

Robert Morgan
Attorney General
of North Carolina,
Chairman
Patton G. Wheeler
Executive Director



1516 Glenwood Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina 27608
Telephone 919 832-0356

Special Report

National Association of Attorneys General / COMMITTEE ON THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

June, 1974

Federal - State Law Enforcement Committees

14008
Dup.

CONTENTS

Development of Committees	1
Status of Committees	2
Organization and Composition	4
Areas for Consideration by Committees	5
Examples of Functioning Committees	9
Footnotes	13

FEDERAL-STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEES

The need for better coordination among federal, state and local governments has long been recognized. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice said in 1967 that, "although day-by-day criminal administration is primarily a state and local responsibility, the federal government's contribution to the national effort against crime is crucial."¹ The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals noted in 1973 that, while its report concentrated upon standards for state and local agencies, "the Commission recognizes that federal, state and local efforts are inextricably linked."²

One response to this problem has been the formation of Federal-State Law Enforcement Committees. This report describes the organization and operation of such Committees, and outlines areas where they can work to improve the administration of justice, particularly in regard to prosecution.

Development of Committees

Initiative for establishing Federal-State Law Enforcement Committees has come primarily from the United States Department of Justice. Attorney General William B. Saxbe has said that: "[this] efficient -- and productive -- system of cooperation between the Department of Justice and the states and localities in the criminal justice area is among my major new areas of special emphasis." He added that "the nets which we cast must be side-by-side, so there are no gaps through which major problems may elude us."³

By Memoranda of November 30, 1972 and March 6, 1973, the Department of Justice urged the ninety-four United States Attorneys to consider establishing permanent Federal-State Law Enforcement Committees. Initially, it was suggested that they contact their state counterparts and establish informal agreements for discussions on handling auto thefts and cargo thefts. In addition, Senator Alan Bible, Chairman of the United States Senate Select Committee on Small Business, had written to all state Governors asking them to cooperate in establishing Federal-State Committees.

The response was so favorable that the Department urged the federal prosecutors to convert these informal arrangements into a permanent program. In a February, 1974 telegram to all U. S. Attorneys, Attorney General Saxbe requested that they keep the Department of Justice informed as to the activities of Federal-State Law Enforcement Committees. He stressed that:

These committees or similarly composed groups can do much to enhance mutual understanding between principal state and federal law enforcement officials as well as victimized businessmen in each state by focusing their attention on the enforcement of concurrent jurisdiction offenses such as

cargo thefts, auto thefts, robberies, weapons violations and other problems associated with those areas of mutual interest existing between the states and the federal government.⁴

These Committees, and the concept of cooperation that they represent, have received the endorsement not only of the Department of Justice, but of other groups with related interests, such as the National District Attorneys Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Within the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the Executive Office for U. S. Attorneys, as well as the Criminal Division, are cooperating fully with the program. The Alcohol, Tax and Firearms Division of the Department of the Treasury has indicated that a statement in support of such groups will be forthcoming.⁵

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has taken an active interest in the development of Federal-State Law Enforcement Committees. Charles Work, Deputy Administrator for Administration, wrote to the directors of all state criminal justice planning agencies in April, 1974, explaining the purpose of such Committees and offering to supply additional information.

Irving Slott, Director of Program Evaluation and Development, Office of National Priority Programs, has responsibility for liaison between LEAA and the Department of Justice concerning this program, and can be contacted for further information concerning such Committees.⁶ Because of LEAA's strong support, it would appear probable that requests by Committees for funds to conduct studies or similar projects would be favorably reviewed.

A number of state Attorneys General have taken leadership in establishing Committees, or have cooperated with U. S. Attorneys in their formation. Local prosecutors' associations are actively involved in several states.

Status of Committees

According to the United States Department of Justice, fifteen states now have such groups, and another ten states use existing associations to accomplish comparable results. The Department shows four groupings of states, set forth below.

1. New Committees Established and Operative.

Colorado	New York
Hawaii	Ohio
Iowa	Oklahoma
Maine	Tennessee
Michigan	Texas
Minnesota	Virginia
Montana	Wyoming
New Hampshire	

2. Existing State or Local Groups Utilized; Agenda Input Available.

California	New Mexico
Delaware	South Carolina
Kansas	South Dakota
Massachusetts	Vermont
Mississippi	

3. Either Attempting to Establish a New Committee as in (1) or Seeking out Proper Contact With Local Groups as in (2).

Alaska	North Carolina
Arkansas	North Dakota
Florida	Oregon
Idaho	Rhode Island
Illinois	Utah
Kentucky	Washington
Missouri	Wisconsin
Nevada	

4. No Response Because of Reliance on Informal Relations, or Prevented for Other Reasons.

Alabama	Maryland
Arizona	New Jersey
Connecticut	Nebraska
Georgia	Pennsylvania
Indiana	West Virginia
Louisiana	

The first group consists of states with active committees, formal or informal. Two of these are described in this report. The second group consists of states where an existing group is serving this function, at least in part. Examples of existing groups which are receiving federal agenda input are: the Vermont State's Attorneys Association; the South Carolina Governor's Committee for Criminal Administration; the Mississippi Prosecutor's Association; the California District Attorneys Association; and prosecutors' meetings sponsored by the Attorney General of Idaho.

It might be noted that at least two of the Committees listed in group 1 as "established and operative" are still in a formative stage. Attorney General Andrew P. Miller of Virginia announced on June 10, after a preliminary meeting with several U. S. Attorneys and Commonwealth's Attorneys, that a Committee was being formed. In Iowa, Attorney General Richard C. Turner attended a meeting called by a U. S. Attorney to explore the possibility of establishing a Federal-State Committee to exchange information, discuss problems, and lay the groundwork for constructive action.⁸

It might further be noted that efforts to establish Committees have not proceeded smoothly in all jurisdictions. Attorney General Saxbe has recognized that "rivalries may exist in some areas; jealousies in others." Therefore he asked U. S. Attorneys not only to report on the nature of the new Committees, but for "a frank appraisal of the political conflicts that may have hindered past efforts to establish these types of programs."⁹

Organization and Composition

There are no strict guidelines for the organization of such Committees. As noted previously, some states have established special committees, while others use existing groups, such as local prosecutors' associations. Attorney General Saxbe has noted that many U. S. Attorneys are members of existing committees which might well serve these goals. He has advised that "wherever such existing formal vehicle of communication is adequate to insure the interface here envisioned, such vehicle may be utilized." However, "lines of communication which are totally unstructured will be unlikely to provide the support and coordination of law enforcement as envisioned by [the Department of Justice]."¹⁰ It is suggested that, as a minimum, periodic meetings be held.

Existing Committees usually include federal, state and local prosecutors. In Texas, the Attorney General and a U. S. Attorney are co-chairmen of the Federal-state Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee. Other participants are the other U. S. Attorneys in Texas; seven district attorneys, primarily from metropolitan areas; the Director of the Department of Public Safety; four FBI Special Agents in charge; and the Regional Administrator for the Drug Enforcement Administration.¹¹ Virginia's Attorney General announced June 11, 1974 that a Law Enforcement Committee was being established. Its eleven members will include two representatives of the Attorney General's office, four federal prosecutors, four Commonwealth's Attorneys, and one state police officer.¹²

The Ohio Committee has even wider membership. The Chairman is a U. S. Attorney. Other representative members are from: the Attorney General's office, the FBI, the State Highway Patrol, the State Department of Agriculture Enforcement Division, the Police Officer's Training Council, a local police department, and a local prosecutor's office. In addition, the regular members may be accompanied by other persons; for example, the U. S. Attorney may invite representatives from a related enforcement agency to a particular meeting.¹³

While it is actively promoting the establishment of such Committees, the U. S. Department of Justice has not established any guidelines for their composition or operations, in order to avoid any stigma of federal direction. The Committees will not report to the U. S. Department of Justice although the participating U. S. Attorneys will.

The frequency of meetings varies, as does their formality. Ohio's Committee meets every three months. The Texas Committee held its first meeting on November 14, 1973. It met again on February 19, 1974 and has a meeting scheduled for June 12. Colorado reports that meetings are held on an "irregular basis."

Areas for Consideration by Committees

A packet prepared by the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice was distributed to all United States Attorneys on April 23. A letter from Attorney General William B. Saxbe advised the U. S. Attorneys that the packet would serve as a guide for their "continuing efforts in establishing a permanent vehicle for the coordination of Federal law enforcement activities with those of the state and local agencies." It included analyses of some topics "which might warrant discussion at your next meeting with your state counterparts." These topics are summarized below.¹⁴

Aircraft Hijacking and Related Crimes. It was noted that "often-times, both federal and local investigators respond to the same incident [at an airport] and similarly, at the prosecution level, there is often concurrent statutory jurisdiction for aircraft hijacking related crimes." Certain deficiencies exist in federal law, such as the absence of a civil penalty for hijacking hoaxes, so there is no appropriate penalty where there are mitigating circumstances. Conversely, there is no federal law against carrying a weapon at an airport if one is not a ticketed passenger. Guidelines issued by the Department of Justice in December, 1973, had suggested that U. S. Attorneys "take the appropriate steps to assure that the local authorities are fully exercising their law enforcement capability in this area of crime, including non-passengers who are arrested during the preboard screening process."

Bank Robbery and Kidnap Cases. States usually have statutes which parallel federal bank robbery and kidnap cases, so it is necessary to decide in each case whether such offenses should be investigated and prosecuted by the state or federal government. Some factors to be considered in making such a decision are: whether the state wishes to proceed and has enough manpower; the relative sentences which would be imposed; whether there are other charges pending against the defendant; whether there are techniques being used (such as an informant or electronic surveillance) which might present disclosure problems in another jurisdiction.

Corruption of Officials and Programs. One area where greater coordination of local, state, and federal officials is needed is the detection and prosecution of corruption. The Department of Justice notes that, because of limited resources, U. S. Attorneys "are forced to concentrate on impact cases, cases which, because of the prominence of the defendants or federal programs involved, will receive substantial publicity." State authorities may fail to prosecute cases the U. S. Attorney declines, because of a lack of communications. Cooperation may also involve a substantial exchange of intelligence.

Controlled Substance Investigations and Prosecutions. Persons who violate the federal Controlled Substance Act usually also violate state law. The report points out that "uniform national standards relating to federal, state and local prosecution of controlled substance cases are difficult, if not impossible, to establish," because

of varying conditions. It is, however, desirable that U. S. Attorneys "confer with their local and state counterparts and establish local or regional guidelines which will apply to prosecution of controlled substance cases." In deciding whether to prosecute a case or refer it to local authorities, the U. S. Attorney will consider such factors as "the effectiveness of state and local prosecutors, their willingness to prosecute cases investigated by federal agents, the kind of drug involved (also, its amount and purity), the length of time required to try a drug case in state or local courts, the type of penalties provided by state and local law, and the sentencing policies and practices of local and state judges." The state authorities may, in turn, decide to ask the U. S. Attorney to prosecute a case which they have investigated.

Firearms and Explosives Cases. The memo noted that the U. S. Department of Justice would not be seeking major legislative authority in this area, so must "tighten up enforcement . . . within the existing statutory and regulatory framework." It was suggested that the U. S. Attorney review such cases with state and local officials to determine who should investigate and prosecute them. It was suggested that certain types of firearms and explosives cases, such as those involving major cargo theft, generally should be prosecuted federally.

Immigration. Because of limited staffing, the U. S. Immigration Service "is incapable of coping with the vast numbers of illegal aliens who enter and remain in the United States each year." There is close cooperation between local police and the Immigration Service along the border areas, especially in the Southwest, where the majority of illegal aliens are apprehended by local police, then turned over to the Service. Such cooperation might be extended to other areas of the country, particularly to cities where large numbers of illegal aliens are found at great distances from the border. Because the number of such violations is increasing sharply, increased action is necessary.

Innovative Rehabilitation Programs. These materials note that "a variety of programs for the diversion of offenders into community-oriented rehabilitation programs have been utilized by state and city criminal justice systems," and suggest that U. S. Attorneys inform themselves of such programs used in their jurisdictions. The point is also made that "the practical experience of operational state and city programs might well benefit United States Attorneys in their own implementation of pre-trial diversion, to whatever extent it does now and may later exist."

Labor Disputes. A recent case (Enmons v. United States, 410 U.S. 396), held that when a labor union is seeking a legitimate objective in a labor dispute, the use of violence to obtain that objective is not a violation of the Federal Anti-Racketeering Statute (18 U.S.C. 1951). Thus, federal jurisdiction to investigate or prosecute such violence is limited to cases where federal statutes are violated or when violence continues after a federal court has issued an injunction. This makes state and local action necessary.

Missing Person and Fugitive Felon Act. United States Attorneys often receive requests from local authorities for assistance in cases where a divorced parent, who does not have custody, takes a child out of the state. Absent a showing of imminent physical harm to the child, the Department's policy precludes FBI intervention in such cases. Assistance is also often requested in missing person cases. The FBI is instructed to furnish the Criminal Division copies of communications involving missing person cases which may involve a possible violation of the federal kidnapping statute. The Criminal Division will review such information and, if deemed warranted, request the FBI to conduct the investigation. U. S. Attorneys should make the federal role in such cases clear to state and local authorities.

Obscenity. In dealing with obscenity, "the federal role has always been to focus upon the major producers and distributors interstate or pornography while leaving to the local jurisdictions the responsibility to deal with local exhibitions and sales." Local prosecutors' responsibility was reinforced by Miller v. California, 413 U.S. 15, which established that local standards determine whether matter is obscene. Local prosecutors, however, may experience difficulties because of a lack of experience, lack of community support, or lack of funds. In such circumstances, the United States may provide assistance and "at times undertake prosecutions not falling precisely within its own guidelines." Local prosecutors, conversely, can aid federal authorities to obtain evidence of interstate distribution of obscene material.

Organized Crime Activities. States usually exercise concurrent jurisdiction in areas with which the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the U. S. Department of Justice is involved. In areas such as gambling, loansharking and stolen securities, where joint operations have been undertaken, it has generally been worked out on an ad hoc basis as to which jurisdiction should proceed. "This is an ideal arrangement and affords maximum efficiency when there is interest, professionalism, and competence on all sides." However, "those conditions are obviously not universally prevalent," and "any declination of federal investigation or prosecution in favor of state or local action must be predicated upon a certainty that such officials are able and willing to administer the law."

Referral of Juveniles to State Authorities. The Federal Bureau of Prisons is not equipped to deal with juveniles, so it is suggested that U. S. Attorneys encourage state and local officials to utilize 18.U.S.C. 5001, the "Diversionary Statute," whenever possible. This provides for transporting by U. S. Marshals, at federal expense, of persons under twenty-one years of age to a state or local jurisdiction whose law they appear to have violated, where they have already been charged with a federal offense. The federal charge is dismissed when the receiving authorities agree to proceed against the juvenile. Use of the statute is limited to situations where the juvenile consents to being transported or where the executive authority of the receiving state makes a demand for the juvenile's return. For example, a youth who steals an auto and takes it to another state, where

he is apprehended, can be returned to the state where the theft took place. It is suggested that U. S. Attorneys consider not only auto theft offenses, "but also any offense involving juveniles in which adult prosecution is not authorized by the Department."

Sound Recording Piracy. Public Law 92-140, effective February 15, 1972, protects copyrighted recordings through criminal sanctions contained in the Copyright Law. About half the states now have anti-piracy statutes. The federal law preempts materials after its effective date, and the states with statutes on the subject are authorized to regulate materials prior to that time. "If this situation is continued, there is obviously a mutuality of interest and concern inasmuch as most pirates deal in both federally protected and non-federally protected recordings." Exchange of information concerning the distribution of pirated records is extremely helpful to both federal and state authorities.

White Slave Traffic. The White Slave Traffic Act, 18 U.S.C. 2421 et. seq., prohibits the interstate transportation of a woman for prostitution. Federal policy emphasizes prosecution of major interstate violators, while state and local authorities are looked to for prosecutions of individuals. "Obviously, when the state or local authorities generate 'heat', prostitutes and their sponsors necessarily depart from the area, if only temporarily." Such moves often involve interstate travel and thus involve federal jurisdiction. While exchanging information about such operations, it is helpful to list this as an area in which state-federal cooperation can be especially useful.

In addition to the areas named in this Memo, other subjects have been noted as suited to the Committees' consideration.

Cargo Theft is another obvious area of activity, as establishment of these Committees was urged by the Secretary of Transportation as an extension of the efforts of the National Cargo Security Program. The trucking and rail industries have asked their memberships to support the Committees' work concerning cargo theft. The Department of Justice, in a telegram to U. S. Attorneys, suggested that the recent truckers' strike presented an opportunity for Committees to coordinate federal-state enforcement efforts.

The Memorandum listed specific areas that Committees might consider, but noted also that diversity was desirable:

law enforcement officials have correctly judged this program to be one aimed at the myriad and diverse problems encountered from one area of the country to another. For example, while Montana's committee had dedicated two of its meetings to relations with the Indian nation, the Northern District of New York has spent its time on cargo theft and narcotics violations. Meanwhile, Tennessee has considered auto theft as more worthy of discussion. Whatever the problem, the Federal-State Law Enforcement Committees will provide a forum whereby federal and state officials may seek solutions.¹⁵

The Memorandum that sets forth possible subject areas for Committee consideration also lists the following problem areas:

(1) Duplicitous investigative efforts by federal and state agencies where it is unknown which prosecutor will present the case.

(2) Declination of prosecution by both federal and state offices, because of restrictive prosecutive policies dictated by limited manpower. The problem is further aggravated by misunderstandings in the federal office as to what types of cases will or will not be prosecuted in state courts and vice-versa.

(3) Strained relations between federal and state offices, investigative and prosecutive, due to the desire of each to handle the larger, more important cases. Federal prosecution is often premised on high dollar value, resulting in an emphasis by both federal and state offices on such cases and occasional competition for the prosecution thereof.

(4) Expectation of federal prosecution from the federal presence, which is made manifest by the many federal services available to state officials, including the NCIC, and federal criminal laboratory assistance.¹⁶

These kinds of problems can be ameliorated, if not solved, by regular meetings of federal and state prosecutors.

Examples of Functioning Committees

Although all existing Committees are relatively new, some have already made a significant contribution to improved relationships in law enforcement. Several examples are given here.

Texas. Attorney General John L. Hill gives the following account of the formation of the Texas Federal-State Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee:¹⁷

After I took office as Attorney General of Texas, on January 1, 1973, I became aware--as do all other brand-new attorneys general--of the maize of networks of law enforcement agencies and activities throughout the state.

Now, after 27 years in private law practice, with two years time out as Secretary of State, I was not ignorant of the names and responsibilities of the numerous law agencies --federal, state, county, city, and so on. In fact, I took this office just in time to see some instances of fruition of a state constitutional amendment which authorized cooperative activities for county and city police. But a reasonable man would believe that these layers of enforcement

responsibilities--all operating for a single purpose--would have routes for intercommunication and coordination.

Steps were being taken in this direction by January 1, 1973. The Texas Department of Public Safety, through an LEAA grant, had established a crime reporting communications system which linked local police and sheriffs with the state's top law enforcement branch. The second month after I took office, an LEAA grant was awarded to my agency which enabled us to establish a "crime strike force," with the capacity to gather and coordinate data on crimes considered to be of statewide significance wherever there was a jurisdiction gap or overlap. This strike force consists of five attorneys with police work backgrounds, an accountant, and multi-lingual investigator.

At the same time, we were approached by U. S. Attorney William S. Sessions of San Antonio to assist with a 'Governor's Conference on Cargo Security.' As U. S. Attorney General William B. Saxbe has noted, a former Attorney General (Kleindienst) had suggested the holding of these conferences in the individual states as the first firm move toward coordinating federal and state efforts to allay a single problem.

The Cargo Security Conference was held in August. General Hill says that:

By then, we had experienced many instances in which the state Attorney General and U. S. attorneys in Texas had found themselves working on the same problems, trying to solve some of the same cases, and--since all of us eagerly admit to overwork--feeling quite unhappy upon discovering that there had been serious communications gaps and duplications of effort.

As I wound up my address to the conference, I invited U. S. Attorneys Anthony Farris, Roby Hadden, Frank McCown and Bill Sessions 'and anyone else who wants to meet with us, to meet with me this very afternoon to begin serious planning for coordination of law enforcement efforts relating not only to cargo security, but other vital problems of mutual concern.'

It's a good thing I meant it, because they went right back to my office that same day, and started the serious planning. Bill Sessions started outlining the avenues of interest common to all of us, and we decided to get down to business.

Another event in August added to our impetus: At the invitation of Licenciado Pedro Ojeda Paullada, The Attorney General of Mexico, I went to Mexico with the lawyer in charge

of my strike force, Timothy James, and my assistant chief of enforcement, Gilbert Pena. We discussed improved coordination of efforts by lawmen on both sides of the border to combat the tragically-heavy traffic in narcotics.

The first meeting was held in November, 1973. U. S. Attorney Bill Sessions, who serves as Co-Chairman with General Hill, observed that the meeting "demonstrated that state and federal law enforcement officials in Texas have a strong mutual desire to work more closely and deal more openly with one another." He and General Hill "both felt that state and federal law enforcement officials, and the general public, have much to gain from better coordination of policies, operational efforts, and intelligence resources."

The Committee's February 19, 1974 meeting covered a wide variety of subjects, and illustrates graphically the scope of "problems of mutual concern:"

Consideration of a request by the Mayor of Austin to initiate a joint investigation of a natural gas transportation corporation's transactions with the city;

A discussion about the use of federal prisoners as state witnesses;

A decision to publish a pamphlet describing how to get a federal prisoner into a state courthouse, as a joint project between the Attorney General's office, the District and County Attorneys' Association, and the Texas Criminal Justice Council;

A presentation by a U. S. Attorney on the referral of criminal prosecution between state and federal authorities, followed by a discussion of state officials' problems in that area;

Planning an improved coordination between federal and state authorities in the investigation and prosecution of organized crime;

A presentation by the FBI Agent in Charge on motor vehicle theft.

General Hill concludes that: "The lines of communication are open. The interest is high. And all of the participants in the Federal-State Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee in Texas stand to gain from this venture, if we continue to exert the effort to make it work."

Minnesota. Assistant Attorney General Paul J. Tschida notes that the Attorney General's organized crime investigation unit was started about two years ago.

The most common criminal activity we found which involves criminal organization and statewide as well as interstate contacts was in receiving and selling stolen property (fencing). Based on testimony before Senator

Bible's committee, this is apparently a nationwide problem which has received little attention from most law enforcement agencies at any level.

We decided in about October, 1972 to center our attention on fencing in order to identify major fences in the area and hopefully obtain successful prosecution of them. Coincidentally, at about the same time, Attorney General Spannaus and United States Attorney Renner met to discuss ways to improve cooperation between federal and state law enforcement agencies. They agreed to work to obtain such cooperation on the fencing problem to see what could be done.

Our unit had initiated an investigation into a local fence and his son who were both suspected to be involved in significant fencing activities. We worked with several local police agencies as well as federal agencies in surveillance activities and sharing of information, and ultimately in a state level court authorized wiretap. A four-month investigation culminated in the arrest and subsequent convictions of the two fences and three other persons.¹⁸

Mr. Tschida comments that the significance of the effort does not lie solely in the case itself, as this is only the beginning of a program to control fencing. He says that "we feel that it is significant, however, that law enforcement agencies from several levels showed ability and desire to work together in joint investigative operations. Only through such cooperation can effective investigations be conducted. We hope the experience has shown that the job can be done."

U. S. Attorney Robert G. Renner, in a statement before the U. S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business, commended this example of cooperative action by his office and the Attorney General: "I am convinced that our joint enterprise is absolutely necessary. As of now, it is the only way in this state to get the job done."¹⁹

Ohio. Ohio's State-Local Law Enforcement Committee meets approximately three months. William Milligan, U. S. Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, is Chairman. Subjects discussed at recent meetings have included cargo thefts, and enforcement problems resulting from juvenile crimes. Gene Sterret, who represents the Attorney General's office, comments that "the meetings have been very worthwhile and have received favorable reaction from all participants."²⁰

These examples illustrate the effectiveness of this approach to improving federal-state-local liaison.

FOOTNOTES

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *THE CHALLENGE OF CRIME IN A FREE SOCIETY*, 283 (1967).
2. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM*, 31 (1973).
3. Address of the Honorable William B. Saxbe, Attorney General of the United States, before the Southern Conference of Attorneys General, May 6, 1974, Williamsburg, Virginia.
4. Telegram from Attorney General William B. Saxbe to all United States Attorneys, February 28, 1974.
5. Information furnished COAG by Ralph Culver, Chief of Private Property, General Crimes Section, Criminal Division, U. S. Department of Justice, June 7, 1974.
6. Id.
7. Interview with Irving Slott, Director of Program Evaluation and Development, Office of National Priority Programs, LEAA, Raleigh, North Carolina, May 28, 1974.
8. Information on Virginia and Iowa from telephone interviews with Attorneys Generals' staff members, June 12, 1974.
9. Supra note 3.
10. Memorandum from Attorney General William B. Saxbe to United States Attorneys, April 23, 1974.
11. Letter from Attorney General John L. Hill to Patton G. Wheeler, May 30, 1974.
12. Telephone interview with Donald F. Murray, Virginia Attorney General's office, June 12, 1974.
13. Telephone interview with Gene Sterret, Bureau of Criminal Investigation, Ohio Attorney General's office, June 12, 1974.
14. Packet prepared by Criminal Division, U. S. Department of Justice; forwarded to all U. S. Attorneys by letter from Attorney General William B. Saxbe, April 23, 1974.
15. Id.
16. Id.
17. All information on Texas is from a Letter from Attorney General Hill, supra note 11.

18. Letter from Assistant Attorney General Paul J. Tschida, Minnesota Attorney General's office, to Patton G. Wheeler, May 31, 1974.
19. Statement of Robert G. Renner, United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota, before the Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, concerning Criminal Redistribution Systems (Fencing), May 2, 1974.
20. Supra note 13.

END

7/20/50