

STATEMENT OF S. D. DECKER

Chief of Detectives, Pasadena Police Department, to: Judiciary Interim Committee Subcommittee, re: Sex Crimes.

In a world where living has become most complex, where nerves are keyed to a higher pitch; where spiritual values have been entirely forgotten; where religion has been displaced by pseudo-intellectual and pseudo-scientific conglomeration of half-baked ideas which individuals are pleased to call their "philosophies of life," in a world where there are no ethics except that of "not getting caught"; where there is no set principle of right or wrong; and when children are brought into the world and educated according to the principle that a child should be permitted to express its own personality without restriction; where discipline and self-restraint and consideration for the rights of others are neglected as old-fashioned and too difficult; in a world where the philosophy that asserts that "I will try anything once" is considered a satisfactory attitude for the young and inquiring mind; in a world where there is too much idle time, there has developed a startling and dangerous increase in sex perversion.

Sex perversion of course includes many types which manifest themselves in the form of homosexuality, exhibitionism, and so on down through the categories, until we reach the dangerous sadist whose frequent terminal outbursts direct the attention of the world to the fact that sex perverts do exist, then the mangled form of some child or woman focuses the public attention upon the work of this particular type of sex pervert.

All too often we lose sight of the fact that the homosexual is an inveterate seducer of the young of both sexes, and that he presents a social problem because he is not content with being degenerate himself, but is ever seeking for younger victims. I have come to the firm belief that the sex pervert is an individual of whom society should take note. I am sure that he is seldom insane in any sense which would permit him lawfully to be incarcerated in an insane asylum: I am sure that he is just as much a criminal as is the burglar or murderer. I am also convinced that the present day jails and penitentiaries provide no place for his punishment or rehabilitation. He should be placed in a special institution where proper kind of study and rehabilitary work can be done.

For years Pasadena has vigorously prosecuted all sex offenders and in some instances have received unfavorable criticism when someone of prominence is involved. (Such as the suicide of a very prominent doctor.) For several years the late Hon. Frank C. Collier, judge, Pasadena branch of the superior court, made an intensive study of the sex cases that came before him, and sincerely tried to ascertain the cause, and the best method of punishment, cure and rehabilitation. For years he was liberal in granting probation with regulations that the subject receive medical and psychiatric care.

In 1927 a defendant was convicted of violation of Section 288 P. C. and was placed on probation, to take treatments. (This subject had two prior 288 P. C. convictions.) In October, 1933, this subject again was convicted of 288 and Judge Collier sentenced him to San Quentin, but suspended execution of this sentence on condition that the defendant freely and voluntarily submit to complete castration at his own expense,

which he did and was placed on three years' probation which was satisfactorily completed.

This was Judge Collier's first castration case. From 1937 to 1948 inclusive, 46 other convicted sex offenders, ages 26 to 76 years, received this same treatment (castration). Probation officers kept a very close check on each subject to note if there was any noticeable change in their physical makeup, with negative results.

Judge Collier's confidential files contain many letters of appreciation from these defendants thanking him for his kindness to them and many stated that they had been completely cured of their unnatural sex desires. To my knowledge, not one of these 47 sex criminals, has ever been reported as a repeater.

Of the 47 cases, our records show that only two have had subsequent arrests since their operations—both were charged with violating their probation and were sentenced to San Quentin, neither case was a sex violation.

Records of the Pasadena Police Department show the following arrests for sex offenses for the period 1946 to 1949, inclusive:

	1946	1947	1948	1949
Felony arrests -----	6	24	9	10
Convictions -----	3	16	8	9
Misdemeanor arrests -----	75	48	41	31
Convictions -----	63	42	40	29
Records of 1948-1949.				

Penal Code Section 311 (indecent exposure) are the most prevalent. Sentences ran from \$10 fine to \$250 fine and 30 days suspended. Maximum sentence on violation Section 288 (lewd conduct with minor child) was 10 years probation. One received 90 days county jail. Maximum sentence 288a was six months, five years probation. There were no penitentiary sentences.

Recommendations

1. I strongly recommend that legislation be enacted legalizing "castration" in certain sex crimes. (Such as 288 and 288a.) Judge Collier's experience proves the effectiveness of this positive treatment. Similar laws have been in use for years in Europe.
2. Recommend separate penal institutions to deal with sex offenders, where proper study and treatment can be given.
3. Enact legislation making it mandatory that all parole officers, or probation officers must report to the police department in the city, where every parolee or probationer is residing. (This report should include a brief history of the subject, with whom he is living, where he is working, and the type of crime of which he was convicted.) Any change of address, or violations should be reported immediately. (If subject resides in unincorporated territory, report should be made to the sheriff.)

We recently had a case where a man was arrested on a misdemeanor charge and was granted probation, claimed that he had never been arrested before. When his kickback was received from the F. B. I. it was found that he was on parole from San Quentin. His parole officer was in Los Angeles and knew nothing of his arrest.

[Mar. 8, 1950

believe that this report should be required in all cases regardless of the crime for which subject was convicted. Ex-convicts are not required to register while on parole.

4. Recommend that Section 288 of the Penal Code be amended changing the age from 14 to 16 years.

5. Recommend that legislation be enacted which would permit persons charged with sex crimes against youth to be convicted on the testimony of the victim alone.

6. Recommend legislation forbidding publishing the names, addresses or any identification of victims (or their parents or relations) of sex crimes. (Murder excepted.) If such a law is not constitutional suggest that the Governor hold a meeting with the California Newspaper Publishers Association to obtain a voluntary "gentleman's agreement" that they will refrain from publishing names or identification of victims of sex crimes.

Publicizing names of victims of sex crimes is damaging to those victims, makes it difficult for law enforcement officers to obtain evidence on such crimes, and causes parental reluctance to having children appear as witnesses in sex prosecutions. Many more cases would be reported to the authorities if parents knew that they would be protected.

7. Recommend that all court hearings be held in private, where juveniles are involved.

8. Encourage better cooperation from parents in all stages of investigation and to get over the attitude of feeling sorry for sex offenders. It is generally conceded that lack of discipline in childhood and youth generally contributes to delinquency in adults. Under the social code in which we live, responsibility for the child's training is a parental responsibility. When the parents fail, it becomes the responsibility of the state. The school and the church could do a great deal more in educating the child regarding our social code. Parents should be instructed of their responsibilities in these matters by giving closer supervision and knowing where their children are at all times, and who their associates are. Only through careful observation and study can abnormal sex tendencies be detected. Teachers should be educated to recognize those tendencies and proper action taken as soon as discovered, possibly through public clinics.

9. Recommend that a program of public education be conducted through speakers bureaus, radio, and newspapers, to educate the public in the serious responsibility of serving as a trial juror. I feel that this has been seriously neglected in the past.

10. I recommend quick, sure, and positive punishment of all sex offenders, with no leniency shown by the courts such as reducing felonies to misdemeanors and releasing defendants on small bail. With more stringent requirements in all probation and parole cases. With this assurance from the courts, I am sure all law enforcement officers would be inspired to apprehend every sex crime violator.

Mar. 8, 1950]

STATEMENT OF REV. E. C. FARNHAM

General Secretary, Southern California Council of Protestant Churches, and the Church Federation of Los Angeles.

(For 25 years serving in like capacity, 12 in present position, with particular concern and responsibility for the Protestant churches in relation to the community and community organization and activity. Member Los Angeles County 1948 Grand Jury, member board of directors Los Angeles Welfare Council and Los Angeles Welfare Federation.)

The councils of Protestant churches, operating in numerous cities in California, composed of officially named delegates of member churches and denominations, are concerned with the application of Christian principles and standards to all aspects of community life and relationships. They are concerned not only with the correction of unhappy or unsound moral and social conditions, but even more with the prevention of such conditions through understanding, acceptance, and application of wholesome and sound moral, social, and spiritual laws and principles.

Our Protestant churches share with all others the sense of horror and shock over the revolting sex crimes which have shown tendency toward increase in recent weeks. We join with other elements of society in calling for prompt and vigorous and sane measures of protection against their recurrence. As a responsible element in our social structure, we humbly accept our share of guilt for any sins of omission which may have contributed to this unhappy situation; and we stand ready to undertake our share of the remedy.

Our churches do not claim to be specialized agencies for dealing with sex crimes. But our churches do deal with persons of all types, and with the underlying problems and motives, as well as conduct of people. Throughout its existence, the church has been concerned with persons, with social relationships, and with the moral, social, and religious foundations of conduct. The churches work constantly against the background or upon the foundation of personal and social ethics, having the long range and permanent good of individuals and society constantly in view. Ever present is the concern that individuals achieve moral stature, social acceptability, and full spiritual selfhood. It is out of this experience that we presume to speak in relation to this particular matter, in which there is departure from personal and social righteousness. The treatment of the abnormal must always be against the background of the normal.

With this premise, we cannot support the proposal of some that the death penalty should be prescribed for all involved in sex crimes. Nor can we support the proposal that surgery be used, except it be upon the advice of experts in the fields of physical, mental, and emotional disturbance. Such measures savor of vengeance, a recourse which belongs to God. We must concern ourselves with prevention, cure, and redemption.

We are impressed that society's defense against this threat to social security may be likened to defensive measures in a football game. The defense team involves three elements, the first line, the secondary line, and the "safety."

The member of the team playing "safety" in the instance of sex crimes is obviously our maximum facility, the penitentiary. I would commend our penal system as now established in California and make plea that its program of rehabilitation have the fullest understanding and support by our citizens and by the Legislature.

Our first line of defense is, in the nature of the case, of first importance. The team members include the home, the church, the school, the recreational and character building institutions, the social welfare agencies, our community chests, and the other socially responsible organizations. Those of us who become greatly wrought up over the sudden flare-up of sex crimes—and we all should be wrought up—are certainly inconsistent if we do not exercise similar concern for the regular team members on the first line of defense. Refusal to support home, church, school, community chest raises serious question as to our sincerity in dealing with this particular problem. We must know that marital trouble in the home, whether concealed or overt, is a threat to the emotional stability of the children of the home and out of this situation may come the sex criminal of a few years hence. There must be more concern for the instructional and inspirational processes of the church by which youth are rooted in sound principles of conduct. The innovation being undertaken by the churches of most faiths, in response to permissive laws adopted by our Legislature permitting release of pupils from public schools to receive religious instruction and nurture, deserves wider understanding and support by the public. Our schools should be aided in adding clinical services for children. Our community chests should have the hearty and generous financial support of every citizen.

These are the first line of defense, and they are most important to our whole problem. The fact that the enemy gets through the line means that we must study and strengthen that line. At this point, I call attention to what we must regard as a traitor playing on this first line of defense. I mean the present farcical system of control of liquor dispensing. Alcoholism, by this I mean easy indulgence, is a close ally and inciter of sex crime; and yet we permit a system of dispensing control to operate as an accepted part of our social structure which in the very nature of the system is an open invitation to defeat in control of sex crimes. Our team cannot win as long as this enemy is allowed to play on the front line. A drastic change in method of control of liquor dispensing must be found if we are to do a good job of defeating this present enemy.

The secondary line of defense is possibly the point of most immediate action. This involves the police, law enforcement, the courts, and other processes prior to the penitentiary. There should be a methodical checking of every member of this part of the team and of the processes employed. There must be a more careful "follow through" with known cases of delinquency. Our taxpayers must be willing to incur the expense of improved processes and increased facilities at this line of defense, if we are to avoid tragic consequences.

I would make four suggestions in this connection. First, that suitable legislation be undertaken by which every county would be empowered, and the larger counties be required, to set up clinical facilities

adjunct to the court by which every person arrested on a morals charge would be subjected to clinical examination by competent experts in psychiatry and medicine, with diagnosis and prescription for the guidance of the court in disposing of the case. Secondly, that the State build suitable institutions for the custody, treatment and, if possible, the cure of persons who may be committed by the court as a result of the prescription of the clinical advisors. Third, that we give larger understanding and support to the rehabilitative programs as now set up in county and state custodial institutions. Fourth, that necessary legislation be adopted whereby state and county custodial and rehabilitative institutions be permitted to employ professionally trained and qualified religious counsellors as staff workers.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH M. D. LEWIS

Juvenile Protection Chairman, California Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.

December 9, 1949

The California Congress of Parents and Teachers has long been aware of the seriousness of this problem and has for many years urged authorities to take action to bring about better protection for children. A few years ago, when our members were aroused anew by the Gluskoter murder, the State Board of Managers proposed the formation of a state-wide committee of legal, medical and law-enforcement experts to study all phases of the problem, with the hope that the study would result in more adequate laws. But we were a voice crying in the wilderness: We had neither the authority nor the money to convene such a committee. We thereupon asked the Governor's California Youth Committee to appoint such a committee, but they found themselves unable to carry out our request. A year or so later, the Governor's Crime Commission on Juvenile Justice reported that there was general dissatisfaction with the results obtained in disposing of cases involving sex crimes and that in order to deal effectively with sex offenders, there was need for an extensive study which would include medical phases of the problem and possible treatment as well as the merely punitive aspects. Their proposal was embodied in Senate Bill No. 429, which asked for an appropriation of \$50,000 for a study. The California Congress of Parents and Teachers strongly endorsed this bill and was greatly disappointed when the bill died in committee.

Then, when the Glucoft murder took place, during a meeting of the Board of Managers of the Congress, the board unanimously voted to send a letter to Governor Warren with two requests: (1) The inclusion in his budget of a sum sufficient to enable a study to be made; (2) consideration of the sex crime problem at a special session of the Legislature. The State Juvenile Protection chairman received unanimous support, also, from the board for her motion that the congress ask for the cooperation of other organizations in urging immediate action.

The plea for cooperation from other organizations brought immediate results. The request to the Governor was endorsed by the Los Angeles County Youth Committee, the Southern California Juvenile Officers Association, Southern California WCTU, several other women's groups, 24th District American Legion, and parents' councils in private schools. We are therefore pleased that Governor Warren has called a special session, and that he held, on December 7th, a conference of law-enforcement chiefs.

We are further encouraged by the appointment of your special sub-committee, and by the fact that, in contrast to four years ago, when our congress received no response from officials for our plea for action, there are now moves on the part of many official groups at all levels, state-wide, county and municipal.

We have advised our local units that in addition to state-wide action there is much that can be done within counties and municipalities. We have urged them to confer with their local law-enforcement chiefs to discover the status of the problem in their own communities.

We wish to make it clear to your committee, that we, being lay citizens, do not set ourselves up as experts. We can give no opinions about the medical or psychological aspects of the problem. Our sole interest is to protect children from a very prevalent danger. We request action on the part of authorities so that our children may go about in their communities in safety and without fear.

We realize that the problem is so complex that there is no simple solution. At present, most people seem to be concerned almost entirely with what should be done after an offense has been committed, so are considering the questions of laws, their enforcement, bail, parole, psychiatric examinations, medical treatment, institutions, life imprisonment where no cure is possible, and so on.

We feel that there are other phases to consider. There will have to be a change in attitudes all along the line. Juries and judges need to be more severe; arresting officers, district attorneys and lawyers must stop reducing charges from felonies to misdemeanors; and the public must be educated to cooperate with law enforcement in the apprehension of sex offenders by showing willingness to sign complains (when the facts can be substantiated) and to testify.

However, in our juvenile protection work in the California Congress we have always emphasized the importance of prevention. The basic answer probably lies in early and adequate sex education in home and school. Certain maladjustments could be avoided or recognized in time for something to be done about them.

But education is slow and prevention through education will never be absolute. Still, children must be protected from the sex pervert. This means that parents must teach their children safety. Just as we caution our children against touching flame or petting strange dogs, so must we warn them to keep away from strangers who offer them candy or money or who try to lure them into cars. We must teach them, too, to tell us immediately when any older person takes any liberties with their person. Solution must come from a long, careful, comprehensive study. We endorse this most strongly.

As a congress, we shall not "let up" in our efforts, but shall "stick by" the problem until satisfactory action has been taken.

We wish to assure your committee and the State Legislature as a whole that you will have the wholehearted support and cooperation of the California Congress (largest group in the State whose sole object is child welfare about three-fourths million members) in whatever constructive measures you propose to bring about an amelioration of the present intolerable situation.

STATEMENT OF ROBERTA CHAPMAN

Young Women's Christian Association Metropolitan Teenage Director; Supervising Thirteen Teenage Directors in Ten Areas of Los Angeles

The YWCA believes that its best contribution in the problem of sex crimes can be made in five ways:

1. Through regular club work help girls develop normal, healthy attitudes toward sex
 - a. Lectures and discussions under qualified leaders
 - b. Well supervised and chaperoned dances and parties
2. Through making available authoritative literature on the subject in clubs and through the Health Education Department. We have very good libraries on the subject, many of the books and pamphlets having been published by our national publishing house, the Woman's Press, and the American Social Hygiene Association.
3. Counseling service available to girls through
 - a. Teenage and young adult staff
 - b. Health counseling by doctors who give health examinations in the Health Education Department
 - c. Individual Services Department
 Cases which the staff is not equipped to handle are referred to case work agencies.
4. Through the recently organized young wives work. Psychiatrists maintain that many of our habit patterns are set early in life. Working with young wives can be helpful in preventive work in the coming generation.
5. Public Affairs Committee working for better housing standards to eliminate the deplorable conditions that go with overcrowding.

Members of the YWCA staff have listed several ways where they have seen either the existing laws or law enforcement very weak:

1. The present practice of trying cases in open court many times is worse than the original experience. Parents are often unwilling to allow their children to go through that experience.
2. Magazines carrying lurid and obscene pictures available on many news stands add to the problem.
3. At present it is difficult to catch offenders. It is almost necessary for the authorities to see them in the act. The girls on at least one playground recently have been annoyed by a man who exhibits himself but have never been able to notify the authorities in time to catch him.
4. Under existing laws, little can be done about common law marriages and yet they have a great influence on the children involved.
5. There doesn't seem to be sufficient patrolling around schools, particularly junior high schools when they close. Older boys loafing around are a great attraction for the younger girls.
6. Often when children are reported missing, there seems to be no hurry in tracing them.

7. In homes where there is language difficulty, it is often confusing for the police to talk to them about a problem from one angle and a social work agency from another. It would be better if the two could work through the problem with the family together.
8. The notoriety given sex crime cases puts them into an entirely false light. It is often very suggestive and tends to glamorize the whole thing to some people.

It would be helpful if we could have the following legislation to improve present laws:

1. Change court procedure so that sex crime cases are conducted in private and children are not in the room when adults' problems are aired.
2. Laws prohibiting the printing of pictures, names and addresses of juveniles involved in crimes.
3. More stringent laws on publishing and/or selling books and magazines containing lurid and indecent pictures.
4. More stringent laws governing teenage dances so that older boys and men cannot attend with younger girls.
5. Laws to protect older men, too, so that they cannot be exploited by those with a grudge or fears.
6. Places made available for men to go for treatment and/or confinement who are registered sex deviates.

STATEMENT OF SHERIFF E. W. BISCAILUZ ON THE SUBJECT OF SEX
CRIMES, GIVEN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
JUDICIARY INTERIM COMMITTEE

Law enforcement has a two-fold responsibility; the detection and apprehension of sex offenders and prevention of offenses.

There is no basic difference in the investigation of sex offenses from investigation of any other serious offense. Metropolitan departments have made it a practice to have special details handle murder, burglary, robbery, etc. Recently, many departments have created a special detail to handle sex offenses. The only problem faced by administrators is lack of sufficient personnel, and when that problem is met, law enforcement will be in a better position to discharge its responsibility of detection and apprehension.

The additional responsibility of preventing offenses entails a two-phase program. First, adequate patrol of high hazard areas. This is accomplished by concentrating patrols in those areas. Second, an educational program directed toward citizens, schools, and children. The purpose of such a program is to condition children in their conduct toward strangers, together with educating parents as to their responsibility regarding prosecution.

I wish to make it clear that law enforcement disclaims responsibility for treatment of convicted offenders. We have no responsibility to protect the sex offender from the enticement of a six-year-old child or against the problems of our complex society. Our responsibility is to the decent good people in society; protecting them against the advances of the sex offender.

In commenting on the cooperation existing between law enforcement and the courts, prosecuting bodies, parole and probation, may I state that there must be a meeting of the minds in final disposition of sex cases, and the only way to arrive at this meeting of minds is by closer liaison and a complete understanding on the part of all such agencies regarding their mutual interests and problems.

During the past few weeks we have all heard a great deal of talk about the apprehension and confinement of sex offenders. As the sheriff of this county, it is my duty to be concerned with all of these matters. If present laws governing sex offenses are inadequate, then I should, to the best of my ability, suggest means by which this inadequacy might be eliminated.

What do I feel may be the shortcomings of present legislation?

First: Offenders who choose children as their victims can be charged with a misdemeanor and upon conviction receive a light sentence in the county jail, or a fine, or both.

This provides the offender with the opportunity of pleading guilty to a misdemeanor, even when the original charge is a felony—a practice which amounts to a circumvention of the felony statute. (288 Penal Code.)

Second: When these offenders are convicted under the misdemeanor charge and sentenced, the lower court does not have the available institutions, hospitals, or asylums in which to place the individual. They can only sentence to the county jail, which fact denies to the offender, all of the aids authorized by law to be dispensed by the higher courts.

Third: Sex offenders are dangerous, and especially so when they focus their attention upon little boys and girls in our communities. Six months in the county jail and/or a fine is not an adequate disposition of these cases. The touch of the sex pervert is poisonous, and the final result of a youngster's falling into the hands of such perverts is, in almost every case, tragic. True, we have not always to face a brutal murder, but the impact of such an experience upon a child's mind can very often lead to a life of perversion and sex delinquency. Knowing these facts, I repeat, six months in the county jail and/or a fine is not an adequate disposition.

It is my opinion that the ordinary jail or prison facilities fall short in providing proper personnel and equipment to adequately care for sex offenders. It is unfair, both to the individual involved and the institution, if that institution is not set up to meet the requirements of the individual. I believe the State of California should build an institution for the sole purpose of confining, for a lifetime if necessary, and treating, with the goal of curing and rehabilitating these sex offenders. I further believe this institution must be available to all offenders who prey upon little children.

In conjunction with recommending possible legislation to help the situation in California, wherein sex offenses are concerned, may I say this: Many persons today are deeply interested in this subject, persons who are trained to study and analyze what we have and what we may need in the way of legislative action and statutory provisions.

I am reluctant to enter my voice into the chorus being raised at the present time, but I do feel that a complete study of the possibility and practicability of having our Penal Code provide that all sex offenses against children under 14 years of age shall be considered felonious.

Such a statute would obliterate the practice of reducing felonies to misdemeanors. It will assure the offender of all of the legal aids for confinement and treatment. It would provide a greater equity in the matter of sentence and thus serve as a more effective deterrent.

Attached to this report, a copy of which has been given your committee, are statistical tables showing facts and figures about sex offenses and offenders in Los Angeles County.

*!
good

Sex Offenses Reported to Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office

Year and Month	Total	Forcible rape	Statutory rape	Crimes against children	Indecent exposure	Sex perversion	Crime against nature	Incest	Seduction
1948	907	177	106	250	316	42	7	8	1
January	80	15	10	21	30	4			
February	67	13	7	20	22	3	1	1	
March	86	17	8	23	29	7		2	1
April	35	13	10	15	23		3		
May	97	22	11	28	30	3		3	
June	81	17	11	19	27	6		1	
July	73	10	10	30	17	4	1	1	
August	69	16	6	18	25	3	1		
September	87	16	8	21	36	6			
October	72	14	8	21	28	1			
November	68	9	10	22	22	4	1		
December	62	15	7	12	27	1			
11 months of 1949	877	191	111	226	307	29	7	5	1
January	77	17	11	18	29	2			
February	48	8	5	13	17	2	2	1	
March	71	16	8	25	18	3			1
April	77	19	9	17	30	2			
May	75	21	8	20	22	1	1	2	
June	81	12	10	23	33	3			
July	86	17	3	29	32	4		1	
August	82	23	10	11	31	5	1	1	
September	82	15	14	15	36	2			
October	96	19	18	29	26	1	3		
November	102	24	15	26	33	4			

Arrest of Sex Offenders by Los Angeles County Sheriff

Year and month	Total	Rape	Crimes against children	Indecent exposure	Sex perversion	Crime against nature	Incest	Seduction	Adultery
1948	548	235	178	67	46	10	11	1	
January	46	23	14	1	7			1	
February	50	23	12	5	6	2	2		
March	47	17	17	3	8				
April	36	10	15	8		3			
May	59	21	21	7			4		
June	39	16	10	9	3		1		
July	70	37	21	9	1	1	1		
August	47	20	14	6	6	1			
September	33	9	14	3	4	3			
October	53	27	19	4	3				
November	37	14	13	7	2		1		
December	31	18	8	5					
11 months of 1949	523	250	169	61	31	6	1	3	2
January	41	15	17	3	6				
February	21	10	6	1	2	2		1	
March	40	20	12	6	1			1	
April	54	21	19	10	3			1	
May	43	18	17	4	3			1	
June	46	21	13	7	5				
July	43	20	17	6		2			
August	75	38	19	7	9	1			
September	45	23	15	5	1	1			
October	49	25	15	8		1	1		2
November	66	39	19	4					

Disposition of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office Sex Offender Arrests

Charge	Released, no complaint requested	Released to other authorities	Convicted of this or a lesser offense	Acquitted or dismissed
Total, 1948 -----	57	24	398	102
Rape -----	35	16	173	50
Crimes against children -----	13	7	130	35
Indecent exposure -----	3	-	48	8
Sex perversion -----	5	-	30	7
Crime against nature -----	-	-	8	-
Incest -----	1	-	9	2
Other sex offenses -----	-	1	-	-
Total, 11 months of 1949 --	52	18	297	76
Rape -----	34	12	124	37
Crimes against children -----	11	4	113	26
Indecent exposure -----	4	1	35	6
Sex perversion -----	2	1	20	7
Crime against nature -----	-	-	3	-
Other sex offenses -----	1	-	2	-

STATEMENT OF RICHARD A. MCGEE
Director, Department of Corrections, State of California

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
SACRAMENTO, 14, January 18, 1950

Hon. Ralph M. Brown, Chairman
Assembly Interim Committee on Judicial System and Judicial Process
Modesto, California

DEAR MR. BROWN: Concerning testimony given before the Sub-Committee to Investigate Sex Crimes of your Assembly Interim Committee on Judicial System and Judicial Process in San Francisco on January 14th, I am enclosing, at your request, a copy, for each member of the committee, of "Sex Offenders in California Prisons, 1945-1949" and also of an article prepared by myself on the same general subject matter in 1937.

I made certain recommendations at the hearing which for your convenience I will summarize here:

1. The staffs of the Bureau of Criminal Statistics and of the Division of Criminal Identification and Investigation of the Department of Justice should be augmented so as to permit the complete collection of data on sex offenders from the local law enforcement agencies. This data should be collected on a case basis and each arrest reported should be followed through to disposition so that a clear picture may be established for the first time of exactly how many offenses of this type occur and how they are dealt with by the various local agencies. Until this is done, it is my opinion that we are working in the dark and making an effort to cure a social ill without knowing either the nature of the disease or the extent of it. I would recommend, in this connection, that the committee discuss this matter with the heads of the two agencies mentioned above, namely, Mr. Ronald Beattie and Mr. George Brereton.

2. There is a need for medical research in the fields of psychiatry and bio-chemistry. The direction of this research should be, first, toward identifying potential offenders before offenses are committed, and, second, toward developing better methods of differential diagnosis for purposes of separating the dangerous offenders who should be institutionalized from the less dangerous who can be controlled and handled successfully under community supervision. Finally, the research should attempt to find cures and, if not cures, at least methods of physical and mental treatment which will result in control of the potential offender without the necessity of institutionalization.

3. Laws and machinery should be provided to insure the complete registration of all misdemeanor offenders who have molested or attempted to molest children. This can only be brought about if everyone of these individuals is fingerprinted and the fingerprints filed and classified in the State Bureau of Identification. Registration is only a partial answer to the problem and serves primarily as a tool in the hands of the police in apprehending suspects. Even here, it is not too effective because statistics presented indicate that more than half of the sex offenders sent to prison have no previous police records.

4. It is recommended that the committee take a strong position on the question of local law enforcement agencies issuing "floaters" in sex cases. This is a vicious practice in any event but it is inexcusable in connection with sex offenders. It is a common practice in cases of indecent exposure, Peeping Toms, and similar offenses, in which no actual physical violence is involved, to convict these individuals on a misdemeanor charge and then suspend sentence on the condition that the offender leave the jurisdiction. This has exactly the opposite effect from that desired because, instead of placing these persons under competent supervision so that some local agency will know at all times where the individual is living and how he is conducting himself, he is only foisted upon another community where, because of his anonymity and because of his transient condition, he is more likely than not to commit another offense. The community which issues the "floater" is likewise the victim of "floaters" from other communities. If there ever was a sample of official stupidity, the equivalent to the ostrich burying his head in the sand, this is one of the best.

5. There should be provided in connection with the probation departments in the major counties special sex clinics wherein the personnel would be carefully selected and trained in these peculiar problems. Experience with these offenders would lead us to believe that a great many of them can be adjusted by counseling and community supervision so that they can continue in the community as self-supporting citizens without being a menace to the life and welfare of others.

6. For those serious cases who have been convicted of felonies and who are committed to prison, it is recommended that a large proportion of them be confined in a separate institution. The Department of Corrections Medical Facility, authorized by the Legislature in 1945, should be activated immediately and no delay should be countenanced in the construction of the permanent institution at Vacaville. This institution is not designed exclusively for sex offenders but several hundred of them should be confined, studied, and treated in this facility. The Navy prison at Terminal Island is available on a lease basis for the temporary and immediate activation of this institution and the Department of Corrections is recommending that the State

7. Some state agency or agencies, possibly the State Department of Education, should take the initiative in the preparation of materials of an educational nature to be used in police training courses, teacher training institutes, nurses' training and by social workers. Much of the hysteria and maladministration in connection with this whole problem has its root in the fact that very few of the persons charged with the responsibility for dealing with the welfare of children have any adequate understanding of what the problem is or what the defenses against it may be.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD A. MCGEE
Director of Corrections

This brief study of sex offenders in California State prisons is based on detailed statistical information on all male prisoners committed to the California prisons and incarcerated in these prisons since the beginning of the year 1945. The first section of the report shows the trend of commitments to prison from January 1, 1945, through the month of November, 1949. The second section presents an analysis of the characteristics of sex offenders received from court and is based on all prisoners admitted from the first of 1945 through June 30, 1949. The third section indicates the sentence and time served of sex offenders who have been released from California prisons on parole. This information covers all prisoners paroled from the first of 1945 through October, 1949.

Persons committed to prison for commercialized sex offenses, as pandering, are omitted from the study.

I. *Trend of Commitments of Sex Offenders to Prison*

The number of new prisoners committed to the California prisons from the superior courts of the State on felony charges involving sex offenses during the four years and eleven months from January 1, 1945, through November 30, 1949, was 1,078 men or 8.8 percent of the total new prisoners received during the period. This information by year is shown in Table I.

The total number of sex offenders is made up of three subgroups: 377 who were committed for rape under Penal Code Section 261; 470 committed for lewd and lascivious conduct with children under 14 years, Penal Code Section 288 (this class of cases will be referred to as L. and L. cases in this report for convenience and brevity); and 231 committed for other sex offenses, which includes 58 commitments for sodomy, Penal Code Section 286; 120 commitments for sex perversion, Penal Code Section 288a; 51 commitments for incest, Penal Code Section 285, and two commitments for the offense of annoying or molesting children, Penal Code Section 647a.

It is noted that in 1945, 11.2 percent of all men committed to prison were sex offenders. This percentage decreased very slightly each succeeding year until 1949 which shows a slight increase over the 1948. Still the 1949 percentage is less than the percentage of sex offenders for the whole five-year period. On the whole, rape accounts for about 3 percent of all commitments, L. and L. for about 4 percent, and other sex offenses about 2 percent. A decline through the whole period in relative number and proportion of rape offenses is indicated. There has been but small variation in the annual percentage of L. and L. offenses, although this percentage rose very slightly in 1949. The fact that many sex acts involving children may be charged under either Penal Code Section 261, rape, or Penal Code Section 288, L. and L., together with the fact that there has been a small increase in L. and L. and a decrease in rape, may indicate a tendency to make greater use

II. *Characteristics of Sex Offenders Committed to Prison*

Detailed information on adult males committed to California prisons during the four and one-half year period from January 1, 1945, through June 30, 1949, is presented in the next six tables which show county or area from which committed, race, age at admission, marital status, recidivism, and intelligence rating.

There are some striking variations in the proportion of sex offenders committed from certain areas as compared to the proportion of all offenders (Table II). Los Angeles County, which contributed 34 percent of the total commitments during this period, accounted for less than 22 percent of the sex offenders. Alameda County and the seven San Joaquin Valley counties also sent a smaller proportion of sex offenders to prison than they did of all offenders. On the other hand, the other areas of the State furnished more than their proportionate share of sex offenders. The nine Southern California counties, aside from Los Angeles, accounted for almost one-fourth of all the sex offenders committed, but only 17.4 percent of all offenders. Likewise, the seven counties in the San Francisco Bay region, apart from San Francisco and Alameda Counties, committed a relatively greater proportion of sex offenders.

Concerning the type of offense, it is interesting to note that the 10 Sacramento Valley counties sentenced proportionately twice as many L. and L. cases as rape cases, whereas the seven San Joaquin counties and the other 22 counties of the State committed a much larger proportion of rape cases than of L. and L. cases.

Race

The racial composition of offenders received in prison (Table III) indicates that during the period covered 64.4 percent of all commitments were white, 12.7 percent were Mexican, and 20.7 percent negro. There are some notable differences from these in the racial make-up of those committed for sex offenses.

The white group showed a relatively low proportion committed for rape and a very high proportion for L. and L. and other sex offenses. The Mexican group had a very high proportion committed for rape. The negro group, on the other hand, showed low proportions in all types of sex offenses, actually having only 6 percent of the total L. and L. cases.

Age at Admission to Prison

Considerable variation in age is indicated among the sex offense groups and between sex offenders and all other offenders committed to prison. Table IV shows that the median age of all offenders committed was 29.3 years while for sex offenders it was 36.7 years. Within the sex offender groups, there is a wide divergence between those committed for rape and those committed for other sex offenses.

The median age for those committed for rape was 27.3 years, while this age was approximately 41 years both for L. and L. and other sex offenses, a difference of nearly 14 years. Obviously, it is a much older group that is engaged in the latter types of offenses. This same observation restated is that over 41 percent of all those committed for rape were under the age of 25 years at the time of admission to prison. Less than 10 percent of the L. and L. cases and only 11 percent of the other sex cases were under the age of 25 when committed.

[Mar. 8, 1950]

Mar. 8, 1950]

Table I—Sex Offenses by Year
Adult Male Prisoners Received by California Prisons From Superior Courts
January 1, 1945, Through November 30, 1949

Offense	Total 4 yrs. 11 mos.		1945		1946		1947		1948		1949 11 mos.	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total received	12,258	100.0	1,939	100.0	2,215	100.0	2,727	100.0	2,852	100.0	2,525	100.0
Total sex offenders	1,078	8.8	218	11.2	204	9.2	238	8.7	204	7.2	214	8.5
Rape	377	3.1	75	3.9	85	3.8	93	3.4	68	2.4	56	2.2
Lewd and lascivious conduct	470	3.8	94	4.8	70	3.2	103	3.8	101	3.6	102	4.1
All other	231	1.9	49	2.5	49	2.2	42	1.5	35	1.2	56	2.2

Table II—County or Area From Which Committed and Sex Offenses
Adult Male Prisoners Received From Court
January 1, 1945, Through June 30, 1949

County or area of commitment	Total commitments		Total sex		Rape		L. and L. conduct		Other sex	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	11,158	100.0	972	100.0	345	100.0	421	100.0	206	100.0
Southern California	5,743	51.5	447	46.0	163	47.4	193	45.9	91	44.2
Los Angeles County	3,801	34.1	211	21.7	83	24.1	88	20.9	40	19.4
Nine others	1,942	17.4	236	24.3	80	23.2	105	25.0	51	24.8
San Francisco Bay Region	2,237	20.0	230	23.7	75	21.7	110	26.1	45	21.8
San Francisco County	873	7.8	88	9.1	24	7.0	41	9.7	23	11.1
Alameda County	634	5.7	40	4.1	17	4.9	17	4.0	6	2.9
Seven other counties	730	6.5	102	10.5	34	9.8	52	12.4	16	7.8
Balance of State	3,178	28.5	295	30.3	107	31.0	118	28.0	70	34.0
Sacramento Valley, 10 counties	884	7.9	102	10.5	22	6.4	54	12.8	26	12.6
San Joaquin Valley, 7 counties	1,642	14.7	116	11.9	48	13.9	37	8.8	31	15.1
Rest of State, 22 counties	652	5.9	77	7.9	37	10.7	27	6.4	13	6.3

Table III—Race and Sex Offenses
Adult Male Prisoners Received From Court
January 1, 1945, Through June 30, 1949

Race	Total commitments		Total sex		Rape		L. and L. conduct		Other sex	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	11,158	100.0	972	100.0	345	100.0	421	100.0	206	100.0
White	7,181	64.4	694	71.4	189	54.8	344	81.7	161	78.1
Mexican	1,420	12.7	156	16.0	93	26.9	43	10.2	20	9.7
Negro	2,313	20.7	99	10.2	52	15.1	25	6.0	22	10.7
Other	244	2.2	23	2.4	11	3.2	9	2.1	3	1.5

Table IV—Age at Admission and Sex Offenses
Adult Male Prisoners Received From Court
January 1, 1945, Through June 30, 1949

Age in years	Total commitments		Total sex		Rape		L. and L. conduct		Other sex	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	11,158	100.0	972	100.0	345	100.0	421	100.0	206	100.0
Under 20	583	5.2	43	4.4	32	9.3	5	1.2	6	2.9
20-24	3,061	27.4	163	16.8	111	32.2	35	8.3	17	8.2
25-29	2,250	20.2	127	13.1	63	18.3	50	11.9	14	6.8
30-34	1,599	14.3	107	11.0	46	13.3	40	9.5	21	10.2
35-39	1,268	11.4	137	14.1	29	8.4	71	16.9	37	18.0
40-49	1,624	14.6	230	23.6	46	13.3	115	27.3	69	33.5
50-59	572	5.1	101	10.4	11	3.2	61	14.5	29	14.1
60 and over	201	1.8	64	6.6	7	2.0	44	10.4	13	6.3
Median age	29.3	-	36.7	-	27.3	-	40.8	-	41.0	-

Marital Status

Information on marital status has its limitations, as it records only the status of the prisoner at the time of commitment and does not disclose the relative degree of family and marital stability or instability which may have occurred in each offender's case. Nevertheless, these limited data on marital status do show some interesting facts regarding sex offenders.

In Table V it is seen that more men classified as divorced, separated, or widowed are to be found in the L. and L. cases; and, on the other hand, more single or married men are rape cases. For the group of 206 cases of other sex offenses, those classed as single predominated.

Recidivism

Considerable information on prior criminal record of all persons committed to California prisons is kept in the statistical system. This information (Table VI) points out for sex offenders the number of persons committed to prison who had no record of a prior commitment to jail or a juvenile institution, those that had one prior commitment to prison, and those who had two or more prior commitments to prison.

From the data in Table VI, it is seen that the sex offenders are on the whole a group with much less recidivism than are the other types of offenders. In fact, the proportion of persons committed to prison for sex offenses who had no prior record of commitment is over 50 percent, whereas for all men committed it was only 26 percent.

Intelligence

During the four and one-half year period covered by this section of the study, nearly everyone received at prison was tested for an intelligence rating. The tests used and the conditions under which the tests were administered have not always been consistent, so that too much reliability should not be placed on information relating to the specific intelligence ratings. However, for a large group of cases and for the main intelligence classifications, it is believed that the ratings do have general value.

Table VII presents the information on intelligence rating for the sex offenders as well as for all offenders. For the total sex offender group there is very little difference in the intelligence ratings recorded as compared with the results for all offenders. However, as between the types of sex offenders, it is to be noted that those committed for L. and L. and other sex offenses show a definitely higher intelligence rating than those committed for rape.

Table V—Marital Status and Sex Offenses
Adult Male Prisoners Received From Court January 1, 1945, Through June 30, 1949

Marital status	Total sex		Rape		L. and L. conduct		Other sex	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	11,158	100.0	345	100.0	421	100.0	206	100.0
Single	4,143	37.2	120	34.6	123	29.2	83	45.1
Married	3,703	33.2	160	46.4	153	36.4	64	31.1
Divorced	1,637	14.7	32	9.3	71	16.9	81	15.0
Separated	1,298	11.6	24	6.9	41	9.7	16	7.8
Annulled	81	0.7	4	1.2	3	0.7	1	0.5
Widowed	290	2.6	5	1.4	30	7.1	1	0.5

Table VI—Recidivism and Sex Offenses
Adult Male Prisoners Received From Court January 1, 1945, Through June 30, 1949

Recidivism	Total sex		Rape		L. and L. conduct		Other sex	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	11,158	100.0	345	100.0	421	100.0	206	100.0
No prior	2,918	26.1	184	52.2	227	53.3	96	46.6
Misdemeanor or previous juvenile	4,149	37.2	105	30.5	102	24.2	63	25.7
1 prior	2,296	20.6	46	13.3	60	14.3	33	16.0
2 or more prior	1,795	16.1	10	2.9	32	7.6	24	11.7

Table VII—Intelligence and Sex Offenses
Adult Male Prisoners Received From Court January 1, 1945, Through June 30, 1949

Intelligence	Total sex		Rape		L. and L. conduct		Other sex	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	11,158	100.0	345	100.0	421	100.0	206	100.0
No rating	226	2.0	3	0.8	6	1.4	4	1.9
Total rated	10,932	100.0	312	100.0	415	100.0	202	100.0
Superior, 120 and over	826	7.5	18	5.8	41	9.8	21	10.4
High average, 110-119	1,897	17.1	40	11.7	63	15.2	34	16.8
Average, 90-109	4,829	44.2	140	40.9	204	49.2	90	44.0
Low average, 80-89	1,955	17.5	79	23.1	60	14.5	38	18.8
Borderline, 68-79	1,029	9.2	40	11.7	32	7.7	16	7.4
Defective, under 68	490	4.5	25	7.3	15	3.6	4	2.0

III. Sentence and Time Served in Prison Before Parole for Sex Offenders

Information on sentence and time served is available for all sex offenders paroled from January 1, 1945, through October 31, 1949, a period of four years and ten months. Table VIII shows the distribution of persons released on parole for the first time for these factors and for type of sex offense. For each offense and for both time served before parole and for sentence there is shown the median (the middle case of the distribution, 50 percent of the cases being lower and 50 percent higher) and the range of values for the middle 80 percent of the cases. Inasmuch as there are always a few extraordinary cases, it has been found that the range of the middle 80 percent, omitting the 10 percent at both ends, presents a very usable comparison of distributions.

For those committed for rape the median sentence was 10 years and for the middle 80 percent the sentence ranged from 5 to 20 years. The median time served before parole was 36.3 months, and for the middle 80 percent ranged from 18 to 91 months. The assault on rape cases although having different statutory limits show sentences and periods of time served very similar to the rape cases. On the other hand, L. and L. cases have larger sentences and also periods of time served. The median sentence in L. and L. cases was 12 years. The range of the middle 80 percent was from 7 to 20 years. The median time served by L. and L. cases was 44.4 months. It will be noted that incest cases showed sentences as severe as the L. and L. cases and more time served before parole. Offenders charged with sodomy and sex perversion had both the shortest sentences and time served before parole. This would be expected as the statutory range for these offenses is considerably lower than for rape, L. and L., and incest.

4 yrs 10 months

Table VIII—Sentence and Time Served in Prison Before Parole for Sex Offenders January 1, 1945, Through October 31, 1949 (Sentence in Years and Time Served in Months)

Item	Rape Number	Rape Percent	Assault to Rape	L. and L. Number	L. and L. Percent	Sodomy	Sex Perversion	Incest
SENTENCE IN YEARS								
statutory limits	0-50	100.0	0-20	1-Life	100.0	1-10 yr.	1-15 yr.	0-50 yr.
Total	234		45	336		48	92	40
Less than 5 years	14	6.0	4	1	0.3	4	8	-
5 years	17	7.3	3	12	3.6	9	12	-
6 years	23	9.8	6	12	3.6	4	8	-
7 years	15	6.4	6	17	5.0	5	11	2
8 years	21	9.0	6	20	8.0	5	11	-
9 years	8	3.4	2	7	2.1	2	3	-
10-14 years	75	32.0	18	167	49.7	14	31	21
15-19 years	32	13.7	4	57	17.0	-	8	14
20 years and over	29	12.4	2	34	10.1	-	-	3
Median	10	-	10	12	-	7	8	12
Range middle 80%	5-20	-	0-15	7-20	-	5-10	5-14	10-18
TIME IN PRISON BEFORE PAROLE IN MONTHS								
Total	234	100.0	45	336	100.0	48	92	40
12-23 months	48	20.5	9	24	7.1	11	21	10
24-35 months	63	26.9	13	64	19.1	14	29	10
36-47 months	42	17.9	7	98	29.2	9	14	10
48-59 months	30	12.8	6	66	19.6	5	13	10
60-71 months	13	5.6	3	30	8.9	3	6	3
72-83 months	13	5.6	2	17	5.1	1	4	4
84-95 months	7	3.0	2	9	2.7	1	1	-
96 months and over	18	7.7	2	28	8.3	-	4	3
Median	36.3	-	37.0	44.4	-	30.3	32.5	40.5
Range middle 80%	18-91	-	20-67	25-80	-	10-58	10-71	31-81

SUMMARY OF REGISTRATION SUBMITTED BY FRED N. HOWSER, ATTORNEY GENERAL

Under Section 290 Penal Code, by County and City

Table A—290 PC Registrations (By County and City) Received as of 11-16-49

Alameda	31	Riverside	6
Oakland	60	Sacramento	13
Alpine	0	San Benito	0
Amador	0	San Bernardino	8
Calaveras	0	San Diego County	22
Colusa	0	San Diego City	39
Contra Costa	9	San Francisco	91
El Dorado	0	San Joaquin	11
Fresno	12	San Mateo	35
Humboldt	2	Santa Barbara	31
Imperial	0	Santa Clara	21
Inyo	1	Santa Cruz	12
Kern	5	Shasta	2
Kings	0	Sierra	0
Lake	0	Siskiyou	0
Lassen	0	Solano	0
Los Angeles County	108	Sonoma	0
Long Beach	48	Stanislaus	0
Los Angeles City	102	Sutter	1
Madera	2	Tehama	0
Marin	7	Trinity	0
Mariposa	0	Tulare	3
Mendocino	2	Tuolumne	0
Merced	1	Ventura	2
Modoc	0	Yolo	1
Mono	0	Yuba	4
Monterey	15	Outside of California	
Napa	5	Ohio	1
Nevada	0	Oklahoma	1
Orange	4	Nevada	1
Placer	0		
Plumas	0	Total	719

Table B—290 PC Registrations Submitted

POLICE DEPARTMENTS		To date (12-1-49)	To date (12-1-49)
Alameda	2	Belvedere	0
Albany	5	Benicia	0
Alhambra	7	Berkeley	7
Alturas	0	Beverly Hills	3
Alviso	0	Biggs	0
Anaheim	0	Bishop	0
Angels Camp	0	Blue Lake	0
Antioch	0	Blythe	0
Arcadia	0	Brawley	0
Arcata	0	Brea	0
Arroyo Grande	0	Brentwood	0
Atherton	0	Burbank	4
Atwater	0	Burlingame	4
Auburn	0	Calexico	0
Avalon	0	Calipatria	0
Azusa	2	Calistoga	0
Bakersfield (see Kern County combined bureau)	0	Capitola	0
Banning	0	Carmel	0
Barstow	0	Ceres	0
Beaumont	0	Chico	0
Bell	1	Chino	0
Belmont	0	Chowchilla	0
		Chula Vista	0

Table B—290 PC Registrations Submitted—Continued

	To date (12-1-49)	To date (12-1-49)	
Claremont	0	Hercules	0
Cloverdale	0	Hermosa Beach	1
Clovis	0	Hillsborough	0
Coachella	0	Hollister	0
Coalinga	1	Holtville	0
Colfax	0	Huntington Beach	0
Colma	0	Huntington Park	0
Colton	0	Imperial	0
Colusa	0	Indio	0
Compton	3	Inglewood	5
Concord	0	Isleton	0
Corcoran	0	Jackson	0
Corning	0	Kensington Police Protection District, Berkeley	0
Corona	2	Kerman	0
Coronado	0	King City	0
Corte Madera	0	Kingsburg	0
Covina	0	Laguna Beach	0
Crescent City	0	La Habra	0
Culver City	0	Lakeport	0
Daly City	0	La Mesa	0
Davis	0	Larkspur	0
Delano	0	La Verne	0
Dinuba	0	Lemoore	0
Dixon	0	Lincoln	0
Dorris	0	Lindsay	0
Dos Palos	0	Live Oak	0
Dunsmuir	0	Livermore	0
El Cajon	1	Livingston	0
El Centro	0	Lodi	0
El Cerrito	2	Lompoc	1
El Monte	0	Long Beach	62
El Segundo	0	Los Angeles	112
Elsinore	0	Los Banos	0
Emeryville	0	Los Gatos	0
Escondido	0	Loyalton	0
Etna	2	Lynwood	3
Eureka	0	Madera	0
Exeter	0	Manhattan Beach	0
Fairfax	0	Mauneca	0
Fairfield	0	Marietta	0
Ferndale	0	Martinez	0
Fillmore	0	Marysville	4
Firebaugh	0	Maywood	2
Folsom	0	Mendota	0
Fort Bragg	1	Menlo Park	0
Fort Jones	0	Merced	0
Fortuna	0	Millbrae	0
Fowler	0	Mill Valley	0
Fresno (see Fresno County, combined bureau)	0	Modesto (see Stanislaus County, combined bureau)	0
Fullerton	0	Monrovia	1
Galt	0	Montague	0
Gardena	0	Montebello	1
Gilroy	0	Monterey	0
Glendale	15	Monterey Park	0
Glendora	0	Morgan Hill	0
Gonzales	0	Grass Valley	0
Greenfield	0	Mountain View	0
Gridley	0	Mount Shasta	0
Guadalupe	0	Napa	5
Hanford	1	National City	0
Hawthorne	0	Needles	0
Hayward	2	Nevada City	0
Healdsburg	0	Newman	0
Hemet	0	Newport Beach	2
		North Sacramento	0

Table B—290 PC Registrations Submitted—Continued

	To date (12-1-49)		To date (12-1-49)
Oakdale	0	San Luis Obispo	0
Oakland	34	San Marino	0
Oceanside	3	San Mateo	5
Ojai	0	San Pablo	0
Ontario	3	San Rafael	0
Orange	0	Santa Ana	3
Orange Cove	0	Santa Barbara	24
Orland	0	Santa Clara	0
Oroville	0	Santa Cruz	0
Oxnard	0	Santa Maria	1
Pacific Grove	0	Santa Monica	4
Palm Springs	0	Santa Paula	0
Palo Alto	2	Santa Rosa	0
Palos Verdes Estates	0	Sausalito	0
Parlier	0	Seal Beach	0
Pasadena	6	Sebastopol	0
Paso Robles	0	Selma	0
Patterson	0	Shafter	0
Perris	0	Sierra Madre	0
Petaluma	0	Signal Hill	3
Piedmont	0	Soledad	0
Pinole	0	Sonoma	0
Pismo Beach	0	Sonoma	0
Pittsburg	1	South Gate	2
Placentia	0	South Pasadena	0
Placerville	0	South San Francisco	2
Pleasanton	0	Stockton (see San Joaquin County, combined bureau)	0
Plymouth	0	Suisun	0
Pomona	0	Sunnyvale	0
Point Arena	0	Susanville	0
Porterville	0	Surter Creek	0
Portola	0	Taft	0
Port Hueneme	0	Tehachapi	0
Red Bluff	0	Tehama	0
Redding	1	Torrance	2
Redlands	0	Tracy	1
Redondo Beach	3	Trinidad	0
Redwood City	5	Tulare	0
Reedley	0	Tulelake	0
Rialto	0	Turlock	0
Richmond	3	Tustin	0
Ripon	0	Ukiah	0
Rio Vista	0	Upland	0
Riverbank	0	Vacaville	0
Riverside (see Riverside County, combined bureau)	0	Vallejo	0
Rocklin	0	Ventura	0
Roseville	0	Vernon	0
Ross	0	Visalia	0
Sacramento	11	Walnut Creek	0
Saint Helena	0	Wasco	0
Salinas	0	Watsonville	3
San Anselmo	0	Weed	0
San Bernardino	2	West Covina	0
San Bruno	1	Westmoreland	0
San Carlos	0	Wheatland	0
San Clemente	0	Whittier	1
San Diego	38	Williams	0
San Fernando	0	Willits	0
San Francisco	101	Willows	0
San Gabriel	0	Winters	0
Sanger	0	Woodlake	1
San Jacinto	0	Woodland	0
San Joaquin	0	Yreka	0
San Jose	18	Yuba City	0
San Juan Bautista	0		
San Leandro	0	Total	549

Table B—290PC Registrations Submitted—Continued

SHERIFFS' OFFICES		To date (12-1-49)	To date (12-1-49)	
Alameda		42	0	
Alpine		0	6	
Amador		0	3	
Butte		0	0	
Calaveras		0	6	
Colusa		0	20	
Contra Costa		3	San Francisco (See San Fran- cisco Police Department)	0
Del Norte		0	San Joaquin	12
El Dorado		0	San Luis Obispo	0
Fresno		12	San Mateo	17
Glenn		0	Santa Barbara	6
Humboldt		0	Santa Clara (See San Jose Police Department, combined bureau)	0
Imperial		0	Santa Cruz	10
Inyo		1	Shasta	1
Kern		5	Sierra	0
Kings		1	Siskiyou	0
Lake		0	Solano	2
Lassen		0	Sonoma	0
Los Angeles		54	Stanislaus	0
Madera		2	Sutter	0
Marin		4	Tehama	0
Mariposa		0	Trinity	0
Mendocino		0	Tulare	2
Merced		0	Tuolumne	0
Modoc		0	Ventura	1
Mono		0	Yolo	0
Monterey		14	Yuba	1
Napa		1		
Nevada		0	Total	226
Orange		1		
Placer		0		
Total Sheriffs' and Chiefs of Police			775	