

TEARS OF PENITENCE WIN VICTOR ANOTHER CHANCE

Unruly Youngster, Devoted to Movie Thrillers and Circus, Tells Judge He'll Be Good. *July 18/1920*

Tears of penitence streamed down the chubby cheeks of Victor Reverio, 10, No. 328 South State street, when he stood before Judge James J. Barrett in his chambers recently and promised to stay at home nights and to take his father's dinner to the reservoir every day so his mother would not have to walk the three-mile round trip.

Victor was represented as a bad boy with a preference for lurid moving picture serials when he was introduced to Judge Barrett by Mrs. Margaret Downes, who has the child in charge since a little trouble in children's court some time ago.

Frank Reverio, the father, brought his unruly son before Judge Barrett and said that even frequent use of a razor strop as a whip had failed to curb the boy's rebellious spirits, and if he could not behave, there was nothing left but to send him to a reform school.

"My wife does not understand English and she cannot travel on the street cars, as she does not know how to transfer," the father told Judge Bar-

rett. "This bad boy would not bring me my dinners, so my wife had to walk three miles to carry them to me."

"Victor goes out and begs pennies to go to these every-week pictures where the hero does fine and brave tricks. I told him not to beg, but he won't listen. He ran away from home and said he was going to Arizona, where they make these movies."

Little Victor hung his head while his father denounced him, but when Judge Barrett threatened to have him sent away if he did not help his mother, whose household tasks are none too light with his two little sisters to care for in addition, he burst into tears.

"I'll try to be good," he said. "I won't run away any more and sleep all night in a back yard again," the child sobbed.

Victor was told it was his last chance and he promised faithfully to help his mother until he goes back to school in the fall, and said he would report regularly to Mrs. Margaret Downes, even if the day he was due fell on circus day, which he thought ought to be a holiday even from reporting to the probation officer.

WOMEN ASK ^{San Nov 2/20} MORE SALARY

Mrs. Tormey and Mrs. Downes Believe County Should Increase Pay.

Mrs. Mary F. Tormey, deputy sheriff, and Mrs. Margaret Downes, county probation officer, seek salary increases to take effect January 1.

Mrs. Tormey receives \$1,000 yearly and Mrs. Downes \$900. They claim the nature and scope of their duties are such that they should receive compensation commensurate with the amount of work they do, and that the fact of their sex ought not to count against their claim.

"During the last fortnight," Mrs. Tormey said on Saturday, "I have rounded up 11 young girls who were in danger of being led into evil ways and have returned them to their parents. Often I have worked until 1 o'clock in the morning or later, and Mrs. Downes and myself have attended sessions of justice's court all over the county."

"Our work never is done and we never have tried to shift any of it. We try to do preventive work rather than get convictions and we think that our work shows for itself."

It is not known what the salaries committee of the supervisors has decided in regard to the applications but they have been recommended by County Judge Barrett and the sheriff's office.

Disappearing Diamond Cause of Consternation Around Sheriff's Office

Lawyers in embryo from Syracuse University on Saturday settled a "grave" legal question that has provoked considerable discussion among Sheriff Edward G. Ten Eyck's office force and Court House attendants.

Mrs. Margaret M. Downes, county probation officer, walked into the office with a man's diamond ring in her hand.

"How much is that worth?" she queried, handing the jewelry to Undersheriff Michael J. O'Brien.

"I haven't the slightest idea," answered the undersheriff. "John Kratz is the official appraiser. Show it to him."

Kratz took the ring in his right hand and reached for his glasses with his left. He pinched the glasses on his nose and held up the ring, for inspection. But no ring could be found.

The gem had slipped from the clutch of the fingers which had closed on Onondaga's criminals for more than a quarter of a century. Search of the sheriff's office failed to reveal its hiding place.

Deputy Kratz retired to an inner office and stripped, searching every article of clothing. But without avail.

Meanwhile the owner of the ring had called at the probation office for his property. He was in a hurry and wanted it. He couldn't understand why he couldn't get it.

Question: Who was responsible for the loss?

Deputy Kratz offered to pay for the ring if it were not found, when a freshman law student volunteered the information that he was not liable. Others said he was. All went up to the Court of Appeals Library and began poring over decisions.

Several instances of lawsuits arising over similar circumstances were found.

A man hands a friend a pair of diamond earrings in a crowded theater lobby, asking him to appraise them. One falls to the floor and is lost. Is the friend liable?

Is a business man, who permits a friend to store valuables in his safe, liable in case of burglary?

Is a bank, which has offered gratuitously to become the custodian of Liberty Bonds, liable for their embezzlement by an employee?

After a conference, the law students, decided that a gratuitous bailee (Deputy Kratz in this case) is bound only to exercise a slight degree of care and is liable only for gross negligence. The students voted to free Deputy Kratz from liability.

After an hour's search, and talking his clothing off for the second time, Deputy Kratz found the ring.

It had rolled along his belt, while he was seated in a chair, fallen into a hip pocket and buried itself in the folds of a handkerchief.