

The Evolution of Miami and Dade County's Judiciary, 1896-1930

By Paul George*

City and county courts reflected in various ways the meteoric growth of Miami and Dade County between the former's incorporation as a city in 1896 and 1930.¹ Swelling court dockets, numerous special sessions, a growing number of judges, and additional tribunals were the norm. The area's courts handled civil and criminal cases, ruled on the constitutionality of municipal and state ordinances, and issued opinions and pronouncements on the structure and operation of numerous institutions of criminal justice in Miami and Dade County. Furthermore, the county Grand Jury, an adjunct of the Circuit Court, served a vital community role through investigation of crimes, presentation of indictments, and proposals for the improvement of city and county institutions. This study will examine the operation and growth of the area's court system during Miami's first generation of corporate existence, the Grand Jury and its impact upon criminal justice, and, finally, other functions of the courts in addition to the adjudication of civil and criminal cases.

The original city charter gave Miami's lone court, the Municipal Court, jurisdiction over all offenses against the city code and any and all misdemeanors under state law committed within the city of Miami.² The county has separate and distinct courts which were created by Florida statute during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

A Circuit Court consisting of three sections — criminal, chancery, and common law — is the highest level county court. Initially, all crimes in the county came under the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court, which until 1917 was a peripatetic tribunal holding two sessions annually in

*Instructor, History Department, Florida State University

Dade County. A twelve person jury decided each criminal case. The Circuit Court also directed the deliberations of a county Grand Jury. Finally, this tribunal heard appeals from the lower courts of Dade County.

The other branches of the Circuit Court dealt with civil suits. The chancery tried litigation cases, such as divorce suits and foreclosures on mortgages or liens, where jury trials were unnecessary. The common law division of the Circuit Court was concerned with monetary suits involving \$5,000 or more, which could be referred to a six person jury for settlement.

In addition to a judge elected to a term of four years by the voters of Dade County, the chief officers of the Circuit Court included a state's attorney who served as a prosecutor in criminal cases and a county sheriff who served as bailiff.³

The second level county court was the Criminal Court of Record which, after its creation in 1907, relieved the heavily congested Circuit Court of all criminal cases except those involving capital crimes.⁴ The Criminal Court of Record held six regular sessions annually. A six person jury decided cases in this court. In addition to a judge who also served a four-year term, the court's chief officers included a county solicitor, who acted as a public prosecutor, and a county sheriff.⁵

Minor suits involving sums of money less than \$500.00 were tried in the County Court under the direction of a county judge and in the presence of six jurors. The county judge was also the presiding officer in the County Judge's Court, which tried both criminal and civil suits. In criminal cases, this judge sat as a committing magistrate with his authority limited to one of two areas. He could either discharge a defendant from arrest, or bind the defendant over to the Criminal Court of Record, or, in capital cases, to the Circuit Court. The County Judge's Court had jurisdiction in civil suits involving less than \$100.00. This court was also the probate court with jurisdiction over wills and estates. The judge of the County Judge's Court also held lunacy hearings, issued marriage and hunting licenses, and signed occupational and other licenses. Officers of the County Court and County Judge's Court included the sheriff and several county constables.⁶

The county judge also served as ex-officio coroner. In addition, from 1911 until 1921, he was judge of a Juvenile Court, an appendage of the County Court. The jurisdiction of this court extended to delinquent persons seventeen years of age and younger.⁷

A Court of Crimes, created by the state legislature in 1927 to relieve the congested Criminal Court of Record of all misdemeanor cases, became another important county tribunal.⁸ Additional courts in Dade County included a Civil Court of Record which heard all common law suits involving \$5,000 or less, the United States District Court for the southern district of Florida, a peripatetic federal court which heard hundreds of cases during the 1920's involving violators of federal prohibition statutes, and a Justice of the Peace Court.⁹ In a Justice of the Peace Court, justices acted as committing magistrates with authority to discharge or bind defendants over to the Criminal Court of Record or the Circuit Court. In civil actions, the justice of the peace for Miami had jurisdiction in suits involving not more than \$50.00¹⁰

In the years immediately after Miami's incorporation, the few courts in the area met only briefly and sporadically. Miami's Mayor or Police Court was the lone court in the immediate area since the county tribunals met in Juno in northern Dade County until the county seat returned to Miami in 1899. The Mayor's Court held several sessions monthly in the new city hall building on Twelfth Street (later Flagler Street). The city's mayor served without compensation as its judge, sentencing offenders in accordance with a schedule of penalties outlined in the municipal code. Despite light court dockets and modest fines, the Mayor's Court was the primary source of municipal revenue during this period.¹¹ As the city entered its second decade crime had increased sharply. To meet heavier court loads more effectively, the city council replaced the Mayor's Court with a Municipal Court in 1905. The Municipal Court had a full-time elected judge who served a two year term at an annual salary of \$600.00 A prosecuting city attorney assisted the Municipal Court judge.¹²

The rise in criminal activity also contributed to heavier dockets in the county courts, which heard cases in the new county courthouse on Twelfth Street after 1903. Meeting in spring and fall sessions, the Circuit Court disposed of hundreds of cases annually by 1907. Despite this record, the Circuit Court faced a backlog of six months to one year in criminal cases and indefinite delays in the disposition of civil cases. Consequently, support grew for the establishment of a Criminal Court of Record to relieve the Circuit Court of a portion of its work.¹³

Therefore, the Florida Legislature created a Criminal Court of Record for Dade County in 1907. In its inaugural session in December, 1907, the new court heard 120 cases.¹⁴ Within one year of its inception,

the Criminal Court of Record had disposed of nearly 700 cases, from misdemeanors to homicides.¹⁵ In the ensuing decade its case load continued to spiral.

The dockets of other county courts were considerably lighter, but the fine and forfeiture money collected in the County Court enabled the county to finance its penal institutions, pay the costs of criminal prosecutions, and underwrite the operations of the sheriff's department. As mentioned earlier, additional responsibility for the judge of the County Court came with the creation of a Juvenile Court in 1911.¹⁶

In the Juvenile Court's first decade, the County Court judge disposed of hundreds of cases that came before it. Since the county lacked a juvenile detention home, the Juvenile Court sent serious offenders to the Florida Industrial School for Boys, a reform school at Marianna; the Court placed minor offenders in the custody of parents or with a court appointed guardian. The Court's probation officer maintained frequent consultation with the latter.¹⁷

Due to the heavier work load and responsibilities of the county judge and a rise in juvenile delinquency, the state legislature, in 1921, created a separate Juvenile Court for Dade County. The judge of the new Juvenile Court served for two years at an annual salary of \$2,400. The Court's jurisdiction remained as before. Within two years of its creation, the Juvenile Court had heard over 400 cases. By 1926, it had adjudicated 4,000 cases.¹⁸

The Municipal Court was the area's busiest tribunal. By 1915, it was deciding 3,000 cases annually and its fine and forfeiture total had reached \$12,000.¹⁹ Daily sessions, which initially lasted for several minutes, stretched to one hour or longer. The Court's docket included infractions against nearly every municipal ordinance. Violations of traffic, liquor, and gambling laws brought the largest numbers of offenders before the Court. The Municipal Court also issued rulings on the constitutionality of municipal ordinances. On a lighter note, the judge of the Municipal Court married numerous persons brought before the Court for fornication in order to prevent their incarceration.²⁰

Most of the defendants appearing in Municipal Court posted bonds. Increasing numbers found that although they might forfeit their bonds, they would suffer no ill consequences. Persons arrested and unable to post bond usually remained in the city jail overnight and appeared in court the following morning. Punishment of persons found guilty of a municipal offense was relatively light, rarely exceeding thirty days in

jail or a fine of several hundred dollars. Those persons found guilty and unable to pay a fine were usually put to work on municipal building and cleaning projects for the length of their term.

By the early part of the 1920's, the Municipal Court was hearing upwards of 5,000 cases and contributing \$60,000 annually to the municipal coffers. With the great South Florida land and construction boom bringing thousands of fortune seekers to Miami monthly in 1925, the Court now tried as many as 250 cases daily and collected as much as \$25,000 monthly from fines and forfeitures.²¹

With the Municipal Court unable to hear cases quickly enough to relieve the overcrowded city jail, the city commission, in 1925, authorized an assistant Municipal Court judge to assist the Court in processing its cases.²² But congestion in the court and jail continued. Consequently, the city commission established, in October, 1925, an evening session of the Municipal Court which met six times each week.²³ At one session in November, 1925, it heard 113 cases.²⁴ During the spring of 1926, Coconut Grove, which had recently been annexed to Miami, received its own Municipal Court; this tribunal subsequently heard cases involving infractions against the municipal code in Miami's southwest sector.

The boom had ended by 1926, but the Municipal Courts' dockets remained heavy. During one night session in April, Judge John Hefferman sentenced more than one hundred traffic offenders to jail for one day.²⁶ On November 8, Judge Frank Stoneman tried 254 cases.²⁷ By 1927, however, the city's population had declined sharply; a commensurate decrease in crime led to a sizable reduction of the Municipal Courts' dockets. Soon the city eliminated the night session of the Municipal Court. Later, the Municipal Court in Coconut Grove closed.²⁸

The astounding growth of the Municipal Court during this period was matched in the county courts. The Criminal Court of Record, with a broad spectrum of cases before it, heard, by the beginning of the 1920's, upwards of 200 cases during each of its six annual terms.²⁹ By this time the Court had received another officer — a county detective whose investigatory work provided the county solicitor with vital assistance in preparing the state's case against a defendant.³⁰ By 1925, the court was hearing thousands of cases annually and conducting numerous special sessions.³¹

Like the Municipal Court, the Criminal Court of Record's backlog of cases remained heavy after the boom was over. This backlog reached

800 in the fall of 1926, prompting a Grand Jury to recommend creation of a second Criminal Court of Record.³²

The Florida Legislature, instead, created, in 1927, a Court of Crimes which assumed jurisdiction over all misdemeanors previously tried in the Criminal Court of Record. The judge of this new tribunal served a four year elective term and received an annual salary of \$6,800. During its inaugural session in September, 1927, the Court of Crimes heard over 200 cases. It remained busy for the duration of the 1920's, hearing, in particular, numerous cases involving persons arrested for driving while intoxicated.³³

Despite its limited jurisdiction, the Criminal Court of Record remained busy. Heavy court dockets prompted the state legislature to provide the county solicitor with an assistant, and led to special sessions of the Court in 1928 and 1929.³⁴

The Circuit Court underwent even more dramatic changes during Miami's boom years. Prior to the boom, the state legislature, in 1917, provided a permanent Circuit Court for the area. The Circuit Court now met in several annual sessions in the Dade County courthouse.³⁵

Litigation before this tribunal increased sharply, prompting Florida Governor Cary Hardee to assign another judge to the bench in 1923.³⁶ Two years later, the Circuit Court received a third jurist. By this time the Court's clerk had 156 assistants to help him prepare its business.³⁷

As the Circuit Court's civil sector became increasingly congested, the legislature, in 1926, provided the county with a Civil Court of Record with jurisdiction over all common law suits involving \$5,000 or less.³⁸ In the following year, the Circuit Court received a fourth judge to assist it in adjudicating nearly 7,000 cases. These included more than 5,600 chancery suits, 1,250 common law suits, and a small number of criminal cases.³⁹

While other county courts also disposed of increasing numbers of cases, their dockets never reached the levels of the aforementioned tribunals. Some of these courts, however, played increasingly important roles during the 1920's. The United States District Court for the southern district of Florida held several sessions annually in Dade County by the middle of the 1920's, disposing of hundreds of cases of prohibition violations.⁴⁰

The Justice of Peace Court was another tribunal which assumed increasing importance in the 1920's, primarily because city and county lawmen, in an effort to halt a steep rise in reckless driving and au-

tomobile accidents, turned over many persons convicted of these offenses in Municipal Court to the Justice of Peace Court (as well as the Court of Crimes) for a second trial under state statute.⁴¹

The operation of the courts, as well as other institutions of the city and county, was influenced directly by the Dade County Grand Jury. This body was composed of eighteen men selected from various parts of Dade County by the judge of the Circuit Court. The County Grand Jury met several times annually at the behest of this jurist who charged it with investigating major crimes and conducting inquiries into local affairs and institutions supported by taxation, including city and county government, public schools, hospitals, and jails. At the outset of its deliberations (which could last from a few weeks to several months), each Grand Jury selected a foreman from among its peers to provide it with leadership and a clerk to prepare its final report to the judge of the Circuit Court.

In conducting criminal investigations, the Grand Jury worked closely with the state's attorney, who presented the state's cases to the Grand Jury, seeking indictments. This process included interrogation of witnesses by the Grand Jury. In the event a Grand Jury returned an indictment, the case, depending on whether it came under the category of a capital offense or a lesser crime, went to either the judge of the Circuit Court, the Criminal Court of Record, or the Court of Crimes. The judge of the court receiving indictments then ordered its chief officer to issue *capiases* (judicial writs) to the sheriff to make arrests. In special circumstances, such as the murder of Sergeant Laurie Wever of the Miami Police Department in 1925, the judge of the Department in 1925, the judge of the Circuit Court could call a Grand Jury into session immediately. A civil emergency, such as the labor unrest in Miami during 1919, could also lead to the immediate convocation of a Grand Jury.⁴²

Conducting trial investigations was an important Grand Jury function. Proceeding according to specific instructions from the judge of the Circuit Court, the Grand Jury also undertook investigations into a wide variety of municipal practices and institutions. At the end of its labors, it issued a written report containing, in addition to indictments in criminal cases, its findings on the conditions of the institutions examined with recommendations for their improvement.⁴³

City and county authorities, however, rejected most Grand Jury recommendations. Notable exceptions occurred in the realm of prisons, traffic and liquor enforcement, and court personnel.

The Grand Jury's recommendations were generally balanced. A notable exception occurred in 1918, when the Grand Jury recommended the establishment of a "restricted district" where prostitution would be allowed. The Grand Jury argued that such a district would prevent the spread of prostitution into residential areas of Miami — which had occurred since the demise of Hardieville, Miami's redlight district, in 1917. But a loud outcry from the press and many prominent Miamians quickly killed this recommendation.⁴⁴

Ten years later a Grand Jury undertook a laborious investigation of the Miami Police Department highlighted by the interrogation of hundreds of witnesses. It subsequently recommended a total reorganization of the force under new leadership. This recommendation was, for the most part, adopted.⁴⁵

The number of categories of criminal cases before the courts at a particular time reflected the type of crimes predominant in the area during that era. For example, many persons appeared before the Municipal Court and some county courts during the early years of the twentieth century for alleged offenses against the sanitary code.⁴⁶ By the second decade of the twentieth century, liquor and gambling cases far exceeded sanitary violations. In the latter part of this decade, cases involving traffic violations began to clog the dockets of several courts. Throughout the 1920's, liquor, gambling, and traffic violations continued to dominate court dockets.⁴⁷

But the function of the courts and their justices transcended adjudication of civil and criminal cases. The courts also judged the constitutionality of laws brought before them in test cases, particularly legislation regulating liquor and traffic. For example, Judge W. Frank Blanton of the Municipal Court struck down, in 1915, a law providing that all near beer saloons pay \$1,500 for a merchant's license because it imposed a "prohibitive" cost on a product not proven to be intoxicating.⁴⁸ In the following year, the city council passed a new ordinance setting the price of a merchant's license for near beer operators at \$500.00.⁴⁹ The Municipal Court and, later, the Circuit Court upheld this law.⁵⁰ At other times, however, a higher court reversed a decision of a lower court. This occurred in 1922 when the Circuit Court reversed an earlier decision of the Municipal Court upholding an ordinance which banned jitneys from thoroughfares where street cars operated.⁵¹

Judges also addressed themselves to numerous social issues. They advocated procedural and institutional reforms, and, in the process of

sentencing offenders, took direct aim at repeated violations of certain laws. Thus Judge James T. Saunders of the Municipal Court complained, as early as 1906, of the large number of vagrants in the city, and promised that "if the police will arrest them, I will do the rest."⁵² Soon after, Judge William I. Metcalf of the Criminal Court of Record, angered at the number of persons before his Court for offenses committed while inebriated, declared that the police must exercise more vigilance in pursuing drunks.⁵³ One decade later, Judge Stoneman of the Municipal Court declared a war on vice and promised to impose maximum fines on prostitutes who came before his court.⁵⁴

Judges sometimes expressed opinions on race. Judge John Grambling of the Municipal Court spoke disparagingly of Nassau blacks who "upon their arrival here consider themselves the social equal of white people."⁵⁵ Judge Blanton asked the city council in 1917 to establish a "Color Line" separating the races in Miami.⁵⁶ Three years later, Judge H. Pierre Branning of the Circuit Court led a delegation of municipal leaders who met with black leaders in the aftermath of a white bombing in Colored Town and proposed solutions to the problems which provoked the crisis.⁵⁷

Justices of the Circuit Court were ideally suited to combat social problems because of their power to impanel an investigating Grand Jury. Justice Branning charged a Grand Jury in 1919 with investigating the possibility that a labor-race conspiracy was behind the unrest that rocked Miami during this period.⁵⁸

In the realm of institutional reform, the most frequent judicial demand concerned the area's crowded jails. Judge Saunders in 1906 requested that the city council act to relieve the city jail of severe overcrowding, while his counterpart on the bench of the Criminal Court of Record, Judge Metcalf, requested similar action of the county commission for the county jail in 1908.⁵⁹ This refrain continued, becoming more frequent in the 1920's when jurists like Judge Stoneman repeatedly asked the city commission to provide the city with a new jail.⁶⁰

The Circuit and County Courts directed their pleas for institutional reform to demands for additional tribunals to assist with increasingly heavier court dockets. As mentioned earlier, Judge Minor Jones of the Circuit Court asked for a Criminal Court of Record in 1906.⁶¹ Twenty years later, two of his successors, H.F. Atkinson and Andrew J. Rose, pressed state authorities and the Florida Legislature for additional judges and courts.⁶² In the meantime, justices of the County Court made frequent entreaties for an independent Juvenile Court.

The recent origins of the city and its institutions provided the courts with an excellent opportunity to introduce new procedural and legal practices and improve upon old ones. Consequently, demands for reform in these areas focused on a wide variety of issues. This activity was especially evident in the Municipal Court. The first period of change occurred with the accession of Paul G. Phillips to the bench in 1911. Judge Phillips instituted daily sessions of the Court which began promptly at 9:00 A.M.⁶³ Phillips also eliminated the practice of many persons who, after their arrest, signed "John Doe" on the police blotter in place of their legal name, posted bond, and subsequently forfeited it in lieu of a court appearance. This procedure permitted them to avoid any connection with their arrest. Phillips ruled that the legal name of all persons arrested would have to appear on police and court records; furthermore, the name and offense of each person would be read on the day their trial was scheduled whether or not they appeared in court. Judge Stoneman, in 1919, took Phillips' ruling one step further by prohibiting any person from avoiding a court appearance after an arrest.⁶⁵

By 1920, the Municipal Court had compiled an index file of all cases before it.⁶⁶ In subsequent years, persons appearing in court were checked against this file, and, if found to be repeaters, were usually fined more heavily than a first offender. By the middle of the 1920's, the Municipal Court and the Miami Police Department were cooperating closely in issuing "Courtesy Cards" to Miamians and visitors. A person holding a "Courtesy Card" could avoid a trip to police headquarters, a booking and bond after an arrest on a minor charge. Instead, he received a date to appear in court.⁶⁷ By the end of the decade, the Municipal Court and the police were permitting petty traffic violators to avoid a court appearance altogether by paying a fine at police headquarters.⁶⁸

The Criminal Court of Record was also innovative. Judge H.F. Atkinson, in 1910, installed a blackboard in his courtroom. At the outset of each daily session of the Court, the clerk listed cases scheduled for that day and the following day on this board. Atkinson adopted this measure to ensure the appearance of attorneys with cases before the court at the correct time, since, according to Atkinson, "the court has been bothered a great deal in the past by attorneys not being ready for since, according to Atkinson, "the court has been bothered a great deal in the past by attorneys not being ready for trial, either because they misunderstood the date set for the trial of certain cases, or because they had forgotten the date."⁶⁹

The Criminal Court of Record's prosecuting attorney, the county solicitor, sometimes contributed to court innovations. For example, Fred Pine, county solicitor from 1918 to 1926, was the primary force behind the passage of a law providing the Criminal Court of Record with a detective in 1919.⁷⁰ Pine's successor Robert Taylor also left his mark on court reform. In order to reduce congestion in the county jail and courts, Taylor in 1926 instructed Dade County Sheriff Henry Chase to release any prisoner whose conviction was doubtful because of insufficient evidence. For the same reason, Taylor also supported speedy trials for all prisoners.⁷¹

The Circuit Court's primary contribution to procedural reform occurred in 1926 when it sponsored a countywide law enforcement conference which, in part, dealt with schemes for a more expeditious dispatch of court cases.⁷²

Many judges believed that stern sentencing was an effective approach to reducing repeated violations of certain ordinances. John L. Billingsly, who was Judge of the Criminal Court from 1914 to 1917, was especially severe on prohibition offenders. Frequently Billingsly fined an offender \$500.00 or imposed a sentence of six months in jail.⁷³ Billingsly's successor, Thomas Norfleet, imposed lengthy sentences on confidence men and thieves who preyed on wealthy tourists. Norfleet sentenced a man convicted of robbing a tourist of \$9.50 to ten years in prison.⁷⁴ Judge J. Emmett Wolfe of the Criminal Court of Record dealt severely with traffic violators. Throughout 1920, Wolfe sentenced reckless drivers to three months in the county jail.⁷⁵

Judges of the Municipal Court were severe with gamblers, prostitutes, and liquor violators; but speeders, and reckless and drunken drivers were special targets. Judge Phillips in 1913 declared a "war on automobile speeders" and promised to punish persons convicted of this violation to the full limit of the law.⁷⁶ As the automobile accident rate increased sharply in the 1920's, the Municipal Court began sentencing many traffic offenders to twenty-four days in jail and \$50.00 fines before turning them over to the Court of Crimes for a second trial for this violation under state statute.⁷⁷

Contrasting sharply with the punitive approach was the *modus operandi* of the Juvenile Court. H.W. Penny, the Court's first judge after its establishment as an independent entity in 1921, exercised paternal care over each offender during his four years on the bench. The background of each youth was investigated to determine the underlying causes of his trouble. Penny was reluctant to send offenders to the state

reform school at Marianna, preferring instead to place them under the guidance of the county probation officer.⁷⁸

Penny's successor, Edith Atkinson, the first female jurist in Dade County, also believed that errant youths should be sent to reform school only as a last resort. Instead, Judge Atkinson campaigned tirelessly for a county farm for delinquent youths, which she believed would be more effective than reform school in their rehabilitation.⁷⁹

Judge Atkinson was also an indefatigable campaigner for an assistant probation officer to process the court's increasingly heavy case load, the passage of child welfare measures, and secondary school courses in the care and training of children. In pursuit of these objectives, Judge Atkinson addressed numerous civic groups and even lobbied before the state legislature. Most of these objectives were realized during her term on the bench.⁸⁰

Thus, by 1930, the Juvenile Court had compiled an enviable record. Representatives of the area's other courts could also take pride in the performances of their tribunals for each had handled with reasonable dispatch and efficiency extremely heavy dockets resulting from Miami's meteoric growth. The area's judiciary was firmly implanted by 1930 and could look forward to the future with optimism.

NOTES

1. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States, Volume III, Part I, Population. Reports By States* (Washington, 1932), p. 451. Miami's population at the time of its incorporation was approximately 3,000. Transient laborers, employed by Henry Flagler on myriad construction projects, comprised a large percentage of the early population. Within a few years of incorporation, most of these projects had been completed. Accordingly, many laborers left Miami, causing a sharp dip in the population. By 1930, however, Miami's population stood at 110,637 after exceeding 200,000 at the peak of the boom in 1925.

2. Paul Wilcox (ed.), *City Manager's Report to the City Commission of Five Years of Commission-Manager Government for the City of Miami* (Miami, 1926), p. 105.

3. *Revised General Statutes of Florida, 1920, Volume Two*, Chapter IV, Section 3052; Chapter II, Articles 1-7; Chapter X, Title I, Chapter I, Section 3104-3233; Part II, Title I, Chapter I, Section 5937; Chapter II, Article I, Section 5941-5942.

4. Capital crimes include murder and rape.

5. *Revised General Statutes of Florida, 1920, Volume Two*, Chapter III, Article I, Section 5960.

6. *Revised General Statutes of Florida, 1920, Volume Two*, Title VI, Section 3327; Title VII, Section 3326; Title VII, Article I, Section 3337; Title VII, Article II, Section 3341-3343.

40 TEQUESTA

7. *Revised General Laws of Florida, 1920, Volume One*, Chapter XXX, Article Two, Section 2308-2309; Chapter XXXII, Section 2322-2327.

8. *Compiled General Laws of Florida, 1927, Annotated, Volume Four, Crimes and Criminal Procedure*, Sections 8266-8277.

9. *Compiled General Laws of Florida, 1927, Annotated, Volume Two, Civil Courts, Their Organization and Proceedings Therein*, Title VIII, Chapter One, Sections 3363 & 3365.

10. *Revised General Statutes of Florida, 1920, Volume Two*, Title VIII, Chapter One, Sections 3363-3365.

11. John K. Dorn, "Recollections of Early Miami," *Tequesta*, 9 (1949): p. 52; *Miami Herald*, July 23, 1916, pp. 8-9, 23; *Miami Metropolis*, January 8, 1897, p. 8; October 1, 1897, p. 2; October 15, 1897, p. 4; *Miami Daily News*, July 28, 1921, p. 9; John Sewell, *Memoirs and History of Miami, Florida* (Miami, 1933), p. 137.

12. *Ordinances of the City of Miami*, Book I, p. xix; *Miami Daily News*, July 26, 1925, Utilities Section, p. 22; *Miami Metropolis*, November 24, 1905, p. 7; *Minutes of the City Council*, Volume Two, October 19, 1905, p. 158; Volume Two, December 7, 1905, p. 216.

13. *Miami Metropolis*, April 20, 1900, p. 8; May 4, 1900, p. 4; December 13, 1901, p. 1; April 11, 1902, p. 1; October 23, 1903, p. 9; October 21, 1904, p. 1; October 6, 1905, p. 8; October 5, 1906, p. 6; March 22, 1907, p. 4. Judge Minor Jones of the Circuit Court and members of the Dade County Bar Association were leading supporters of a Criminal Court of Record.

14. *Miami Herald*, May 10, 1913, p. 2; *Miami Metropolis*, December 4, 1907, p. 1; December 5, 1907, p. 1; December 12, 1908, p. 1.

15. *Miami Metropolis*, September 22, 1908, p. 1; December 12, 1908, p. 1.

16. *Miami Metropolis*, September 27, 1911, p. 1; *Revised General Statutes of Florida, 1920, Volume One*, Chapter XXXII, Sections 2322-2327.

17. *Miami Herald*, January 13, 1912, p. 1; May 6, 1915, pp. 4-5; *Miami Metropolis*, April 2, 1911, p. 6; December 19, 1911, p. 2.

18. *Miami Herald*, July 10, 1921, Part II, p. 3; October 16, 1921, Part II, p. 8; October 18, 1921, p. 12; December 25, 1921, p. 11A; May 2, 1923, p. 1; June 3, 1926, p. 36; *Illustrated Daily Tab*, August 5, 1925, p. 2.

19. *Miami Herald*, April 21, 1915, p. 6.

20. *Miami Herald*, February 12, 1914, p. 3; April 23, 1914, p. 5; December 7, 1915, p. 8; *Miami Metropolis*, December 29, 1911, p. 3; December 30, 1911, p. 3; July 9, 1912, p. 4; September 4, 1912, p. 8; October 17, 1914, p. 8.

21. *Miami Herald*, March 23, 1924, p. 4; April 2, 1925, p. 2A; August 11, 1925, p. 2.

22. *Minutes of the City Commission*, Volume Fourteen, September 14, 1925, pp. 610-611.

23. *Ibid.*, Volume Fifteen, October 28, 1925, p. 65.

24. *Miami Herald*, November 6, 1925, p. 2.

25. *Minutes of the City Commission*, Volume Fifteen, May 24, 1926, p. 416.

26. *Miami Herald*, April 14, 1926, p. 17.

27. *Ibid.*, November 9, 1926, p. 8.

28. *Miami Herald*, July 1, 1927, p. 2; *Minutes of the City Commission*, Volume Seventeen, June 30, 1927, p. 132.

29. *Miami Herald*, August 2, 1920, p. 1; July 31, 1921, p. 2; June 25, 1922, p. 11; October 24, 1922, p. 3.

30. *Miami Metropolis*, December 4, 1919, p. 9.

31. *Miami Herald*, August 2, 1924, p. 1; June 10, 1925, p. 10B; December 27, 1925, p. 1F; May 9, 1929, p. 2.

32. *Ibid.*, December 18, 1926, p. 1; February 24, 1927, p. 3; August 4, 1927, p. 3.
33. *Ibid.*, June 14, 1927, p. 4; July 14, 1927, p. 1; September 12, 1928, p. 6.
34. *Ibid.*, June 14, 1927, p. 2; October 3, 1929, p. 2.
35. *Ibid.*, May 30, 1917, p. 4. The new Circuit Court was part of the Eleventh Judicial District encompassing Dade and Monroe (the Keys) counties.
36. *Ibid.*, December 8, 1925, p. 1; December 27, 1925, p. 1F.
37. *Ibid.*, November 22, 1925, p. 3A; December 30, 1927, p. 15.
38. *Compiled General Laws of Florida, 1927, Annotated, Volume Two, Civil Courts, Their Organization and Proceedings Therein*, Title V, Sections 5156-5168.
39. *Miami Herald*, May 5, 1927, p. 3.
40. *Ibid.*, November 1, 1924, p. 2B; May 5, 1927, p. 3; August 31, 1928, p. 2; April 30, 1929, p. 24; May 14, 1929, p. 20.
41. *Ibid.*, November 21, 1924, p. 11A; March 20, 1925, p. 2; March 19, 1928, p. 2; *Miami Metropolis*, December 12, 1919, p. 6.
42. *Miami Herald*, March 19, 1928, p. 2.
44. *Miami Herald*, November 30, 1918, p. 2; December 5, 1918, p. 4; *Miami Metropolis*, November 30, 1918, p. 1.
45. *Miami Herald*, March 8, 1928, p. 2; March 9, 1928, pp. 1 & 10; March 19, 1928, p. 2; March 21, 1928, pp. 1 & 6; May 8, 1928, pp. 2 & 13. The indictment of Police Chief H. Leslie Quigg and three policemen in the death of a prisoner prompted this Grand Jury investigation of the police.
46. *Miami Metropolis*, July 12, 1901, p. 4; November 13, 1903, p. 9; December 4, 1907, p. 1; December 12, 1908, p. 1.
47. *Miami Herald*, September 4, 1912, p. 8; February 25, 1914, p. 7; December 7, 1915, p. 8; August 8, 1916, p. 2; September 19, 1918, p. 1; April 21, 1920, p. 6; March 20, 1923, p. 6; June 22, 1924, p. 2; September 4, 1928, p. 2.
48. *Ibid.*, January 28, 1916, p. 8. Since the fall of 1913, Dade County had been "dry" in regard to the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages.
49. *Ibid.*, October 14, 1916, p. 8.
50. *Miami Herald*, June 30, 1917, p. 3; *Miami Metropolis*, June 29, 1917, p. 1.
51. *Miami Herald*, February 15, 1922, p. 13; September 3, 1922, p. 14.
52. *Miami Metropolis*, November 23, 1906, p. 2.
53. *Ibid.*, May 7, 1908, p. 1.
54. *Miami Herald*, June 10, 1919, p. 2.
55. *Minutes of the City Council*, Volume Three, December 17, 1908, p. 313.
56. *Minutes of the City Council*, Volume Eight, March 15, 1917, p. 588.
57. *Miami Metropolis*, May 21, 1920, p. 12; May 26, 1920, p. 1.
58. *Miami Herald*, August 23, 1919, p. 8. Miami experienced a protracted labor strike in 1919, as well as several incidents of violence between whites and blacks.
59. *Minutes of the City Council*, Volume Two, January 4, 1906, p. 230; *Miami Metropolis*, July 2, 1924, p. 1.
60. *Minutes of the City Commission*, Volume Fourteen, June 1, 1924, p. 136; *Miami Herald*, July 2, 1924, p. 1. With the adoption of a commission-manager government in 1921, a city commission replaced the city council as the municipal legislature.
61. *Miami Metropolis*, March 22, 1907, p. 1; May 1, 1909, p. 1.
62. *Miami Herald*, May 12, 1926, p. 4.
63. *Miami Metropolis*, December 14, 1911, p. 1.
64. *Miami Herald*, November 2, 1911, p. 2.
65. *Ibid.*, February 1, 1919, p. 1.
66. *Miami Metropolis*, November 27, 1919, p. 7.
67. *Miami Herald*, October 20, 1923, p. 2; November 5, 1923, p. 2.

68. Department of Public Safety, *First Annual Report (Fiscal Year July 1, 1928-June 30, 1929)* (Miami, 1929), pp. 4 & 6; *Miami Herald*, May 31, 1929, p. 1.
69. *Miami Metropolis*, January 21, 1910, p. 1.
70. *Miami Herald*, April 27, 1917, p. 6; May 27, 1917, p. 4; *Minutes of the County Commission*, Volume One, December 2, 1919, p. 125.
71. *Miami Herald*, July 17, 1926, p. 2.
72. *Ibid.*, June 20, 1926, p. 5; July 16, 1926, p. 2; July 17, 1926, p. 2.
73. *Ibid.*, April 30, 1914, p. 2.
74. *Ibid.*, December 9, 1926, p. 2.
75. *Miami Metropolis*, June 13, 1920, p. 8, from the manuscript collection of Judge J. Emmett Wolfe (Silver Spring, Maryland).
76. *Miami Herald*, April 8, 1913, p. 8.
77. *Ibid.*, September 12, 1928, p. 6.
78. *Ibid.*, July 10, 1921, II, p. 1; November 19, 1922, p. 5A. The state reform school at Marianna, known officially as the Florida Industrial School for Boys, acquired much notoriety during this period owing to inadequate facilities and harsh treatment of its inmates.
79. H.F. Atkinson, husband of Edith Atkinson, had been judge of Dade County's Criminal Court of Record and the Circuit Court.
80. *Ibid.*, January 23, 1925, p. 2; July 24, 1927, p. ; September 8, 1928, p. 2; September 27, 1929, p. 2.