	3,703	108,689	80,807	68,327	93,884
92	100	105	127	2,015	1,493	1,169	1,607
96	104	120	139	1,812	1,615	1,179	2,243
59	68	84	96	1,159	979	1,292	1,607
33	32	39	37	179	224	147	110
48	44	48	47	225	210	167	228
53	52	57	55	342	304	712	1,305
13	16	17	11	28	29	37	45
55	50	57	51	178	222	267	621
44	43	46	35	132	162	109	129
493	509	573	598	6,070	5,238	5,079	7,895
493	509	573	598	6,070	5,238	5,079	7,895
59	56	56	71	2,157	1,695	894	1,017
66	65	105	142	1,368	938	1,095	1,457
58	53	74	85	4,309	826	758	918
37	38	40	43	1,350	665	436	411
84	84	97	103	1,122	3,392	2,490	3,513
53	54	62	67	961	1,251	993	867
357	350	434	511	11,267	8,767	6,666	8,183
55	59	61	59	1,067	795	682	936
80	73	66	58	672	437	421	577
53	52	56	55	731	523	437	586
47	50	52	46	995	735	427	451
43	44	44	45	1,143	648	472	705
85	81	92	81	1,486	1,108	776	893
363	359	371	344	6,094	4,246	3,215	4,148
49	49	54	49	1,105	588	598	481
77	71	73	70	1,313	821	654	1,011
57	57	56	55	1,109	977	725	926
55	51	49	44	684	544	407	429
64	62	61	51	1,536	1,469	978	1,417
302	290	293	275	5,747	4,399	3,362	4,264
47	51	49	47	789	585	604	692
46	46	53	47	888	554	521	522
77	76	84	96	1,337	851	962	972
52	51	56	61	1,297	907	706	809
23	26	28	24	170	172	139	180
46	55	65	62	583	413	370	304

Precinct.	Area Square Miles.	Miles of Street.	Total Population.	Patrol Posts.	Average Length.	Population Per Patrol Posts.
*11.....	18.88	475.34	404,000	222	2.14	1,820
168.....	5.80	115.00	6,000	17	6.94	353
169.....	3.40	72.50	13,000	26	3.07	500
170.....	3.33	89.00	25,000	27	3.29	926
174.....	4.40	122.00	17,000	19	6.42	895
*15.....	16.93	398.50	61,000	89	4.48	685
143.....	4.00	76.00	89,000	51	1.57	1,745
144.....	1.53	34.00	84,000	42	.81	2,000
171.....	3.70	91.00	16,000	35	2.67	457
172.....	3.75	110.00	47,000	54	1.59	870
173.....	1.25	35.00	29	1.21
*16.....	14.23	346.00	236,000	211	1.64	1,118
Brooklyn.....	66.73	1,656.69	1,679,000	1,096	1.51	1,532
276.....	8.25	147.75	33,000	31	4.77	1,065
278.....	35.00	250.00	22,000	42	5.95	524
279.....	2.25	40.00	6,000	16	2.50	375
281.....	4.00	50.00	4,000	16	3.13	250
290.....	1.37	29.43	7,000	11	2.67	636
292.....	2.57	44.00	6,000	8	5.50	750
*12.....	53.44	561.18	78,000	124	4.53	626
274.....	18.00	142.00	42,000	27	5.26	1,556
275.....	3.73	25.00	21,000	30	3.83	700
277.....	10.00	81.00	40,000	24	3.38	1,667
282.....	6.12	70.00	20,000	17	4.12	1,176
283.....	5.58	90.00	16,000	17	5.29	941
285.....	5.23	92.00	67,000	36	2.55	1,861
*17.....	48.93	500.00	206,000	151	3.31	1,364
Queens.....	102.37	1,061.18	284,000	275	3.86	1,033
80.....	5.73	78.00	22,000	20	3.90	1,100
81.....	11.61	93.00	45,000	22	4.23	2,045
89.....	24.00	150.00	8,000	9	16.67	889
99.....	16.54	80.00	11,000	8	10.00	1,375
*13.....	57.88	401.00	86,000	59	6.80	1,458
Richmond.....	57.88	401.00	86,000	59	6.80	1,458
City.....	290.85	4,450.35	4,821,000	2,800	1.59	1,722

*Districts.

Table

List of Positions Held by Members of the Police Department

Character of Duties.	
Doormen:	
Manhattan (including 14th Inspection District).....	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="font-size: 3em; margin-right: 5px;">{</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 1 2 1 73 — </div> </div>

Average Number of Patrolmen.				Total Arrests and Summonses.			
1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.
291	305	335	337	5,064	3,482	3,302	3,479
51	54	61	50	258	193	939	377
71	66	66	52	1,335	852	1,964	1,451
36	38	40	41	386	266	264	266
..	29	34	36	11	178	174
158	187	201	179	1,979	1,322	3,345	2,268
64	62	67	63	1,501	837	635	912
78	79	83	77	1,441	969	731	842
37	44	51	57	418	241	176	309
62	71	74	94	621	389	417	684
59	55	53	56	921	188	191	128
300	311	328	347	4,910	2,660	2,150	2,875
1,771	1,802	1,962	1,993	35,061	24,876	22,040	25,217
46	43	41	37	283
41	44	51	50	466	481	1,132	1,650
29	25	30	36	273	193	106	178
32	30	39	41	35	134	106	112
23	23	21	21	68	73	57	60
16	15	12	15	81	51	35	38
187	180	194	200	1,206	932	1,436	2,038
53	54	62	67	472	420	393	393
54	57	61	63	760	569	454	321
37	35	40	40	252	207	150	139
23	23	25	23	187	128	108	119
30	28	28	28	234	167	87	154
36	35	45	42	511	349	306	382
233	232	261	263	2,416	1,840	1,498	1,508
420	412	455	463	3,622	2,772	2,934	3,546
35	41	51	46	672	475	251	207
45	45	53	51	929	889	549	544
15	13	14	19	277	84	69	48
19	21	24	20	311	128	84	38
114	120	142	136	2,189	1,576	953	837
114	120	142	136	2,189	1,576	953	837
5,503	5,562	5,977	6,893	155,631	115,269	99,333	131,379

III.

t on February 20, 1913, That Should Be Held by Civilians.

No. of Members of Police Department Employed.	Rank of Officers and Grades of Patrolmen.	Salary Cost Per Annum.
	5	\$1,000 00
	4	2,200 00
	3	1,200 00
	1	102,200 00
77		\$106,600 00

Character of Duties.

Bronx	{ 1 1 14
Brooklyn	{ 5 2 1 59
Queens	{ 1 20
Richmond	{ — 6
Totals	
Patrol Wagon Drivers—Horse:	
Manhattan	32
Bronx	8
Brooklyn	45
Queens	4
Richmond	{ 1 1
Totals	—
Patrol Wagon Drivers—Auto:	
Manhattan	{ 1 1 1 1 5
Totals	—
Character of Duties.	
Coachmen:	
Driver to Inspector, 11th Inspection District.....	1
Chauffeurs:	
To Commissioner	1
First Deputy	1
Third Deputy	1
Chief Inspector	1
Inspectors	{ 1 2
Mail car	2
Totals	
Hostlers, 42d pct.....	
Kennel duty, 172d pct.....	
Chief Lineman, Telegraph Bureau	
Linemen, Telegraph Bureau.....	
Chief of Boiler Inspectors.....	
Boiler Inspectors	
Totals	

No. of Members of Police Department Employed.		Rank of Officers and Grades of Patrolmen.	Salary Cost Per Annum.		
		6	\$900 00		
		4	1,100 00		
		1	19,600 00		
16				21,600 00	
		6	\$4,500 00		
		5	2,000 00		
		3	1,200 00		
		1	82,600 00		
67				\$90,300 00	
		3	\$1,200 00		
		1	28,000 00		
21				29,200 00	
6		1	8,400 00	
—	187				\$256,100 00
32		1	\$44,800 00	
8		1	11,200 00	
45		1	63,000 00	
4		1	5,600 00	
..		2	1,350 00	
2		1	1,400 00	2,750 00	
—	91				127,350 00
		6	900 00		
		4	1,100 00		
		3	1,200 00		
		2	1,350 00		
		1	7,000 00		
9				\$11,550 00	
—	9				11,550 00
1	1	1	1,400 00	1,400 00	1,400 00
1		5	1,000 00	
1		4	1,100 00	
1		4	1,100 00	
1		4	1,100 00	
..		6	900 00	
3		1	2,800 00	3,700 00	
2		1	2,800 00	
—	9				10,800 00
..	1	1	1,400 00
..	1	1	1,400 00
..	1	1	1,500 00
..	5	8,212 50
..	1	1	1,400 00
{ 2		2	2,700 00	
{ 5		1	7,000 00	
—	7				9,700 00

Character of Duties.

Chief of Engineers and Firemen.....		
Examining Engineers		
In command of boiler squad.....		
Custodians of buildings:		
240 Centre street, Man.....		
300 Mulberry street, Man.....		
Borough Hdqts. Bldg., Bklyn.....		
Totals		
Bicycle Repairers.....		
Chief Clerks of Bureaus and Offices:		
Third Deputy Commissioner's office.....		
Fourth Deputy Commissioner's office.....		
Chief Inspector's office.....		
Complaint Clerk's office.....		
Bureau of Information, Man.....		
Bureau of Information, Bklyn.....		
Bureau of Criminal Ident.....		
Bureau of Repairs and Supplies.....		
Offices of Inspection Districts:		
Manhattan		
Brooklyn		
Bronx		
Queens		
Richmond		
Totals		
Chief Clerks of Divisions:		
Division of Horses and Equipment.....		
Division of Supplies.....		
Division of Repairs.....		
Storehouse		
Stationery		
Correspondence Room D. D., Man.....		
Correspondence Room D. D., Bklyn.....		
Clerks—		
Precincts and Districts:		
Manhattan	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 5px;">{</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 1 1 2 1 1 13 </div> </div>	
Bronx	—	19
Brooklyn	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 5px;">{</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 1 7 </div> </div>	1
Queens	—	8
Richmond		2
		1

No. of Members of Police Department Employed.		Rank of Officers and Grades of Patrolmen.	Salary Cost Per Annum.	
..	1	3	1,200 00
..	2	1	2,800 00
..	1	Lt.	2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		1	1,400 00
1		Sgt.	1,750 00
—	3		5,400 00
..	2	1	2,800 00
1		Sgt.	1,750 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Capt.	2,750 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
6		Lts.	13,500 00	
6		Lts.	13,500 00	
1		Lt.	2,250 00	
2		Lts.	4,500 00	
1		Lt.	2,250 00	36,000 00
—	24		54,000 00
				\$499,262 50
1		Lt.	\$2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		1	1,400 00
1		1	1,400 00
1		Lt.	2,250 00
1		Sgt.	1,750 00
—	7		\$13,550 00
..		Lt.*	\$1,125 00	
..		Sgt.*	875 00	
..	5		2,000 00	
..	3		1,200 00	
..	2		1,350 00	
..	1		18,200 00	
			24,750 00
..	1		1,400 00
..	2		1,350 00	
..	1		9,800 00	
			11,150 00
..	1		2,800 00
31	1		1,400 00
			41,500 00

Character of Duties.

Headquarters :		
	{	5
		2
		1
Manhattan	{	3
		2
		44
		—
		57
Brooklyn	{	1
		6
		—
		7
		—
Court Dispositions		
Totals		
Desk Duty :		
Manhattan		
Brooklyn	{	3
		3
		—
Totals		
Stenographers and Typists.....		
Stock Clerks		
Telephone Operator Chiefs.....		
Telephone Operators		
Draughtsmen		
Interpreter		
Messengers		
Total Number of Members of Police Department Employed.....		

*On clerical and patrol duty.

No. of Members of Police Department Employed.		Rank of Officers and Grades of Patrolmen.	Salary Cost Per Annum.		
..		Lts.	11,250 00		
..		Sgts.	3,500 00		
..		7	800 00		
..		6	2,700 00		
..		5	2,000 00		
..		1	61,600 00		
				81,850 00	
..		2	\$1,350 00		
64		1	8,400 00		
				9,750 00	
					91,600 00
1		Sgt.	1,750 00
—	96				\$134,850 00
3		Lts.	6,750 00
		Lts.	6,750 00	
6		1	4,200 00	
—	9				10,950 00
					17,700 00
					17,700 00
{ 2		6	1,800 00
{ 1		5	1,000 00
{ 3		1	4,200 00
—	6				7,000 00
{ 1		900 00
{ 5		1	7,000 00
—	6				7,900 00
{ 8		Lts.	18,000 00
{ 1		Sgt.	1,750 00
—	9				19,750 00
{ 1		2	1,350 00
{ 38		1	53,200 00
—	39				54,550 00
..	2	1	2,800 00
..	1	Sgt.	1,750 00
{ 1		5	1,000 00
{ 6		1	8,400 00
—	7				9,400 00
528			Total Salary Cost Per Annum.....		\$754,962 50

Table IV.
Post Statistics.

	Patrol Posts.	Fixed Posts.	Patrol- men Nec- essary.	Patrolmen on Duty	Excess of Patrol Posts Over Number of Patrolmen on Duty.	Patrol Posts Only Half Patrolled.
1.....	23	18	87	85	1	2
5.....	26	19	97	98
7.....	23	17	86	84	1	2
13.....	31	31	124	128
15.....	32	23	119	108	4	8
17.....	21	15	78	76	1	2
1st Insp. Dist.....	156	123	591	579	7	14
2.....	21	19	82	78	1	2
6.....	25	18	93	88	2	4
8.....	24	21	93	87	2	4
10.....	25	20	95	93	1	2
12.....	18	12	66	66
14.....	30	25	115	111	1	2
16.....	26	19	97	88	3	6
2nd Insp. Dist.....	169	134	641	611	10	20
18.....	29	23	110	104	2	4
21.....	38	27	141	135	2	4
22.....	28	20	104	95	3	6
23.....	29	20	107	103	1	2
25.....	24	18	90	88	1	2
3rd Insp. Dist.....	148	108	552	525	9	18
26.....	37	30	141	136	2	4
28.....	49	38	185	171	5	10
32.....	41	36	159	145	5	10
33.....	54	..	162	74	29	58
4th Insp. Dist.....	181	104	647	526	41	82
29.....	36	31	139	136	1	2
31.....	46	40	178	204
35.....	38	32	146	136	3	6
39.....	40	34	154	152	1	2
5th Insp. Dist.....	160	137	617	628	5	10
36.....	53	42	201	191	3	6
37.....	52	43	199	192	2	4
40.....	37	28	139	135	1	2

	Patrol Posts.	Fixed Posts.	Patrol- men Nec- essary.	Patrolmen on Duty	Excess of Patrol Posts Over Number of Patrolmen on Duty.	Patrol Posts Only Half Patrolled.
42.....	47	21	162	157	2	4
43.....	35	28	133	125	3	6
6th Insp. Dist.....	224	162	834	800	11	22
Manhattan	1,038	768	3,882	3,669	83	166
61.....	50	35	185	141	15	30
63.....	81	51	294	155	46	92
65.....	76	43	271	111	53	106
66.....	20	..	60	35	8	16
68.....	29	..	87	47	13	26
69.....	25	..	75	50	8	16
74.....	28	..	84	48	12	24
77.....	7	..	21	10	4	8
79.....	16	..	48	35	4	8
7th Insp. Dist.....	332	129	1,125	632	163	326
Bronx	332	129	1,125	632	163	326
145.....	30	17	107	74	11	22
146.....	43	37	166	136	10	20
147.....	28	22	106	87	6	12
148.....	13	10	49	41	3	6
149.....	38	26	140	99	14	28
150.....	29	17	104	64	13	26
8th Insp. Dist.....	181	129	672	501	57	114
154.....	46	36	174	64	37	74
155.....	38	29	143	61	27	54
156.....	44	29	161	59	34	68
157.....	24	16	88	53	12	24
158.....	31	23	116	47	23	46
164.....	52	38	194	90	35	70
9th Insp. Dist.....	235	171	876	374	168	336
159.....	31	21	114	49	22	44
160.....	41	30	153	68	28	56
161.....	32	22	118	56	21	42
162.....	25	16	91	43	16	32
163.....	29	22	109	56	18	36
10th Insp. Dist.....	158	111	585	272	105	210

	Patrol Posts.	Fixed Posts.	Patrol- men Nec- essary.	Patrolmen on Duty	Excess of Patrol Posts Over Number of Patrolmen on Duty.	Patrol Posts Only Half Patrolled.
151.....	27	2	83	46	12	24
152.....	35	..	105	47	19	38
153.....	63	..	189	104	28	56
165.....	42	..	126	60	22	44
166.....	13	..	39	24	5	10
167.....	42	1	127	62	22	44
11th Insp. Dist.....	222	3	669	343	108	216
168.....	17	4	55	48	2	4
169.....	26	..	78	39	13	26
170.....	27	..	81	41	13	26
174.....	19	2	59	35	8	16
15th Insp. Dist.....	89	6	273	163	36	72
143.....	51	..	153	67	29	58
144.....	42	..	126	77	16	32
171.....	35	..	105	61	15	30
172.....	54	6	168	101	22	44
173.....	29	..	87	55	11	22
16th Insp. Dist.....	211	6	639	361	93	186
Brooklyn	1,096	426	3,714	2,014	567	1,134
276.....	31	..	93	34	20	40
278.....	42	..	126	49	26	52
279.....	16	..	48	35	4	8
281.....	16	..	48	41	2	4
290.....	11	..	33	21	4	8
292.....	8	..	24	17	2	4
12th Insp. Dist.....	124	..	372	197	58	116
274.....	27	..	81	63	6	12
275.....	30	..	90	63	9	18
277.....	24	..	72	41	10	20
282.....	17	..	51	23	9	18
283.....	17	..	51	28	8	16
285.....	36	..	108	43	22	44
17th Insp. Dist.....	151	..	453	261	64	128
Queens	275	..	825	458	122	244

	Patrol Posts.	Fixed Posts.	Patrol- men Nec- essary.	Patrolman on Duty	Excess of Patrol Posts Over Number of Patrolmen on Duty.	Patrol Posts Only Half Patrolled.
80.....	20	..	60	46	5	10
81.....	22	..	66	48	6	12
89.....	9	..	27	24	1	2
99.....	8	..	24	18	2	4
13th Iisp. Dist.....	59	..	177	136	14	28
Richmond	59	..	177	136	14	28
<i>City of New York.</i>						
Manhattan	1,038	768	3,882	3,669	83	166
Bronx	332	129	1,125	632	163	326
Brooklyn	1,096	426	3,714	2,014	567	1,134
Queens	275	..	825	458	122	244
Richmond	59	..	177	136	14	28
	2,800	1,323	9,723	6,909	949	1,898

Table V.
Patrol of Other Cities.

	Area in Square Miles.	Population.	Miles of Streets.	Strength of Police Force.	Population Per Policeman.	Number of Patrolmen.	Population Per Patrolman.	Patrolmen on Patrol.	Patrolmen Per Square Mile.
New York	290.85	5,250,000	4,450.35	10,371	507	9,387	559	6,909	32
London	699.42*	10,000,000*	21,000	476	16,690	599	24
Philadelphia	129	1,549,008	1,181	3,882	398	3,190	485	2,468	25
Chicago	190	2,326,400	2,921	4,466	521	3,994	581	1,539	21
Boston	42.50	686,092	1,558	440	1,359	504	1,250	32
Cincinnati	66.35	264,465	665	548	488	746	360	7

*The London Metropolitan Police patrols more than the city of London.

APPENDIX E.

School for Recruits.

Table I.—Teaching Staff.

Table II.—History, Occupation and Literacy of Last Ninety-six Men Appointed to Force.

Table I.
Teachers in Recruit School and Their Experience.

Name and Rank.	Length of Teaching Service.	Length of Police Service.
James Savage, Captain.....	1½ years	20 years
P. Gargon, Lieutenant.....	4 years	31 years
Wm. Dugan, Patrolman.....	1 month	16 years
Thomas Shaw, Patrolman.....	9 months	5 years
I. Cantor, Patrolman.....	9 months	4 years
Henry Seligman, Patrolman.....	4 years	10 years

None of the instructors in the school had any teaching experience previous to assignment to the school.

Table II.

History, Occupation and Literacy of the Last Ninety-six Men Appointed to Force.

An analysis of the Civil Service records of the last 96 Patrolmen appointed to the police force prior to our investigation of the school, shows that 94 had attended common school (grade reached not stated), and only two had attended high school.

Section 284 of the New York Charter provides that "no person shall be appointed or reappointed to membership in the police force or continue to hold membership therein * * * who cannot read and write understandingly the English language."

Inadequate school preparation and inadequate Civil Service tests are evidenced by the prevalence of misspelling, poor grammar and illegible penmanship in the Civil Service papers of the recruits. The following illustrations are taken from the Civil Service papers of these men, all of whom are now Probationary Policemen.

"Dead Body is take from the river the patrolman that is on Duty at the time the Body was found had charge of it tell conron come and then he would take it away and find out woe it may be.

"A destitute woman is found Starving in the street when the patrolman that is on Duty see it he left the pirciet he is in and them have it taking away and then left the conron no about it." (Writing very poor.)

"(One) It is held for Coringer.

"(B) I would rap for assistance surond the place and enter with anouther officer.

"(A) Go to the Mgrgrastate and issue a summons.

"No. 17 (B) To care for Inamable and to Exit to Public Buildings. (Writing illegible.)

"The Woman would be brouth to staten house and Send for a Amblance and if she needs treatment and if not she would be sent to the charity Sacisty.

"I as a Patrolman would call for my side partner to keep the crowed a way and would call for amblance and take the names an address and age of every Persers that where hurt and how they where hurt and to witch Hospitel they Whent and I would make the arrest of the shoffer and the Motorman and make a report to staeton house." (Writing illegible.)

"A. Try and find out he is and have a couple of Citizen and go through his clothes and see if can find any card or adress if noify the Corroner and put down when he aros pick up and arbout hour and notif the Captain and send it to the Morgue and put this in you Mandreme Book and report to superior officer at once.

"B. If she is staving try and help her has much has you can if she has knou home send her to the Municapal lodiging house and if is close take her to the station house and repout the Department of Charties." (Writing very poor.)

"A. Rap for assents wring for samplaces and do the best I can to save Lives. Ring Fire Alam rap for assents and go back to Fire and save Lives and Property. Report it to station for help to Drew Fire Line.

"A. Tell the Citizen to go to Court and get a Warrent and have him Lock up.

"B. If the man was still on the Connor go with him Lock him up. If he Was gone I would as him full Discription of the Man Report it to Station House and take the Citizen Name and Adress Put it in Memradm Book."

"Try and get the people to safty call an amblance take there names address age what the worked at find out what engres they got. Take man of automobile License No. Mortoman if any are dead locked to up bothe man. call the patrol.

"Try and not he seem me and get my side partner but keep my eye on hin all the time. I would not let him have start on me so I woul go quietly and lock up find out the owner find what is gon and the amount and aleram people."

"I would firist call the City Ambulace then take the mane of the Schefeur and number of Automobilee, and also get mane of men rummong the car and also the mme of the ingured put the offenders (can't read) called the acident under arrest then try and revive the ingured."

"The Police would be into cantact whith the Department of Charities.

"The Patrolmon woud Pick it up and brand to satiron hause and inkice Porcel dined call for it the Police would taun it over to Society Peventions Curlitey Childrens some times call the Carrey Society."

"B. I would go in awack all the tenement in the house ane try to get all the tename out safe.

"I would bramb it mear by sable and mack a rapid of it in saterion house.

"Lock for Hallen Asderson a Cachld Septice 19 years old Ware classes Blue eyes Bran hear up to Sadday Last was a nouse in Buliven Hospetle exceped from queantime island."

Clearly several of these examples of English writing hardly meet the charter requirements.

It is incredible that men of such illiteracy should have been admitted to the force. The standards of the civil service tests have obviously been lowered to obtain an adequate number of Policemen. The low ratings of these recruits may indicate more adequate knowledge of police work than they possess, for doubtless many of them are the products of the so-called civil service schools. These schools prepare candidates for civil service examinations. Cramming them sufficiently to pass an examination but giving them no real training. These schools practically negative the value of the written civil service tests and make comprehensive training and vigorous tests all the more important after appointment to the force.

The degree and kind of training required by probationers depend in part on the character of their ante-police experience. The diversity of the occupational experience of probationers and its varying relation to the character of work required of policemen is shown by the following analysis of occupations for five years preceding civil service examination:

Civil Occupation of 96 Patrolmen for Five Years Previous to Appointment.

One Occupation for Five Years.		More than One Occupation for Five Years.	
	No.		No.
Driver	12	Iron worker and driver	2
Clerk	6	Sawyer, laborer, helper	1

One Occupation for Five Years.		More than One Occupation for Five Years.	
	No.		No.
Butcher	3	Motorman, odd jobs	1
Plumber	3	Clerk, porter, driver	1
Blacksmith	2	Real estate agent, clerk, driver	1
Stationary Fireman	2	Clerk, electrician	1
Mason	2	Switchman, fireman, driver	1
Superintendent	2	Fireman, cowboy	1
Conductor	2	Butcher and driver	1
Timekeeper	1	Messenger (one year)	1
Laborer	2	Machinist and packer	1
Machinist	1	Plumber's helper, clerk and salesman.....	1
Soldier	1	Theatrical business and shipping clerk.....	1
Salesman	1	Newspaper hustler and laborer	1
Golf	1	Driver and truckmaker	1
Pedlar	1	Sheet straightener and driver	1
Elevator operator ..	1	U. S. Marine Corps and farmer	1
Plasterer	1	Driver and bricklayer	1
Expressman	1	Soldier and motorman	1
Bill poster	1	Chauffeur, useful man and groom	1
Special police	1	Confectioner, elevated conductor	1
Car repairer	1	Iron worker, checker, hoister, runner	1
Guard	1	Laundry and plumber's helper.....	1
Draftsman	1	Laborer and Driver	1
Stone polisher	1	Bookkeeper, chauffeur and driver	1
Granite cutter	1	Driver and sign painter	1
Meter tester	1	Pianomaker and driver	1
Varnisher	1	Driver and bartender	1
Sponger	1	Clerk and feeder	1
Iron worker	1	Watchman, polisher and butcher	1
Chauffeur	1	Conductor and waiter	1
Jeweler	1	Patrolman, soldier, clerk	1
Bricklayer ..	1	Letter carrier and printer	1
		Chauffeur, driver and helper	1
		Clerk and platform man	1
		Driver and motorman	1

Obviously, a Patrolman who has been a clerk, timekeeper or salesman, should need less brushing up in the use of English in report writing than a bricklayer, a butcher, a hostler or cowboy.

The first requisite of a good Policeman is sympathy with the law. That certain recruits are in need of instruction in the spirit of laws and the importance of their enforcement is indicated at least by the police record of 30 members of the group under consideration.

Table Showing Police Records of Recruits.

Offense.	No. of Arrests.	No. of Acquittals.	No. of Convictions.	Sentence.		No Disposition Stated.
				Parole.	Imprisonment.	
Disorderly Conduct..	9	4	3	1	2	2
Traffic regulations	2	1	1	..	1	..
Abandonment	1	..	1	1
Rape	1	1
Violation City Ord.	1	Suspended	..
Violation City Ord.— Bon Fire	2	1	Suspended	..
Running from home	1	1
Stealing ice cream	1	1
Misdemeanor	1	1
Pool parlor on Sunday	1	1
Posting bills	1	..	1	..	1	..
Auto speeding	1	..	1	..	1	..
Auto smoking	1	..	1	..	1	..
Assault, 1st degree	1	1
Suspicion	1	1
Gambling, craps	1	1
Assault and excise	1	1
Breaking police lamp	1	1
Shooting craps	1	1
Assault	1	..	1	..	1	..
Violation Sullivan Law	1	1
Playing baseball	1	..	1	..	1	..
Disorderly conduct	1	..	1	..	1	..
Simple assault	1	1
Throwing dice	1	1
Driving without light	1	1
Fighting in street	1	1
Total	37	16 (43.3%)	11 (29.3%)	2	9	2
				2	2	8

The preceding table shows that of 30 recruits who had been arrested, six had been arrested more than once, making a total of 37 arrests. In these 37 cases there were 11 convictions, of which 2 were paroled and fined, 2 cases were suspended, and in 8 cases disposition was not stated.

In order that no unfair impression might be given by this analysis, a further analysis was made of the police records of the last 421 Patrolmen appointed to the force prior to February, 1913. Of this total group 147, or 35 per cent., had previously been arrested, 35 had been arrested twice, 5 three times, 5 four times, 2 five times, 1 six times, 1 seven times.

An analysis of arrests and convictions follows:

Offences.	Arrests.	Convictions.
Disorderly Conduct	85	36
Violation Corporation Ordinance	40	31
Assault	21	3
Larceny	16	2
Violation Sanitary Code	6	2
Violation Traffic Law	6	3
Vagrancy	5	3
Abandonment	5	2
Intoxication	5	4
Violation Health Law	5	2
Violation Liquor Tax Law	4	1
Burglary	3	..
Seduction	2	..
Cruelty to Animals	2	2
Homicide	2	..
Crap-shooting	2	1

APPENDIX

Policemen in

Table

Time Consumed by Policemen in

	Number Cases Observed.	Number Policemen Observed.	Total Time in Court.	
			Hrs.	Min.
Summary of all cases observed.....	796	637	1,108	58
Summary of arrest cases.....	466	435	730	26
†Summary of summons cases.....	330	202	378	32
Summary of cases on which policemen were at court during their time off.	210	176	*314	47
Arrest cases on which policemen were at court during their time off.	141	140	*243	40.5
†Summons cases on which policemen were at court during their time off.	69	36	*71	6.5
Summary of cases on which policemen were at court while on duty.....	586	461	794	11
Arrest cases on which policemen were at court while on duty.....	325	295	486	45.5
†Summons cases on which policemen were at court while on duty.....	261	166	307	25.5

In 26.4% of all cases observed, policemen were at court during their time off.

In 30.3% of all arrest cases, policemen were at court during their time off. 33.

In 20.9% of all summons cases, policemen were at court during their time off.
time off.

*Does not include time spent by policemen in going to and from courts while on

†Time at which summons is returnable is assumed to be the time at which officer

Offences.	Arrests.	Convictions.
Violation Rules of Road	1	1
Bastardy	1	..
Violation Motor Vehicle Law	1	1
Pool Room, Section 265	1	..
Rape	1	..
Keeping Gambling House	1	..
Participating in Immoral Shows	1	..
Conspiracy	1	..
Playing Ball	1	1
Carrying Concealed Weapons	1	..
Truancy	1	..
Gambling	2	..
Misdemeanor	1	..
Violation Bicycle Law	1	1
Suspicious Person	1	1
Total	226	96

F.

the Courts.

I.

Attendance at Magistrates' Courts.

Time Consumed.				Average Time Required for Each Case.					
Between Arrival and Arraignment.		Between Arraignment and Disposition.		Total Time in Court.		Between Arrival and Arraignment.		Between Arraignment and Disposition.	
Hrs.	Min.	Hrs.	Min.	Hrs.	Min.	Hrs.	Min.	Hrs.	Min.
1,071	49	37	9	1	23.6	1	20.8	..	2.8
700	42	29	44	1	34	1	30.2	..	3.8
371	7	7	25	1	8.8	1	7.5	..	1.3
304	57	9	50	1	29.9	1	27.1	..	2.8
235	28	8	12.5	1	43.7	1	40.2	..	3.5
69	29	1	37.5	1	1.8	1	.4	..	1.4
766	52	27	19	1	21.3	1	18.5	..	2.8
465	14	21	31.5	1	29.8	1	25.8	..	4.0
301	38	5	47.5	1	10.6	1	9.3	..	1.3

28.5% of total time spent at court was spent by policemen during their time off.

3% of time spent at court on arrest cases was spent by policemen during their time off.

18.7% of time spent at court on summons cases was spent by policemen during their

their time off.

arrived at court.

APPENDIX
Surgical

Table I.—Personnel of Bureau.

Table II.—Physicians in Other City Departments.

Table
Surgical Bureau—
July 1, 1911—

Name of Surgeon.	Number of District.	Hours at Office Daily.	Number of Uniformed Force in District.	Total Number Sick Days.	Average Number of Calls per Patient Made by Surgeon Living in District.
Chief Surgeon Palmer....
Fred J. Schoenenberger..	1	3	295	1,977
E. J. Donlin.....	2	4	430	5,218½	8.23
A. S. Vosburgh.....	3	6	495	5,490	4.63
C. E. Nammack.....	4	3	400	4,164½	7.57
S. M. Johnson.....	5	4	373	4,485½
M. A. McGovern.....	6	3	465	6,922	8.65
D. J. Donovan.....	7	3	464	6,561½	7.67
J. D. Gorman.....	8	2	387	6,213½	11.75
M. Williams	9	3	438	3,894	6.65
E. T. Higgins.....	10	3	421	5,115	7.8
A. H. Brown.....	11	4	444	3,795½
L. F. Warner.....	12	4	459	4,299½
C. J. Dillon.....	13	4	376	3,931
W. B. Brouner.....	14	2	457	3,714
A. D. Smith.....	15	6	428	3,428½	4.67
E. H. Fiske.....	16	1	485	6,198½	4.9
F. R. Oastler.....	17	3	443	2,812½
E. V. Hubbard.....	18	1½	453	6,666
D. D. Jennings.....	19	3	462	4,360	5.2
T. A. McGoldrick.....	20	2	376	3,044
H. G. Webster.....	21	2	256	3,749½
P. J. Murray.....	22	4	391	5,502½
H. P. deForest..... }	23	2½	378	4,494½
P. F. O'Hanlon..... }					
F. J. Murray.....	24	3	415	4,409½

G.

Bureau.

Table III.—“Sick Leaves.”

Table IV.—Causes of Retirement on Pension.

I.

Police Department.

June 30, 1912.

Average Number of Calls per Patient Made by Surgeon Living Out- side of District.	Number of Times Patients Were Treated by Surgeons Residing		Number of Times Ap- pearing on Survey Board When Disability Pensions Granted.	Miles Residing from Nearest Part of District to Which Assigned.	Miles Uniformed Force Must Travel to Reach Surgeon.
	In District.	Outside of District.			
....
3.22	951	45	3½	3½ to 14
....	3,543	18	Dist.	Dist.
....	2,295	18	Dist.	Dist.
....	3,028	24	Dist.	Dist.
7.8	2,910	37	2½	2½
....	4,032	43	Dist.	0 to 4½
....	3,559	26	Dist.	Dist.
....	4,549	43	Dist.	Dist.
....	2,914	29	Dist.	Dist.
....	3,286	12	Dist.	Dist.
5.1	2,267	16	1	1
5.99	2,752	25	5	5
5.23	1,968	11	7	7
4.2	1,923	12	2	2
....	2,011	17	Dist.	Dist.
....	2,379	50	Dist.	Dist.
2.23	989	17	4	4
5.89	2,670	52	7	7
....	2,405	52	Dist.	Dist.
4.2	1,581	23	2	2
6.3	1,614	25	1	1 to 10
7.23	2,828	42	1½	1½ to 10
5.05	1,911	25	25	25
5.42	2,251	27	14	14

Name of Surgeon, Residence and Precincts Composing Surgeon's District.
 Chief Surgeon Palmer.
 Fred J. Schoenenberger, 260 West 71st street, 80-81-89-99 Staten Island and 1-2-8
 Manhattan.
 E. J. Donlin, 118 West 12th street, 7-10-13-14-15-17 Manhattan.
 A. S. Vosburgh, 137 East 39th street, 18-22-23-26 Manhattan.
 C. E. Nammack, 42 East 29th street, 6-12-16-21-25-29 Manhattan.
 S. M. Johnson, 51 West 9th street, 28-32 Manhattan.
 M. A. McGovern, 1203 Park avenue, 5-35 Manhattan.
 D. J. Donovan, 46 East 126th street, 36 and Part of 37 and 43 Manhattan.
 J. D. Gorman, 326 East 67th street, 31-39 and Part of 37 and 43 Manhattan.
 M. Williams, 556 West 150th street, 40-74 Manhattan and Bronx.
 E. T. Higgins, 473 East 145th street, 61-79 Bronx.
 A. H. Brown, 262 West 136th street, 63 Bronx.

Table

Surgical Bureau—Police Department—Showing the Salaries

Department and Salary.
Public Charities—Minimum, \$500; maximum, \$6,000.....
Fire—Minimum, \$3,300; maximum, \$3,600.....
Police—\$3,500
Street Cleaning—\$1,800
Correction—Minimum, \$1,200; maximum, \$1,500.....
Coroners—Minimum, \$1,500; maximum, \$3,000.....
Bellevue and Allied Hospitals—Minimum, \$600; maximum, \$4,000.....
Health—Minimum, \$120; maximum, \$7,000.....

*Only 6 of the 427 medical employees of the Board of Health have any private

Table III.
 "Sick Leaves."

An analysis of the "sick leave" and principal causes of disability covering a period of one year from July 1, 1911, to June 30, 1912, reveals the following facts:

(a) Analysis of sick leave according to number of times absent.

2,982 men were reported sick one time.
 720 men were reported sick two times.
 577 men were reported sick three times.
 296 men were reported sick four times.
 155 men were reported sick five times.
 62 men were reported sick six times.
 40 men were reported sick seven times.
 26 men were reported sick eight times.
 12 men were reported sick nine times.
 5 men were reported sick ten times.
 2 men were reported sick eleven times.
 1 man was reported sick twelve times.
 1 man was reported sick thirteen times.
 1 man was reported sick fourteen times.
 1 man was reported sick fifteen times.

(b) The following list shows the principal causes of disability:

L. F. Warner, 159 West 93d street, 65 Bronx.
 C. J. Dillon, 161 West 77th street, 66-68 69-77 Bronx.
 W. B. Brouner, 27 West 9th street, 145-147-148-149-150 Brooklyn.
 A. D. Smith, 159 Herkimer street, Brooklyn, 146-151-172 Brooklyn.
 E. H. Fiske, 152 Lafayette avenue, Brooklyn, 152-155-156-157-158 Brooklyn.
 F. R. Oastler, 126 West 59th street, 159-160-161-162-163 Brooklyn.
 E. V. Hubbard, 11 East 48th street, 153-154-165 Brooklyn.
 D. D. Jennings, 406 Ovington avenue, Brooklyn, 143-171 Brooklyn.
 T. A. McGoldrick, 294 Clinton avenue, Brooklyn, 144-170 Brooklyn.
 H. G. Webster, 364 Washington avenue, Brooklyn, 166-167-168-169-174 Brooklyn.
 P. J. Murray, 478 Classon avenue, 164 Brooklyn and 285 Queens.
 H. P. deForest, 150 West 47th street, 276-278-279-281-282-283 Queens.
 P. F. O'Hanlon, 121 West 95th street, 276-278-279-281-282-283 Queens.
 F. J. Murray, 40 East 31st street, 274-275-277-290-292 Queens.

II.

Received by Medical Men in Various City Departments.

Number Employed.	Office Hours Daily.	Hours on Duty.	Private Practice.	Average Salary Paid.
28	8	Subject to call 24	Yes.	\$1,738.18
11	8	Subject to call 24	Yes.
25	1½ to 6	Subject to call 24	Yes.	3,500.00
4	..	Subject to call 24	Yes.	1,800.00
7	24	Subject to call ..	Yes.	1,286.00
11	10 to 14	10 to 14	Yes.	2,590.90
69	Part time	Yes.	771.42
427	24	*Yes.	1,196.00

practice.

Disease or Condition.	No. of Days Lost.
Diarrhoea	1,526
Gastritis and Indigestion.....	3,722
Gout and Rheumatism.....	9,575
Grippe	3,274½
Laceration	1,143
Laryngitis	882½
Lumbago	1,463
Malaria	892
Nervousness	166½
Neurasthenia	1,821½
Neuralgia	600
Neuritis	837
Otitis Media	544
Pneumonia	1,055½
Tonsillitis	1,929½
Tuberculosis	1,592
Ulcers	1,167

Total number of days absent on account of sickness during the year examined 79,788.

Not many days are lost through illness as a result of alcoholism. An examination of the records shows that in the fiscal year from July 1, 1911, to June 30, 1912, there were but 396½ days sick leave as a result of illness due to alcoholism.

Table III-a.

Surgical Bureau—Police Department of New York City.
Analysis of Causes of Disability in Police Department from July 1, 1911, to June 30, 1912, as Shown by the Card Records in the Office of the Chief Surgeon.

Cause of Disability.	Number of Times on Sick Leave.	Days Lost on Sick Leave.	Cause of Disability.	Number of Times on Sick Leave.	Days Lost on Sick Leave.
Abcess	144	1,331	Dislocation	11	317
Abrasions	50	376	Dog Bites	15	277
Adenoids	5	39	Dysentery	30	145½
Aenemia	9	254½	Diseases not shown	1	2
Alcoholism	51	299	Endocarditis	33	1,073
Appendicitis ...	41	1,042½	Entevitis	318	1,511½
Apoplexy	1	64	Epididymitis	11	110
Arterio Schlevios	11	143½	Epilepsy	2	71
Arthritis	10	105	Ephernal Fever ..	3	10
Asthma	32	379	Erysipelas	22	307
Biliousness	67	247	Eyes Sore	21	71½
Black Eyes	9	60	Eyelid tumor ...	4	11
Blepheritis	3	14½	Epistaxis	9	20
Boils	24	158½	Fatigue	65	105½
Brights Disease.	2	85½	Fancitis	17	72
Bronchitis	309	2,747½	Feet sore	81	415½
Bunion	5	17	Flat feet	79	848
Burns	14	194½	Fistula	11	223½
Calculus	7	182½	Fractures	62	2,618½
Carbuncle	46	597	Frost bite	6	40
Celluhitis	33	559	Furnocolosis	57	315
Circumsision ...	5	18½	Gall stones	9	175
Cirrhosios of Liver	9	210½	Gastritis and indigestion	851	3,722
Cold	234	783½	Gastralgia	14	106
Colic	160	297	Gout and rheumatism	852	9,575
Colitis	139	496½	Gravel	2	59
Concussion of Brain	10	260½	Grippe	549	3,274½
Congestion	25	299	Grief	23	46½
Constipation	125	277	Haemorrhages ..	4	17½
Contusions	300	3,173	Haemorrhoids ..	67	624
Conjunctivitis ..	61	460½	Hay fever	11	109
Comenloinas	1	½	Headache	28	95
Corysa	62	154½	Heat exhaustion.	91	501½
Cystitis	22	159	Hepatitis	3	57
Debility	1	1½	Hernia	43	1,136
Deafness	4	68	Hordeolum	5	38½
Defective Vision	10	372½	Hyperchlorydia .	3	29
Diabetes	10	351½	Heart disease ...	23	650
Diarrhoea	628	1,526	Influenza	416	2,475½
Diphtheria	3	46			

Cause of Disability.	Number of Times on Sick Leave.	Days Lost on Sick Leave.	Cause of Disability.	Number of Times on Sick Leave.	Days Lost on Sick Leave.
Insomnia	81	206	Pruritis	4	19
Insanity	2	155	Pulmonary tuber- culosis	4	28
Intermittent fever	65	281	Purpura	2	30½
Iritis	7	46	Quinsy	7	61½
Jaundice	2	9½	Retinitis	6	60
Lame leg	1	73½	Rhinitis	45	140½
Laceration	69	1,143	Rupture	16	344½
Laryngitis	111	882½	Scabies	4	16½
Locomotor ataxia	4	36½	Sciatica	51	476½
Lumbago	235	1,463	Senility	2	10
Lymphangitis ...	1	23	Sclerosis of spin- al cord	1	51
Malaise	6	21½	Scarlet fever ...	1	54½
Malaria	166	892	Shock	2	166½
Measles	2	33	Smoke inhalation	7	31
Myalgia	65	238	Sprains	236	2,634
Myocarditis	21	488	Sunburn, severe.	28	98
Myositis	22	88	Synovitis	53	787
Nausea and vom- iting	16	34	Syncope	3	16
Nasal haemor- rhage	3	17	Syphilis	2	161½
Necrosis	1	38	Miscellaneous ...	309	3,212½
Nephritis	25	335	Tapeworm	10	30
Nervousness	45	166½	Tetanus	1	126
Neurasthenia ...	136	1,821½	Tachycardia	3	11
Neuralgia	153	600	Tootache	56	167
Neuritis	65	837	Tonsilitis	366	1,929½
No illness	18	22	Trachitis	1	2½
Odemia	2	7	Tuberculosis	20	1,592
Operations	49	1,629	Tumors	4	132
Orchitis	29	315½	Typhoid fever ..	11	615½
Otitis media	44	544	Ulcers	51	1,167
Paralsy	8	291½	Urethritis	1	4
Parotitis	3	36½	Urticaria	3	12
Podalgia	1	9½	Varicose veins..	32	825
Periostitis	6	58½	Vertigo	65	338
Pharyngitis	61	178	Whooping cough	1	13½
Pleurisy	75	576	Worry	8	18
Pleurodynia	7	38½	Wounds	162	527½
Pneumonia	26	1,055½			
Ptomaine poison- ing	21	56½	Total.....	79,788

Table IV.

Causes of Retirement on Pension.
Surgical Bureau—Police Department.

Summary of Causes for the Granting of Disability Pensions to 219 Members of the Uniformed Force.

Diseases of Circulatory System.		Diseases of Ear.	
Heart disease	10	Partial deafness	9
Cardiac hypertrophy	4	Otitis media	2
Endocarditis	16	Diseases of Eye.	
Myocarditis	29	Defective vision	74
Fatty heart	5	Optic neuritis	1
Dilated heart	1	Rheumatic iritis	1
Cardiac asthma	1	Absence of right eye.....	1
Weak heart	2	Conjunctivitis	1
Enlarged heart	1	Diseases of Bones.	
Hemorrhoids	4	Sacral fistula	1
Defective circulation	3	Osteitis	1
Varicose veins	30	Osteomyelitis	1
Arteriosclerosis	23	Osteo-arthritis—Chronic	1
Degeneration of arteries.....	1	Diseases of General Nature.	
Diseases of Extremities.		Obesity	31
Flat feet	46	Cancer of stomach	1
Fallen arches	1	Anasarca	1
Deformed feet	2	Vertigo	1
Deformity—Potts fracture.....	1	Anemia	2
Fractured patella	1	Emaciation	1
Synovitis—Chronic	3	Abdomen pendulous	1
Ligamentaris union	1	Diabetes	5
Arthritis—Chronic	3	Gout	1
Shortening of muscles of right foot..	1	Diseases of Respiratory.	
Muscular atrophy of right leg.....	1	Bronchitis	4
Ankylosis of elbow joint.....	4	Bronchial asthma—Chronic.....	3
Double hallux valgus.....	1	Pulmonary tuberculosis	14
Callosities of feet.....	1	Emphysema	2
Contraction of muscles and cords of both hands	1	Hypertrophy of muscles.....	1
Shortening of left leg due to repeated fractures	1	Laryngitis	1
Deformity of left hand.....	1	Diseases of Genito-urinary System.	
Oedema of right leg—Chronic.....	1	Bright's disease	3
Varicose ulcers	1	Nephritis—Chronic	22
Diseases of Liver.		Cystitis	8
Cirrhosis	5	Prostatitis	1
Hypertrophic cirrhosis	3	Diseases of Digestive Organs.	
Enlarged liver	2	Prolapse of rectum.....	1
Diseases of Brain		Gastritis	2
Premature senility	3	Ulcerative colitis	1
Cerebral softening	1	Malignant growth of intestines.....	1
Epilepsy	2	Incompetency of sphincter muscle...	1
Cerebral hemiplegia	1	Ulcer of stomach.....	1
Defective mentality	2	Injuries.	
Cerebral endarteritis	2	Fractured skull with cerebral compression	1

Leptomeningitis—following depressed fracture of skull.....	1	Hemiplegia	1
Rupture of biceps muscle.....	1	Disease of spinal cord.....	2
Diseases of Nerves.		Paralysis third cranial nerve.....	1
Neuroretinitis	1	Locomotor ataxia	1
Sciatica—Chronic	2	Incipient melancholia	1
Neuritis	4	Ruptures.	
Myelitis	1	Inguinal hernia	11
Neurasthenia	9	Femoral hernia	1
Coccydynia	1	Unbilical hernia	3

APPENDIX H.

Outages.

Table I—Comparative Reports of Outages.

Table I.

Number of Outages of Street Lamps Reported by City Inspectors, Police and Company Inspectors.

	No.	Electric.		Gas.	Naphtha.	Total.
		Arc.	Incan- descent.			
1910.						
City Inspectors	33	20,747	35,771	22,445	2,222	81,185
Police	*2,000	17,558	11,443	15,724	629	45,354
Companies	211	15,976	17,731	33,707
Total		54,281	64,945	38,169	2,851	160,246
Duplicates		8,248	8,458	2,146	21	18,873
Net		46,033	56,487	36,023	2,830	141,373

	No.	Electric.		Gas.	Naphtha.	Total.
		Arc.	Incan- descent.			
Number not reported by police		28,475	45,044	20,299	2,201	96,019
1911.						
Inspectors	33	28,862	48,819	19,484	1,624	98,789
Police	*2,000	18,837	16,728	9,595	477	45,637
Companies	252	41,420	54,738	96,158
Total		89,119	120,285	29,079	2,101	240,584
Duplicates ..		16,971	18,093	1,339	20	36,423
Net		72,148	102,192	27,740	2,081	204,161
Number not reported by police		53,311	85,464	18,145	1,604	158,524

*Estimated.

APPENDIX I.

Preliminary Legislative Report.

March 11, 1913.

The Special Committee, appointed August 5, 1912, by the Board of Aldermen of New York City, to investigate the Police Department, submits the following preliminary legislative report:

Nature of This Report.

This preliminary report upon legislation is submitted at this time in order that it may be available for use during the present session of Legislature. In its final report the Committee will make a summary of its entire investigation, and set forth therein its general conclusions and recommendations upon administrative matters.

Need of Legislation.

The police problem is primarily one of administration. The present situation demands sustained administrative efficiency. There is no magic in the legislative printing press. New legislation should be chiefly for the purpose of improving the administrative machinery of the Police Department. Sections of the Charter needing amendment, together with the amendments recommended, we have scheduled in Appendix A. Bills now pending before the Legislature, with our recommendations thereon, we have scheduled in Appendix B.

Home Rule.

The administration of the Police Department has been hampered by mandatory State legislation, controlling administrative routine. This is inimical to efficiency and subversive of discipline. State laws at present deal with the organization of the department, its different ranks, grades, salaries, qualifications for appointment and promotion, manner of distribution of the force, platoons and tours, structure and quota of the Detective Bureau, Traffic Squad, the suspension, trial and punishment of delinquent Policemen, etc. All such matters should be left entirely to local authorities.

The Police Commissioner.

Appointment, Tenure, Removal.

The Police Commissioner should be appointed by the Mayor for a term of eight years, and should be eligible for reappointment. He should be subject to removal by the Governor, and also by the Mayor, but in either case only after charges preferred and after he has been given opportunity to defend himself in a public hearing.

Charges May Be Preferred by Board of Estimate and Apportionment or Board of Aldermen.

In addition to the right of the Mayor to prefer charges, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment or the Board of Aldermen, by a majority vote, should be given the power to prefer charges against the Police Commissioner, and it should be provided that such charges must be heard by the Mayor at a public hearing, after reasonable notice.

This change should not take effect until January 1, 1914.

Uncertain Tenure Destroys Discipline.

We believe this recommendation to be of vital importance. During the past eleven years we have had eight Commissioners appointed by Mayors of different temperaments and political faiths. There have been three Commissioners during the present City administration. The brief and uncertain tenure of the Commissioner has seriously impaired the efficiency of our police administration. Former Commissioners have testified before us that the force does not respect its head.

Captains and Inspectors upon our witness stand have shown this lack of respect. This is a deplorable situation, and should not be tolerated.

Should Be No "Policy" of Enforcement of Law.

It has been said that the policy of the Police Department should be the Mayor's care and responsibility, and that he should have the power to remove the Commissioner at will. The appointment of a Commissioner should not be a matter of politics. Moreover, there should be no such thing as a "policy" with respect to the enforcement of law. Unenforceable laws should be repealed. People who disapprove of them should seek relief from the Legislature, not from the Police Department. The Police Department should no more have a "policy" with respect to the enforcement of law than the United States army should have a policy in foreign affairs. Police Department Unique.

In this respect the Police Department is essentially different from other departments. Moreover, it is unique in its difficulties and problems. Hence, eight commissioners in eleven years. The Commissioner must have long experience in the department to become efficient. General Bingham, who has served the longest period as Commissioner, has testified before us that it takes between one and two years for a Commissioner to acquaint himself with the conditions and circumstances confronting him. The Commissioner should know the history and character of every superior officer. He should study and learn the spirit of the force at large, in order that he may sympathize with it, or combat it, as occasion requires.

Deputy Commissioners and Inspectors.

Number of Deputies and Inspectors to be Determined by Local Authorities; Chief of Police with Fixed Powers Not Favored.

The increase or decrease in the number of Deputy Commissioners should be determined by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen. The present method of appointment and demotion of Inspectors should be continued, but the power to alter this method should be vested in the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen, and not controlled by legislative enactment. We have been much impressed with Mayor Gaynor's suggestion that more Deputies and fewer Inspectors are needed just at the present time. We think it important that a Commissioner should be able to choose a uniformed cabinet as well as a civilian cabinet, and these in such numbers as occasion requires. Therefore we do not favor the appointment of a permanent Chief of Police. A Commissioner should have power, as at present, to select a Chief Inspector as the head of the uniformed force, and to prescribe for him appropriate duties and authority. To create a Chief of Police with authority fixed by law would be to create a subordinate more powerful within the limits of his authority than the Commissioner.

Gambling and Prostitution.

Studied Only as Police Problems; Graft to be Eliminated by Effective Administration.

The Committee has considered these subjects only as they involve police problems under present laws. We have not studied them as moral problems. Such investigation would have been beyond the scope of the resolution under which the Committee was appointed. We have received shocking evidence of a widespread corrupt alliance between the police and gamblers and disorderly house keepers. The elimination of this grafting is one of the most difficult and important problems with which we are confronted. Believing, however, that the problem is essentially an administrative one, we shall deal comprehensively with it in our final report. We feel that a Commissioner with a fixed tenure, with an adequate staff of Deputy Commissioners, with an ample fund for the engagement of a secret service entirely out-

side of the department, would in time secure and maintain an administrative efficiency that would reduce this evil to a minimum.

Department of Public Morals Opposed.

We are opposed to transferring the enforcement of these laws to a Department of Public Morals, as provided in a bill now pending before the Legislature. We are also opposed to the suggestion that a Board of Social Welfare be established for the same purpose.

These suggestions have been almost unanimously condemned by former Commissioners, Deputy Commissioners and other public men appearing before us.

The responsibility for law enforcement should not be divided between two Commissioners or agencies.

Such Department Would Divide Responsibility.

To place the responsibility in the hands of 200 or 300 "morals policemen" would have a tendency to lose the information which should result from the daily observations of 10,000 policemen covering every square inch of The City of New York. Evidence before us has shown that a proper system of reports from the latter would be of inestimable value to a Commissioner in ascertaining conditions and enforcing these laws.

Cannot Remove Contact.

Contact cannot be entirely removed because policemen must still enter gambling and disorderly houses and saloons for the purpose of enforcing laws against larceny, burglary, assault, murder and many other crimes. This might cause either friction or collusion between the two police forces, and would not eliminate the collection of graft.

Would Lower Standard of Men.

The standard of men deliberately enlisting for service in a department having jurisdiction only over gambling and disorderly houses, whether recruiting from within or without the Police Department, would certainly be very low.

Would be Against Civil Service Reform.

The suggested bills provide that there shall be no Civil Service restriction, and thus they turn back the clock of Civil Service reform.

Matter for Local Determination.

Moreover, even if any such change be desirable, it is clearly a subject which should be left entirely to local administrative and legislative authorities.

Excise.

Home Rule Recommended.

We recommend that excise regulation for The City of New York be determined by local legislative authority. We feel that this subject is essentially one demanding home rule.

Pensions.

No Legislation Until Completion of Investigation.

We are having made a thorough and exhaustive study of the pension system of the Police Department, including its past workings and probable future results to the taxpayers of the City. We have gone far enough to discover that a pension fund once boasting a surplus is now bankrupt, and making constantly increasing demands. A trained corps of experts is making this investigation, which is not yet completed. Any recommendation by us at this time would be premature. We think no pension legislation placing a further load upon the City should be passed at the present session. We shall deal with the subject fully in our final report.

Rogues' Gallery.

Photographs and Measurements of Those Held by Magistrate on Felony Charge; Removal After Acquittal Discretionary with Court.

We recommend a law authorizing the Police Department to photograph and take finger prints and measurements of all persons held by a Magistrate or on a bench warrant upon a charge constituting a felony. In the event of the acquittal of the defendant, the return of these records to be ordered in the discretion of the judge trying the case. In the event of a dismissal of the charge by the Grand Jury, the records to be returned to the defendant upon application. A law to this effect has been strongly urged before us by Judges, District Attorneys and officials of the Police Department, past and present.

Special Patrolmen.

We recommend that no Special Patrolmen be appointed until a bond has been filed to indemnify those who may suffer by misconduct of such Special Patrolmen.

Boiler Squad.

The inspection of steam boilers and the licensing of stationary engineers are not police functions, and should be placed under a bureau to be established for that purpose by local authorities.

House of Detention.

The House of Detention for witnesses should be removed from the Police Department, and should be placed within the jurisdiction of the Department of Correction.

Miscellaneous Subjects.

We recommend changes in various minor matters of administrative routine, as will appear more fully in Appendix A.

Perjury.

Would Stop "Turning Out" Cases.

We endorse the recommendation of the District Attorney that the Penal Law should provide that anyone who swears upon two different occasions in a criminal proceeding in a materially different way, upon a material point, should be liable to punishment without reference to which statement be true and which false. Although the District Attorney and the court see perjury wilfully committed in the recantation of statements, it is usually impossible to prosecute, because of lack of proof as to which statement is true and which false. This will reach the evil of police officers "turning out" cases.

Health Department.

We recommend that the Police Commissioner be relieved from his duty as a member of the Board of Health. His duties in the Police Department are more than enough to occupy his time and energy. Respectfully submitted,

HENRY H. CURRAN, Chairman; RALPH FOLKS, JAMES HAMILTON, O. GRANT ESTERBROOK, W. AUGUSTUS SHIPLEY, FRANK L. DOWLING, FRANCIS P. KENNEY, JAMES J. SMITH. ROBERT F. DOWNING, Secretary. EMORY R. BUCKNER, Counsel.

Appendix A.

Suggested Amendments to Specific Sections of the New York Charter.

Section 270. Police Commissioner; Salary; Deputies; Salaries, Etc.

This section should be amended to conform to the recommendations heretofore made. The Commissioner should be appointed upon January 1, 1914, for a period of eight years, should be eligible to reappointment, should be removable either by the Governor or the Mayor, but only upon charges, and after a public hearing.

In addition to the right of the Mayor to prefer charges, the Board of Estimate

and Apportionment or the Board of Aldermen, by a majority vote, should be given power to prefer charges against the Police Commissioner, and it should be provided that such charges must be heard by the Mayor at a public hearing, after reasonable notice, and with opportunity for the Commissioner and witnesses to be heard.

The salary of the Commissioner, the number of Deputies and their salaries, should be determined by the local authorities.

Section 272. Police Commissioner; Authority to Make and Enforce Rules and Regulations.

Should be amended to give the Police Department the undisputed right to photograph and take finger prints and identification measurements of all persons held by a Magistrate, or upon a bench warrant, upon a charge constituting a felony. In the event of a discharge by the Grand Jury, the defendant should have the right to receive from the Police Department these records. In the event of an acquittal upon an indictment, it should be left to the discretion of the judge trying the case, whether the defendant should receive these records.

Section 284. Police Force; Qualifications of Members; Publishing Names and Residence of Applicants and Appointees.

Should be amended, substituting for the CITY RECORD two daily papers in New York City of at least 100,000 paid circulation.

Section 288. Promotions.

The length of time in which a Patrolman must have served in a particular grade before being eligible for promotion should be left to the Civil Service Commission.

The provisions with reference to Inspectors should be left as at present, except that the word "nineteen" should be stricken out, leaving the number of Inspectors to be determined by the local authorities.

Section 290. Central Office Bureau of Detectives.

The grades and salaries of Detectives, and the maximum number thereof should be determined by the local authorities.

Section 292. Police Commissioner; Duties and Powers.

Should be amended, giving the Commissioner power to suspend Policemen without pay pending investigation of alleged misconduct and trial of charges. If the charges are dismissed, no pay to be forfeited. Under the present law the Commissioner has no right to suspend without pay until the service of written charges. If the charges are sustained, pay can be forfeited under the present law only from the time of suspension after written charges have been served, and not from the time of suspension before such service of written charges.

The last sentence of this section, "Said Police Commissioner may grant leaves of absence to members of the force for a period not exceeding five days," is apparently modified by section 303. In any event, it should be repealed for reasons given under section 303.

Section 299. Salaries of Officers and Members of the Force.

The creation of grades, ranks and the fixing of salaries should be determined by the local authorities.

Section 300. Police Commissioner; Rules, Etc., for Government and Discipline of Police Department and Police Force; Trials, Dismissals.

The mandatory direction to the Commissioner to provide two places for trials of Policemen, each covering certain boroughs, should be repealed. This is a matter of administrative routine and should be left to the discretion of the Police Commissioner.

To make this section conform to the recommendation made under section 292,

with reference to suspension, the word "suspended" should be stricken out in the sentence providing that no man shall be suspended until written charges have been preferred against him.

The word "reprimanded" should be stricken out because the Commissioner will have power under another section to reprimand a Policeman, after a trial and upon conviction, and it may well be that some future Commissioner will desire to establish a system of demerits or reprimands by Captains and Inspectors. The presence of this word "reprimanded" in this section might prove an obstruction. It serves no useful purpose as it stands, because it preserves no substantial right.

Section 302. Police Commissioner; Punishments by; Limitations of Suits for Reinstatements, Etc.

The Commissioner should be given the right to delegate to a Deputy, or to any member of the uniformed force, power to conduct trials and impose punishment upon delinquent Policemen. The Commissioner should have the right to revoke or modify any such punishment within thirty days from the time of its imposition. This is extremely important. Although the law provides that the Commissioner may delegate the power to conduct a trial to a Deputy, he himself must find the delinquent guilty and assess the punishment. The Corporation Counsel has written an opinion recently to the effect that in all cases the Commissioner must read the minutes of the trial, unless he himself presided thereat. Heretofore it has been the practice for the Commissioner to read the minutes only in those cases where dismissal was imposed as a punishment. During 1911 2,338 members of the department were either fined or punished. The Commissioner, under the opinion of the Corporation Counsel, must read the minutes in every case, and personally impose the punishment. This places too much burden upon the Commissioner. The provision that the Commissioner may modify or revoke the sentence of a Deputy or member of the uniformed force gives sufficient protection to policemen and prevents any subordinate from having more power than the Commissioner himself. The recommendation that this right of delegation be extended to members of the uniformed force is made because a Commissioner may desire to establish a system of trial for minor offences by Captains and Inspectors. It is a waste of time to try men at headquarters for appearing in broken collars or unblacked boots.

The Commissioner should have the right in his discretion to have forfeited or withheld in monthly installments the pay of Policemen fined.

Section 303. Police Force; Resignation and Absence on Leave.

The twenty-day limit should be repealed. Occasions frequently arise where Policemen are called upon to perform extended extra duty. Strikes, riots, emergencies of various kinds impose hardships. The Commissioner should have the right to compensate for unusual service by granting leaves of absence with pay. If he cannot be trusted with such a detail, he should not be trusted with the Police Department.

That portion of this section dealing with resignations has given rise to considerable discussion by witnesses before us because of ambiguities. We suggest that it be amended to read as follows:

"Under penalty of dismissal, no member of the police force shall withdraw or resign, except by the permission of the Police Commissioner. If any member of the police force be absent for five consecutive days without leave, the Commissioner may, in his discretion, dismiss such member without notice or trial."

Section 308. Police Force; Special Patrolmen; When May be Appointed; Military Assistance.

One of the several objections urged against the appointment of special patrolmen is that the corporation or individual employing them is not liable for their miscon-

duct, since they are peace officers. We recommend that this section be amended to provide for the filing of a bond in the sum of \$2,000, for each special patrolman, to indemnify anyone injured through his misconduct.

Sections 312, 313, 314.

These sections provide for the detail of police officers to the Department of Health, the Department of Public Parks and the Department of Bridges. A section in the Tenement House Law also provides for the detail of police officers to the Tenement House Department. These provisions should be repealed. We have not been impressed by the reasons advanced for this farming out of Policemen to other City departments.

Section 321. Police Commissioner; To Provide Accommodations for Detention of Witnesses.

We agree with Commissioner Waldo and many of his predecessors that the House of Detention should not be under the jurisdiction of the Police Department. It should be transferred to the Department of Correction.

Sections 342-345. Boiler Inspection and Stationary Engineers.

We recommend that boiler inspection and licensing of engineers be removed from the Police Department and placed under the charge of a bureau to be established for the purpose by local authorities.

Section 350. Special Patrolmen for District Telegraph Officers.

Should be repealed, provision for special patrolmen being made by section 308.

Sections 351-358. Police Pensions.

No pension legislation whatever should be enacted at this session, for reasons already given.

Section 1543a. Police and Fire Commissioners May Rehear Charges and Reinstate Members of Force.

We recommend the repeal of this section. Our investigation shows conclusively that its provisions are inimical to discipline. The present right of a dismissed Policeman to secure a court review affords him ample protection against an unjust dismissal.

Three-Platoon Law.

The present three-platoon law should be continued until changed by local authorities. All such matters should be determined by local legislation.

Appendix B.

Pending Bill Affecting Administration of the Police Department, to Which Our Attention Has Been Called.

Assembly No. 1225, Int. 1146, Mr. Hammer.

Authorizes the Police Commissioner, in his discretion, to reinstate William H. Finley, a resigned member of the Police Department, to the position of Patrolman. It recites that William H. Finley resigned from the department in 1902. We oppose this bill as special legislation.

Assembly No. 282, Int. 278, Mr. Taylor.

Amends section 1543a of the Charter, extending the operation of such section to include a demotion as well as a dismissal. Inasmuch as we favor a repeal of section 1543a, we oppose this extension.

Assembly No. 293, Int. 289, Mr. Ingram.

Identical with above.

Assembly No. 567, Int. 553, Mr. Ingram.

Identical with above.

Assembly No. 1157, Int. 1084, Mr. McMahon.

Provides for the absorption of the members of the Aqueduct Police into the Police Department of New York City, without examination or qualification. We oppose this bill, because such matters should be determined by local authorities.

Assembly No. 1043, Int. 991, Mr. Greenberg.

Creates a Department of Public Morals to take charge of the enforcement of laws regarding gambling, prostitution and excise. It creates a large staff of captains, lieutenants, sergeants, doormen, surgeons and policemen, all "public morals" officers, without any civil service restrictions. We oppose this bill for reasons already given.

Senate No. 156, Int. 154, Mr. Griffin.

Fixes salaries of members of the police force. Salaries should be determined by the local authorities.

Assembly No. 458, Int. 453, Mr. Willmott.

Provides that a member of the force arrested for a crime shall not be dismissed upon charges based upon the same facts until final determination of the criminal charge.

This is inimical to discipline, and an interference with administrative routine. Members of the Police Department awaiting trial upon criminal charges should not be continued in the Department if the Commissioner has in his possession facts sufficient to justify their dismissal.

Senate No. 663, Int. 608, Mr. Boylan.

This bill provides that no fine or demerit shall be counted against a member of the Police or Fire Department for promotion unless the same has been imposed within three years of the time of examination for promotion. We oppose it as an interference with civil service administration.

Assembly No. 738, Int. 709, Mr. Caughlan.

Identical with above.

Senate No. 420, Int. 399, Mr. White.

Amends the present three-platoon law. We oppose all such laws because they should be determined by local legislation.

Senate No. 770, Int. 710, Mr. Frawley.

Provides that Police Matrons shall receive the same salary as Patrolmen. We oppose this bill because salaries of members of the Department should be determined by local authorities.

Police administration in New York City can never become efficient so long as bills similar to these here scheduled are passed by the Legislature. Matters of administrative routine must be left to the Police Commissioner. Matters of Civil Service administration must be left to the Civil Service Commission. Matters of police quota, ranks, grades, salaries must be left to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and the Board of Aldermen.

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
Aldermen, Board of, resolution and committee to investigate		Suppressed and resented.....	4
Police Department	1	Tables	50-70
Sessions and expense.....	2	Complaints, Bureau for.....	6-11
Counsel	2	Deputies, increase in number..	6, 23, 25, 137
Becker, Lieut. Chas, convicted of murder	1	Duties	26
Commissioner, <i>re</i>	3, 12	Organization	26
Extortion	6	Second, over detectives.....	15, 26
Benedetto, M. J.....	31	Department of Public Morals....	138
Bingham, ex-Commissioner	24	Detective Bureau	15-19
Bureau of Investigation.....	30	Efficiency impaired by Commis-	
Blackmail and Extortion—		sioner	16
Commissioner inactive	3-6	Charter, <i>re</i>	15
How made possible.....	6-9	School for	33
Boiler Squad	22	Corruption in	16
Bridge Squad, law, <i>re</i>	22	Evidence of, in court.....	18
Bureau of Investigation of Ap-		“Line up” discontinued.....	17
pointees	30	Photos of criminals destroyed.	17
Bureau of Municipal Research...	2	Organization of	15, 16
Campbell, Thos. F., reinstated...	37	Recommendations	18
Captains, organization and duties.	27	Reports of, improper.....	17
Agents of	9, 27	Records, system of.....	37
Not properly instructed.....	10	Reports of precinct commanders	19
Patrolmen's reports, <i>re</i>	11	Special squads abolished.....	17
Reports worthless	10	Warrants, service of.....	18
Central Office Squad.....	22	Discipline, failure to enforce....	3
Bureau of Repairs and Supplies.	22	Officers favored	3
Civilian duties	22	Tenure of office of Commis-	
Charter, amendments to.....	139-142	sioner, <i>re</i>	24
Checks, lacking on police work..	6	District Attorney rendered assist-	
Complaints not investigated...	12-15	ance	2
Detective's evidence in court...	19, 139	Dougherty, Deputy Commissioner.	16
Headquarter's squads	6	Duffy, Sergeant	15
Chirico, Jos., appointment.....	31	Dunne, P. J., appointment.....	31
Citizens' Union	2	Excise	15, 138
Civil Service Commission.....	29, 30, 39	Extortion, see Blackmail.	
Bill interfering with.....	138, 143	Faurot, Inspector	17
Examinations	78, 79	Fines, remitted contrary to law..	3, 38
Promotions	140	System of	35
Complaints, Commissioner failed to follow up	3, 4	Fixed posts	29, 118-121
Method of handling.....	12-15	Force, perjurers and criminals ap-	
No report by captains nor in-		pointed to	4, 30
spectors	11	Officers	100-105
		Physical condition	19-21
		Resignations and “leave”....	141
		Form 29	11, 40-49

INDEX—Continued.

	PAGE		PAGE
Gambling and prostitution.....	5	Equipment	72
Captain's responsibility	27	Fines	3, 88-89
Efforts of Mayor and Commis-		Occupations, previous	123, 124
sioner	5	Offenses, tables	88-99
Legislative report.....	137-138	Quarters	28
Prostitution, when suppressed.	5	Qualifications	140
Hays, Inspector	9	Reports, none made.....	11
Health Department, Law <i>re.</i>	22, 139	Salary	23-28
Squad should be abolished.....	22	Special detail	28
Hirsch, Samuel, appointment....	32	Special	139-142
Home rule essential	23, 136	Suggestions by	76-78
Homicide cases	17, 19	Suspensions	35
House of detention	139, 142	Testimony in court.....	5, 126, 127, 139
Imbriale, Michael	30	"Throwing" cases	8
Immunity, Commissioner <i>et al.</i> re-		Pensions, on advice of Board....	39
fuse to waive	2, 3	Burden of	4
Dougherty, Deputy Commis-		Legislation, <i>re.</i>	138, 142
sioner	16	Special report	39
Inspectors, organization	26	Surgeon's	19
Agents and discipline of.....	9	"Plain clothes men," inspector's.	9, 26
Chief	26	Not detectives	15
Duties	26, 27	Under captains	27
Fake arrests to cover "protec-		Platoons	29
tion"	8	Police Commissioner, tenure of	
Number of	23, 26	office	24-25
Tables	80, 81	Attitude of Department toward.	24
Tenure of office.....	26	Charter amendments, <i>re.</i>	139
Investigation, accused self-investi-		Legislative report	136-139
gated	3	Removal	24, 25
Lamps out, tables.....	135	Salary	23
Levy, Benj	16	"Police lists" not kept up.....	10, 11
Lieutenants, organization and		Promotions	33
duties	27	Charter, <i>re.</i>	140
Numbers removed from.....	3	Examinations	33
Matrons	29	Recommendations	34
Mayor, effort to suppress gamb-		Tables	78, 79
ling	5	Prostitution, see Gambling.....	5-9
Becker warned as to.....	6, 13	Punishments, charter	34
Complaints	12, 13	Records, criminals'	17, 18
Relation to Commissioner.....	23	Felony of those held for.....	...
Responsibility for non-enforce-		Efficiency	29
ment of law	9	Photographic	4
McClellan, Hon. Geo. B.....	24	Physical, of force.....	20-21
McKay, Deputy Commissioner...	30	Recruits, condition of appoint-	
Nickley, Patrolman, dismissed....	4	ment	32
O'Brien, Michael, appointment...	31	Recommendations	32
Organization and personnel.....	23	School for	32, 125
Distribution	42-47	Reinstatements, Charter <i>re.</i>	36
Duties	110-117	By courts and Commissioner..	35, 36
Patrolmen, organization and duties.	27-29	Illegal and unwise	3
Economic condition	28, 71-76		

INDEX—Continued.

	PAGE		PAGE
Reports, preliminary legislative report	3, 136-139	Unit of administration precinct..	23, 27
Commissioner's annual	17	Waldo, Commissioner	3, 4
Detectives	10, 17-19	Annual report	18
Files inaccurate	3	Appointees	29-31
Inspectors, on complaint.....	13-15	Complaints, failed to follow...	12
Patrolmen	11	Condition of department.....	5-7
Surgeons'	19-21	Gambling, effort to suppress...	5
System of	6, 10-11	Investigation impeded by.....	4
"Reprimanded"	141	Investigation, Bureau of, abol- ished	30
Rosenthal, Herman—		Laws, non-enforcement of.....	9
Accuses police, shot.....	1	Reinstatements	35
Gambling house	1	Removal, recommendation	5
Secret service as check on police.	6	Squads as checks.....	6
Sheehan, W. R., secretary.....	12-15	Subordinates, refused to be warned about	5
Complaints	40-42	Testimony of police in court...	8
Squads, headquarters, as checks..	6, 10	Vindictive spirit	4
Certain, abolished	17		
Failed to suppress vice.....	10	Witnesses:	
Three under lieutenants.....	9	Coleman, Mary	7
Station houses, condition.....	21, 39	Dillon, Deputy Commissioner...	4
Stanton, Lieutenant, dismissed...	4	Dorian	7
Surgeons, organization	19-21	Fox, E.	7
Duties	19-21	Goode, Mary	6
Office hours	21	Hays, Inspector	9
Private practice	20	Hartigan	7
Physical records	20	Hussey, Inspector	7
Residence	20	Maas, E.	8
Salaries	20	Murtha, Inspector	7
Station houses, inspection of...	21	Newell, E. J.	8
Tables <i>re</i>	130-135	Sipp, T. A.....	6
Suspension, charter	140	Stanton, Lieutenant	4
Rules	141	Sweeney, Inspector	7
Sweeney, Inspector.....	14, 15	Thompson, Inspector	7
Tenement House Squad, law <i>re</i> ..	22	Waldo, Commissioner	2
Traffic Squad	21	Walsh, Captain	8
Transfers, detectives	17	Wolff, Sol	8
Trial and punishment.....	34, 35		
System of demerits.....	34		

