Judge Frank Murphy, presiding, admirably presented the law in his charge to the jury, and set forth with particular clearness the conditions under which a man is entitled to defend his home, his family and himself from attack. Three hours and twenty-seven minutes after the jury had retired it reported a verdict of "not guilty."

The acquittal of Henry Sweet, against whom the State felt it had the strongest case, is a clear-cut victory, although to date, eight months afterwards, the State has not yet nolle prossed its cases against the other ten defendants.

As stated in the 16th annual report, for 1925, the total cost of the first trial, of all eleven defendants jointly, was $21,897.67, of which the National Office paid $12,577.74, the Detroit Branch $6,669.93, and the Detroit City-wide Committee, $2,650. Included in the costs were: $5,000 paid to Mr. Clarence Darrow, $3,000 to Mr. Arthur G. Hays, $2,000 to Mr. Walter Nelson, and $1,500 each to Messrs. Perry. Rowlette and Mahoney; $2,305 was paid for transcript of testimony and stenographic services; $2,127.44 for travelling (New York, Detroit, Chicago) and living expenses in Detroit of attorneys and representatives of National Office; $622.52 for meals to defendants in jail and living expenses of Mrs. Sweet; $1,078.34 obligations of defendants for mortgages, notes, rent, insurance, bail bond, etc. assumed by Detroit branch; $632.85 for special investigators; and $631.52 for telegrams, telephone, witness fees, printing, postage, etc., etc.

The cost of the second trial was $15,951.33; of which the National Office paid all. This included: $5,000 to Mr. Darrow, $7,500 to Mr. Chawke, $1,000 to Mr. Perry, $1,203.80 for transcript of testimony, $1,247.53 for travelling and living expenses of those connected with the case, incidentals, etc.

The total cost of both trials was $37,849. The first trial lasted 4 weeks; the second 3½ weeks. For 9 months the energies of the National Office were concentrated upon these cases.

Residential Segregation

Washington, D. C.—On January 8 the Supreme Court of the United States heard argument on the case of *Corrigan and Curtis vs. Buckley*. Argument for defendants was made by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. Moorfield Storey. The other attorneys present, representing the N. A. A. C. P., were Messrs. James A. Cobb, Arthur B. Spingarn,

Herbert K. Stockton and William H. Lewis. James P. Schick appeared for Mrs. Corrigan.

On May 24, the Supreme Court handed down its decision, dismissing the appeal for want of jurisdiction. The closing paragraphs of the Court's opinion read as follows:

> "It results that, in the absence of any substantial constitutional or statutory question giving us jurisdiction of this appeal under the provisions of Section 250 of the Judicial Code, we cannot determine upon the merits the contentions earnestly pressed by the defendants in this court that the indenture is not only void because contrary to public policy, but is also of such a discriminatory character that a court of equity will not lend its aid by enforcing the specific performance of the covenant. These are questions involving a consideration of rules not expressed in any constitutional or statutory provision, but claimed to be a part of the common or general law in force in the District of Columbia; and, plainly, they may not be reviewed under this appeal unless *jurisdiction* of the case is otherwise acquired.
>
> "Hence, without a consideration of these questions, the appeal must be, and is *dismissed for want of* jurisdiction."

From these paragraphs it was apparent that the Supreme Court left open two questions: 1, that of public policy, and 2, the constitutional question. The N. A. A. C. P., therefore, immediately prepared and brought in Washington other cases to be carried before the Supreme Court, for the purpose of procuring a definite decision on these issues.

New Orleans.—On April 27 counsel for the New Orleans Branch, Hon. Loys Charbonnett, filed in the Supreme Court of the United States the case of *Tyler vs. Harmon*. This case resulted from the passage in 1924 by the Louisiana Legislature of a law enabling the city of New Orleans to enforce segregation by ordinance, and was carried to the Supreme Court on a writ of error, by the New Orleans Branch of the N. A. A. C. P. which has raised upwards of $10,000 to contest this legislation.

Indianapolis.—Over the protest of colored citizens and city and state legal officers, the City Council of Indianapolis on March 16 enacted, and the mayor signed, a residential segregation ordinance almost identical with the Louisville ordinance which was declared unconstitutional in 1917. This Indianapolis ordinance was backed by the "White People's Protective League."

The Indianapolis Branch and the National Office contested the ordinance from its introduction in the City Council. The Branch