is fully expected that several other countries will take part later on. There may be differences of attitude toward the drink problem among those who were present, but they will approach it without bias, simply concerned to find out and state the truth.

It is interesting to note that at the Paris Meeting frequent mention was made of the work of the American Committee of Fifty which, it was confessed, furnished the idea of forming an international body; and the wish was freely expressed that the results of the new undertaking may fully measure up to the standard set in the United States.

JOHN KOREN.²

THE NEW YORK POLICE INVESTIGATION

ALTHOUGH those who have opposed the present police inquiry by the board of aldermen of New York are declaring that the investigation by this committee has been a publicity campaign with a view to making the police department a political issue for the coming election in New York City, and although those in power and in charge of the administration have endeavored to obstruct at every turn the inquisitors, this committee by the first of May will have completed the first intelligent study and analysis of the administration of police in the city of New York.

When the committee started its work in the summer of 1912, the opinion was general in New York that the investigation was to be "a hunt for the grafters," and that a small army of detectives would be assembled for the purpose of running down these police grafters and creating a sensational scandal in the city which might well be used as political capital later on.

Great fear was felt that this aldermanic committee would become so ambitious in its desire for publicity of a sensational character, that it would meddle and tamper with the investigation already begun by the district attorney of New York County, which would result in chaos and perhaps in giving immunity to a number of vicious police officials who might be turned up as grafters in the course of the investigation.

Much to the satisfaction of all those who wish well for New York and its citizens, and I might say to the surprise of the many civic agencies in New York, out of what seemed to be and almost was, a hysterical condition, grew a well defined, honest, sincere, and constructive analysis of the police department by the aldermanic committee. This study not only in no way interfered with the district attorney in his research for violators of the

² Secretary of the American section, member of the committee on liquor problem of the National Municipal League and president of the American Statistical Association.

law, but on the contrary brought about a coöperation between counsel for the aldermanic committee, Emory R. Buckner, and the district attorney's office which has resulted in a great many indictments and prosecutions by the district attorney's office and a comprehensive study of administrative police matters by the aldermen.

The police department was divided into various branches, and under the supervision of the Bureau of Municipal Research, accountants, investigators, and experts were sent into them to examine carefully their methods and operations. In order to reach a diagnosis, in its effort to locate the disease from which the department is suffering, the aldermanic committee has called in within the last week many doctors on police, among them George B. McClellan, who served two terms as mayor of New York City; Seth Low, who served one term; District Attorney James C. Cropsey, a former police commissioner; Chief City Magistrate William McAdoo, a former police commissioner; Arthur Woods, former deputy police commissioner; Bert Hanson; John McCullough, former chief of police of the city; and a number of others who have been connected with police work in the city at some period.

The testimony of these men as experts varies so much that the problem of diagnosing in order to find a remedy is made very difficult for the committee. The difference of opinion as to "just what is the matter with New York's police?" and the remedies suggested to cure these ills, may be best illustrated by extracts from the record.

Questions which have been uppermost in the minds of those interested in the police problem in New York, and even elsewhere, have been "what should be the tenure of office of a police commissioner," "who should appoint him," and "how should he be removed."

On these points various experts testified as follows:

J. C. Cropsey, former police commissioner: Personally, I would not favor having any fixed term for the police commissioner; I would not have the police commissioner elected; I would have the police commissioner appointed by the mayor and subject to his removal at will.

William McAdoo, former police commissioner: During the term I was police commissioner, I became convinced that the first cardinal weakness of the police administration in New York is the tenure of the commissioner. The commissioner has absolutely no tenure of office The result of it is this, if he is a very able and honest man all the crooked and inefficient element in the police department want to get rid of him, so from the time he takes office—and they have his measure—they begin counterplotting against him. They will even go so far as to create a crime wave through the newspapers, as they think that is the speediest way of putting them out My idea is that the police commissioner ought to be appointed by the mayor for a term of ten years, not less, and should not be subject to removal except by the appellate division of the supreme court on trial and charges made.

Leonard F. Fuld, civil service examiner and author of "Police Administration": I should think that the police commissioner should have a fixed term. At least he should have as secure an office as his subordinate, the patrolman He should be appointed by the mayor, subject to removal upon charges.

George B. McClellan, former mayor: I believe the police commissioner should be appointed by the mayor and subject to removal only upon charges It might even be wise to give him a public hearing.

Seth Low, former mayor of New York: I am sure the governor exercising state functions should have the right to dismiss the police commissioner after hearing charges, but the mayor of the city should appoint the police commissioner and have a right to remove him at will.

Arthur Woods, former deputy police commissioner: If the police commissioner should be appointed by the mayor for a term, we will say, of ten years, subject to removal by the mayor arbitrarily, but only after a public hearing in which the police commissioner has full opportunity to be heard, to be represented by counsel if he chooses, I think that we should have an improvement over the present situation. Give the police commissioner the assurance that he will stay ten years in office, unless the mayor is ready to brave public opinion in removing him My object would be to make it difficult for a mayor to remove a police commissioner for improper reasons, and yet make it easy for a mayor to remove a police commissioner for proper reasons.

Frank Moss, former police commissioner: My opinion is there should be one commissioner, as there is at present; that he should be appointed by the mayor; that he should be subject to removal at will by the mayor I think that it was a mistake to abolish the office of chief of police.

In the city of New York policemen before being dismissed from the force are entitled to a trial before their commissioner or a deputy, and this trial takes the form of a court procedure, the policeman being represented by counsel. After dismissal the policeman is entitled to a court review. Police commissioners and experts on police,—if there be any—are at a wide variance as to the efficiency of this law. The differences of opinion on this subject can be more fully appreciated by the following extracts from the record of the inquiry.

James C. Cropsey on this point testified as follows:

I would give them (members of the police department) certainly no less protection, and neither would I give them any more protection, than any other civil service employees that would mean, that a man about to be removed would have an opportunity for making an explanation, a chance to present an explanation or his excuse, then before he can be dismissed or when he is dismissed, if at all, the head of the department should file in writing the reasons for his dismissal.

Chief Magistrate McAdoo, former police commissioner, when asked his views on this question, had this to say:

A patrolman must have security. Must know that he has a tenure of office. . . . I had a plan worked out, following the lines of the army and the navy in the United States, that I thought would be a good substitute for the present system. The highest penalty now for a policeman is thirty days' fine or removal. I have always believed that there should be an intermediary punishment like demotion, that is, in those fixed ranks where a promotion is not an arbitrary matter; but above all I think that the thing would be this: that the finding of facts by the police commissioner, through his deputies, should be final. The question of review before the higher court would then be this: Did this man have a fair trial? Were his constitutional and legal rights under the charter and under the law observed? . . . The only question for review should be whether he was tried regularly. There I would stop, and I would not go any further in arbitrary demotion.

Assistant District Attorney Frank Moss, also a former police commissioner, at a different point of view testified as follows:

I think a patrolman ought to have the right of review. Probably the present method enlarges that right of review more than is necessary. I have thought that there might be a special board of review legally created by which the sentence of a policeman might be reviewed quickly and on a broader basis than is done in the courts. There are not so many men restored.

Arthur Woods, former deputy police commissioner, gave an entirely different point of view. He said:

I do believe that if a policeman's offence has been so serious that he has been justly and properly dismissed from the force, he ought not to go back on the force. I believe it is important for the general morale of the force for him to stay off. I think he should have the right to a court review of his dismissal, and if court decides that the dismissal was not merited, he should be allowed to bring a suit for damages against the city.

Bert Hanson, a former deputy who served as a trial commissioner, agreed in some respects and said:

I think the reinstatement question is a very serious thing, and I think that under no circumstances should a man be reinstated on the police force. If he has been improperly dismissed, he should have redress in some other way. I think that it would be cheaper for the city to pay him damages than to take him back on the force, and in fact a good deal better.

On the question of whether or not the head of the force should come from the uniformed ranks rather than be a civilian, almost all the experts have agreed but vary in their opinions as to just whether there should be a chief of police and if there should be a chief, just what his powers should be. Some believe that there should be a permanent chief who should rise from the ranks, receive a much higher salary than the other inspectors, and be

given full control of the uniformed force, subject to the approval on matters of policy by the commissioner. Former commissioner Frank Moss was strongest in favor in this, while Mr. Cropsey believed that there should be a head of the uniformed force, regardless of what he was called, who would be directly under the control of the commissioner, subject to appointment and removal at will by the commissioner.

All of the experts are agreed that the present salary of the police commissioner of New York is entirely too small, and the majority have recommended a salary of \$15,000 a year.

The constructive study of various bureaus of the department, and particularly that of pensions, will be continued until about April 1, when the reports and recommendations of the various experts now engaged in examining the department will be filed.

CLEMENT J. DRISCOLL.¹

¹ First deputy under former Commissioner Cropsey. He is now supervising the police studies which the New York Bureau of Municipal Research is making in behalf of the aldermanic committee.