

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT  
COMMITTEE ON CRIME

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974 O 450-000

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

MARCH 14, 1974

Serial No. 64



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974 O 450-000

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON: 1974

450-000

29986

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable John Conyers, Jr. [chairman of the subcommittee], presiding.

Present: Representatives Conyers, Fish, Froehlich, and Maraziti.

Also present: Maurice A. Barboza, H. Christopher Nolde, and Robert J. Trainor, counsels; and Dorothy Wadley, assistant to counsel.

Mr. CONYERS. Good morning. The subcommittee will come to order.

It is a pleasure to begin one of the most important of the responsibilities that the Subcommittee on Crime has become involved in, because we believe an examination of the committees, the commissions, and others who have studied the area of crime before us, is an important way to begin our responsibilities. We see it important to review carefully the work and the recommendations of previous committees, and this morning the subcommittee will begin by hearing from members of the Select Committee on Crime who, over a period of months, compiled a great number of reports, a number of investigations, and visited crime areas in cities throughout the Nation.

In the future, I might interject, the subcommittee intends to review recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, since this committee has a legislative as well as oversight responsibility.

I would like to welcome our first witness, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Sam Steiger, who has served with distinction not only on the Select Committee on Crime, but also on the Government Operations Committee, where a subcommittee has also touched upon the subject matter of our discussion. I would like to welcome him.

I had the pleasure of sitting on the select committee from time to time, especially when it involved matters connected with Detroit, Mich. I was with the chairman of the committee when he came to Detroit on at least one occasion, and we have generally followed the work of the committee. It is the judgment of the chairman that getting on the record a discussion of the work of the committee, the areas they covered, their recommendations, and their feel for the subject matter, is extremely important if we are to begin our work and follow it through to an effective congressional conclusion.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., *New Jersey, Chairman*

HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts	EDWARD HUTCHINSON, Michigan
JACK BROOKS, Texas	ROBERT McCLORY, Illinois
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin	HENRY P. SMITH III, New York
DON EDWARDS, California	CHARLES W. SANDMAN, Jr., New Jersey
WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Missouri	TOM RAILSBACK, Illinois
JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Michigan	CHARLES E. WIGGINS, California
JOSHUA EILBERG, Pennsylvania	DAVID W. DENNIS, Indiana
JEROME R. WALDIE, California	HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York
WALTER FLOWERS, Alabama	WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JAMES R. MANN, South Carolina	LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Maryland
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland	M. CALDWELL BUTLER, Virginia
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio	WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California	TRENT LOTT, Mississippi
ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts	HAROLD V. FROEHLICH, Wisconsin
CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York	CARLOS J. MOORHEAD, California
BARBARA JORDAN, Texas	JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey
RAY THORNTON, Arkansas	DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, New York	
WAYNE OWENS, Utah	
EDWARD MEZVINSKY, Iowa	

JEROME M. ZEIFMAN, *General Counsel*  
 GARNER J. CLINE, *Associate General Counsel*  
 HERBERT FUCHS, *Counsel*  
 WILLIAM P. SHATTUCK, *Counsel*  
 H. CHRISTOPHER NOLDE, *Counsel*  
 ALAN A. PARKER, *Counsel*  
 JAMES F. FALCO, *Counsel*  
 MAURICE A. BARROZA, *Counsel*  
 ROBERT J. TRAINOR, *Counsel*  
 ARTHUR P. ENDRES, Jr., *Counsel*  
 DANIEL L. COHEN, *Counsel*  
 WILLIAM P. DIXON, *Counsel*  
 JARED B. STAMELL, *Counsel*  
 FRANKLIN G. POLK, *Counsel*  
 THOMAS E. MOONEY, *Counsel*  
 MICHAEL W. BLOMMER, *Counsel*  
 ALEXANDER B. COOK, *Counsel*  
 CONSTANTINE J. GEKAS, *Counsel*  
 ALAN F. COPPEY, Jr., *Counsel*  
 KENNETH N. KLEE, *Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., *Michigan, Chairman*

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland	WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York	HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York
RAY THORNTON, Arkansas	HAROLD V. FROEHLICH, Wisconsin
WAYNE OWENS, Utah	JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey

MAURICE A. BARROZA, *Counsel*  
 TIMOTHY J. HART, *Assistant Counsel*  
 CONSTANTINE J. GEKAS, *Associate Counsel*

(II)

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Page
Pepper, Hon. Claude, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.....	11
Steiger, Hon. Sam, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arizona.....	2
Additional material—	
List of hearings conducted by the House Select Committee on Crime....	36
Summary of Recommendations of the House Select Committee on Crime.....	27

(III)

56688

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable John Conyers, Jr. [chairman of the subcommittee], presiding.

Present: Representatives Conyers, Fish, Froehlich, and Maraziti.

Also present: Maurice A. Barboza, H. Christopher Nolde, and Robert J. Trainor, counsels; and Dorothy Wadley, assistant to counsel.

Mr. CONYERS. Good morning. The subcommittee will come to order.

It is a pleasure to begin one of the most important of the responsibilities that the Subcommittee on Crime has become involved in, because we believe an examination of the committees, the commissions, and others who have studied the area of crime before us, is an important way to begin our responsibilities. We see it important to review carefully the work and the recommendations of previous committees, and this morning the subcommittee will begin by hearing from members of the Select Committee on Crime who, over a period of months, compiled a great number of reports, a number of investigations, and visited crime areas in cities throughout the Nation.

In the future, I might interject, the subcommittee intends to review recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, since this committee has a legislative as well as oversight responsibility.

I would like to welcome our first witness, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Sam Steiger, who has served with distinction not only on the Select Committee on Crime, but also on the Government Operations Committee, where a subcommittee has also touched upon the subject matter of our discussion. I would like to welcome him.

I had the pleasure of sitting on the select committee from time to time, especially when it involved matters connected with Detroit, Mich. I was with the chairman of the committee when he came to Detroit on at least one occasion, and we have generally followed the work of the committee. It is the judgment of the chairman that getting on the record a discussion of the work of the committee, the areas they covered, their recommendations, and their feel for the subject matter, is extremely important if we are to begin our work and follow it through to an effective congressional conclusion.

The former chairman, Congressman Claude Pepper, will be testifying later, but at this time we are very delighted to welcome a gentleman who is very well known to me, who has consented to initiate this part of our work. We welcome Congressman Steiger and invite him to proceed in any fashion that he chooses.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. SAM STEIGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, FORMER MEMBER OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME**

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you that I am comforted, not only by the fact that you are willing to examine the reports of the Select Committee on Crime, but that you plan to also take official committee notice of the Presidential Commission reports.

I always have the sort of empty feeling that once these commissions are appointed and function, the reports just seem to hang there. It is not only entirely appropriate, but I think this may be the validation of the commission itself to have the committee examine and evaluate and make some legislative judgments.

So I think it is great and I am delighted.

As you undoubtedly are aware from your own experience with the Select Committee on Crime—and I think the record ought to reflect, Mr. Chairman, that in my 2 or 3 years on the subcommittee, whatever it was, to the best of my knowledge, you were the only nonmember of the committee who played the kind of active role that you played, and I always felt that it was unfortunate that other members did not have the time to participate as you did, because it is on those problems that are bearing on your own community which you are obviously able to give the best guidance to the committee. I realize that there are demands on time, et cetera, but I was always grateful that you were able to take the time.

Mr. Chairman, my main interest on the Select Crime Committee was organized crime, and that makes me ask, I guess not an editorial question but a pragmatic question of you—this is an instance in which the witness will ask the Chair—but it is my understanding that under the new structure of judiciary, the subcommittees have a variety of responsibilities, among which are certain criminal activities. Is that the situation, Mr. Chairman, in which the attention to the criminal code is generally fragmented? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. CONYERS. I think it is. We assumed the additional jurisdiction of crime and attempted reorganization of the various subcommittees in judiciary. Unfortunately, it went on after the session had begun, which led to, I think, some problems, in that we were forced to merely spread some of the subject matter into other committees. It was conceived that perhaps we might be more effective in beginning this undertaking if we spread it around.

Now, I do not think it is unfair to say that that is a tentative judgment. We are examining that; I do not think it is cast in concrete. But it was the consensus and the feeling of most of the members that it move along in that fashion.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, I will not presume to advise you or the other subcommittee chairmen or the full committee chairman, but I simply

tell you that based on my own experience, the least fragmenting of these responsibilities as far as the criminal code is concerned, the more effective I believe you are going to be. I recognize that there has to be some distinction and you have all got existing responsibilities which necessarily would have to correlate with the criminal activities, but let me give you a very narrow view, Mr. Chairman, that may not have occurred to some members of the committee, and it was a direct result of my experience on the Crime Committee.

I have become chiefly concerned about organized crime in this country. I am awed by it. I do not think that its effect has really ever been overstated. I doubt if its full effect will ever be known. But the full negative weight of organized crime has reached a point where it does invade this body in terms of effect in ways I suspect that most members who are being invaded and being leaned on by organized crime are not even aware of it. They have reached that level of sophistication.

They thrive on what has become the maze of bureaucratic and administrative control exercised by the Federal Government and they become—I say they, the people who organized crime employs—are inevitably very sophisticated in the ways of legislation, often more than the Members of Congress themselves. They thrive on the things that we have to endure, such as parochial interests and responsibilities. The parochial interests of enforcement agencies, they play one against the other.

So I will simply tell the Chair that if judiciary, having accepted a new responsibility in effect of a look at the criminal code in general, the Federal Criminal Code, if they persist in a fragmentation, complete fragmentation through all committees, all subcommittees, they will make their job more difficult as far as organized crime is concerned because organized crime will be able to add to the natural confusion that will result from that kind of fragmentation and they will thrive on it.

I am glad to note that Mr. Rangel is a member of the subcommittee. I urge that the subcommittee sometime in private get Mr. Rangel's experience, have him share his experience on the Select Committee on Crime in the matter of being lobbied. I know he told me that was the most impressive, fantastic lobbying exhibition he had ever seen.

But the point is, the problem really exists. There are people who are not certain it exists and, of course, that myth has been perpetuated.

As a result of our activities on the Select Committee on Crime, I think the committee did an incredible job with regard to organized crime's influence in horseracing in particular, in the invasion of the corporate structure of the country, in the handling of spurious stock certificates and other documents, letters of credit, but it was just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Chairman. I do not suggest that there is legislative remedy for all of this because I think that is one thing the committee concluded, in many instances it was not necessarily legislative remedy, but there is some legislative remedy.

I would like to advise the committee that I have introduced a bill which I understand is in subcommittee No. 2 of Judiciary. I introduced it in October of 1972 and January of 1973, and it is a relatively simple bill. It simply provides Federal penalties for the fixing of horse and dog races. There are no Federal penalties now for it.

Mr. CONYERS. Has organized crime stooped so low as to go into dog racing activities on an international level?

Mr. STEIGER. At a national level, yes, Mr. Chairman. We have had ample testimony, I think the report will bear it out, that where there is large cash flow and opportunity for chicanery, there will be organized crime. And the involvement is pretty well spelled out.

There is no Federal statute that is applicable to parimutuel wagering and the background of that is fairly interesting, because somewhere in its wisdom, the Congress or a previous administration in the dim, dark past decided that parimutuel wagering on horses and dogs was not a gambling device, but a method of improving the breeds of the animals, and therefore was not really interstate commerce.

Well, I think we have reached the point where we can now say without fear of contradiction that that particular king has no clothes and it is indeed interstate commerce.

But, at any rate, I would ask that perhaps the staff of the committee could just make a note to examine 1195, which is before subcommittee No. 2, and in this relatively new assignment of responsibilities, if it occurs to the staff and to the committee that this is worthy of consideration, this is the kind of thing I would like to see because, very frankly, I know of no other specific legislative effort which has arisen out of the Select Committee on Crime. It was not a legislative committee, but this was a specific and very narrow and totally acceptable legislative effort.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I can best serve your interests by responding to the questions of the committee. I will tell the Chair that I think the LEAA, as a committee assignment, is one that can be awfully fruitful in terms of not necessarily criticism of existing procedures of LEAA, but very definite direction and support if it is felt that the current direction is good, but also a shifting of some thinking, perhaps, in LEAA. Because for one thing, it looks like they are going to be well funded for a long time. And money may not be everything, but it can be very helpful. I suggest that perhaps even within the experience of the committee there would be some very positive direction that could be given which is not now being taken in LEAA. I really do not have any specific recommendations on that part.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you very much for the opening shot in this volley.

What are your views, based on what I think was some 18 months or perhaps more with the select committee, in terms of the diminution or increase of crime, both organized and street? You know such statistics are of very plastic substance, and we are not at all sure how accurate even our best statistics are in this area.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, I must tell you that I have a deep conviction that the statistics are never reflective of the situation in this instance. I can only share with you the basis of that conviction which is when I served for 2 years on the District of Columbia Committee and in that role I went out with the District of Columbia police on many occasions in the evening, and I came to know something, again, obviously, in a very limited fashion, but much more than I had ever known before of the problems of street crime.

The one thing that rang true and clear through all of my visits with the police and with the people and with the accused and the

victims was that certainly over half of the street crimes in the District of Columbia are simply not reported. So I do not know how you can evaluate statistics. I suppose the hard statistics like murder, in which there is obviously a victim, or a major felony, in which it is impossible to conceal a crime, those are capable of statistical review. But in the area of street crime, in the area of organized victimless crime—all of organized crime's efforts inevitably are victimless crimes, so-called—I just think it is not sophistry, if the Chair will excuse me, it is just baloney, because it is in the eyes of the beholder.

Mr. CONYERS. Is organized crime gaining in strength or is it under control? Have you found that we are dealing with it in an effective fashion?

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any competent enforcement entity that will tell you organized crime is under control and anyone who does would certainly have to demonstrate to me in a fashion that I do not think is possible.

Organized crime has become an accepted way of life. Since we cannot control it, like many other evils in our society, if we do not control them, we simply condone them, and that is, frankly, what we have done. We have accommodated living with organized crime. We did it as far back as World War II in which we involved them in our efforts on docks in New York to control sabotage. I thought it was a fairly interesting commentary that your Navy Department actually approached the family leaders in New York and got their cooperation in controlling sabotage on the docks, because the best enforcement potential was there.

So I think that recognition has never ceased, Mr. Chairman. In fact, we have learned to accommodate it, and I think there are better ways of confronting it.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, if it is getting worse and not better, what suggestions do you have, not only for the Federal Legislature, but also the Justice Department and those agencies that are combating crime to help get a handle on it?

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, with a broad brush it is not fair to say we are not better equipped to handle it now than we were even 4 years ago. The Congress did pass the Organized Crime Act—I believe it was 1970. I know that the committee participated very actively. It was a good act. I was very interested at that time and I am convinced it was a worthy effort. To the best of my knowledge, we have made no convictions under that act. And I tell you that, I do not constantly review it and there may be a few, but clearly it did not have the impact that was intended.

Now, why that is so, Mr. Chairman, I honestly do not know. I do not know if it is because of lack of personnel, because of the rules of evidence; I suspect all of these things play a part.

The overriding thing you must recognize, Mr. Chairman, is that in the past society had the clear edge over the criminal because the criminal was never able to employ the sophistication that society was able to employ. A prosecutor's office in the past was generally a more effective instrument—effective—was a better equipped instrument than most defense counsels available to at least the unorganized criminal. That simply is not the case any more, Mr. Chairman. Counsel available to organized crime is the best in the country. The

funding of counsel for organized crime exceeds the funding for the prosecutor's office. At least the funding available for the prosecution of a specific situation.

So you have got a unique situation here, Mr. Chairman. You have got a prosecutor's office, whether it is at the city, the county, or the State level, or the Federal level, being outmanned and outgunned by the wealth, if you will, in the selection of counsel by organized crime.

Believe me, Mr. Chairman, I have no suggestion that somehow organized crime should be deprived of counsel. That is not my solution, although I will tell you it would expedite things a great deal. But the point is that has to be recognized in questioning why has not LEAA been more effective in curbing organized crime; why has not the Organized Crime Act of 1970 been effective.

There are people in Justice who will point to convictions that we have never gotten before, and that is true. But the point is, the structure has never been diminished, the structure of organized crime. We do get more significant convictions than we have ever gotten before in terms of the hierarchy of the structure of organized crime, but we do not weaken the affect and that, I think, could be worthy of some attention by some subcommittee of this great committee. My point is, it could well be, to fragment the organized criminal activities between subcommittees, it seems to me, again plays right into their hands.

Mr. CONYERS. One question before I yield to other members. Is there any relationship between controlling, registering, or limiting the availability of handguns in particular with the reduction of crime, based on your experience as a member of the former Select Committee on Crime?

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, I have never seen any and, of course, I guess the most dramatic evidence of that is the history of the Sullivan law in New York City, in which there is now a 56 or 57 year history of the most stringent registration of handguns and in which the crimes committed with handguns can be compared nationally with communities in which there is no such regulation.

My feeling is very strong, Mr. Chairman, that you will have no impact on crime if in some way you were able to eliminate all handguns from society. You would still have no impact on crime because you do not attack the cause—it is the most obvious symptom and therefore it is one that I suppose lends itself to an instant solution type of approach. It is my view that it has served no purpose in this country in the past and would serve no purpose.

Mr. CONYERS. Which would serve no purpose?

Mr. STEIGER. The registration or restriction of the use of handguns. If you could devise a law, I agree that the "Saturday Night Special," which is a term I suspect evokes the same response in you that it does in me—you know what I am talking about when I say "Saturday Night Special," I am talking about a cheap, imported, generally imported, handgun that is available in the widest possible distribution at a very low cost. If there was some way to legislatively define "Saturday Night Special" and eliminate its availability, I suspect that would be at least a positive thing with regard to accidental shootings. But as far as the equation of gun registration, meaning less crime, I would have to come down very strongly against that equation.

Mr. CONYERS. Have you heard the mayor of New York? You mentioned New York on this subject. He respectfully offered to this committee the opposite point of view—

Mr. STEIGER. Oh, yes.

Mr. CONYERS [continuing]. Feeling that the limitation of handguns is directly related to the number of homicides that are committed with those guns.

Mr. STEIGER. I would only tell the Chair that the experience in his city, statistically, does not bear that out.

Now, I certainly respect his feeling for the matter, but statistically—and we get into the same area you and I questioned, I hate to evoke that which I have just condemned—but the statistics in this case, since they support my position I will use them, but the statistics simply do not bear out the Mayor. And while the logic is relatively inescapable, on the other hand, I do not believe that if you reduce the number of guns, you are going to reduce the amount of opportunity for the use of them and therefore reduce the amount of crime committed with them.

Yet the fact is a person who is prepared to do violence with a gun is going to break a number of statutes. He is not going to be inhibited by a statute that says he must not break those statutes with a gun. At least that is my view.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you very much.

I want to yield now to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fish.

Mr. FISH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank our colleague from Arizona for being with us this morning and sharing his experience, which could only come from the long months and years of service on the Select Committee on Crime. Particularly I want to thank you for your advice to us that this new oversight we have over LEAA could be a very fruitful area for this committee to really get into and hopefully be of help in both organized crime and supportive services and technology for local and State police authorities.

Mr. Steiger, since your particular interest while serving on the Pepper committee was in the area of organized crime, I wonder if you could single out another member, either majority or minority member of your select committee, whose particular interest for one reason or other was in the area of the jurisdiction of this committee, which is for street crime. We did have six members of the Judiciary Committee out of the 11 members of your full committee. Did any of them make a specialty of street crime?

Mr. STEIGER. Yes. I will tell my friends, at the risk, I suppose, of offending somebody else, I think probably the most involved person in two areas, street crime and drugs, was Mr. Rangel, who happens to be a member of this subcommittee.

Mr. FISH. Right.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Rangel had a unique incentive, he possibly had the highest concentration of both of these problems in his community. He not only was very aware of it, but his personal experience prior to the committee was invaluable, because he had been a member of the U.S. attorney's office, and he was a very effective and he is a very objective guy, I will tell you. I think that his insight is going to be very helpful to you.

I do not mean to denigrate anybody else's experience on the committee, but as far as somebody who comes to mind who was really involved both from the point of personal awareness and willingness to work, it was Charlie.

Incidentally, the chairman and I had a chance to discuss this informally. This is one of the things I am talking about. Street crime is your purview. I hate to have to get into a semantic situation, but if numbers are street crime or are considered contributory to street crime, if skylocking is part of street crime, if drugs are part of street crime, they are all organized crime. I would be fearful, if as a result of that you got that portion of organized crime's activity and did not get the whole package.

Mr. FISH. I appreciate what you said about the splintering of the jurisdiction over crime among several subcommittees. I know our chairman is aware of that. I can see the direct relationship of drugs to street crime, and of juvenile justice to street crime. Perhaps the correctional system does not have the same strong relationship, in the suggestions for reform you made, even though it does have a bearing, of course.

Did you find that organized crime really had a hand in the drug traffic, or did you find the drug traffickers—I am thinking now of importers of hard-core narcotics—were a little bit apart from the organized families, that they were sort of groups that were put together for a particular purpose and then did not follow through?

Mr. STEIGER. Well, I think you have got to at least understand my point of view. Organized crime is real, there is a Mafia, there is a rigid structure. You must be Sicilian to be made a member of organized crime, and there are few of these people, actually. They work in concert with a great many other people, both criminal and noncriminal. And I hate to generalize, because inevitably there will be some specific that will catch you up, but in general, organized crime bankrolls the largest importations of drugs and they will use people who are in that particular field, whether they are members of organized crime or not. The key to it is the bankrolling and they are the source of most of the cash which, of course, these transactions are inevitably, the large transactions are always cash, and organized crime is the source of the cash for those large importations.

Mr. FISH. Do you have any recommendations to make to the committee based on a report put out by the Select Committee on Crime, entitled "Street Crime: Reduction Through Positive Criminal Justice Responses?"

Do you have any recommendations to us as to what our priorities should be when we try to come to grips with this very complete and lengthy series of recommendations?

Mr. STEIGER. I would urge that you allow your chairman to share some of his experiences, because those were some of the situations in which he participated in, several of those discussions.

What we did—if you had a chance to review the report—what we did was to get the experiences of the various enforcement agencies who appeared to be having some success in this area. The one thread that seemed to run through all of their experiences was a diversity of tactics. In other words, don't use the conventional enforcement tactics.

I do not recall a single instance in which there was a need for

legislation that was cited. It was simply a need, if you will, for an operational device that would be effective, and usually it came down to the quality of the personnel, no matter how sexy the device was. I think that is true of almost any situation.

I think the thing that struck me as the most effective, and one I had not considered, was the use of the so-called plainclothes people, or disguised people, who were able to patrol the streets in an anonymous manner and thus were able to apprehend the relatively few, percentage-wise, people who do engage in street crime.

Again, we have a problem there, a very significant one, that almost all of them recited, and that was the charge of entrapment, because in many situations the only way they could make an arrest was to be involved, was to become the victim, pose as the victim.

But I will tell you that the committee discussed this, and I know we discussed it formally and informally, and there was no suggestion that by mitigating or allowing exceptions to statutes that prohibited entrapment, you would somehow do a superior job in enforcing street crime control. I think that it is going to be through your oversight of LEAA that you can encourage the development of new tactics, and the improvement of existing good ones—

Mr. FISH. Training?

Mr. STEIGER. It involves training; it involves some very special training; it also involves simply the sharing of other experiences in other jurisdictions which would be applicable, because LEAA is a natural vehicle for that, for permitting that sharing. But legislatively, I know of no specific legislative need that would confront street crime.

Mr. FISH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONYERS. I would like to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. MARAZITI. Thank you.

I am sorry that I was late and did not have the benefit of the major portion of your testimony, so I sort of waive my right to cross-examine, except I would like to ask your views on one point that you raised that I think is very important: The question of entrapment as a defense.

I agree that one effective method of rooting out organized criminal acts is by the use of agents. I have been away from the criminal law for some time and perhaps that is a penalty I suffer for being down here, but I have not read too much on decisions. At one time I did do some research in this area. I am under the impression that there is a very close line of what is entrapment and what is not, and I am wondering if we could have an elaboration of your views on this point.

In other words, I think under some circumstances the defense could be asserted, but it seems to me that some of the decisions indicate that under other circumstances it is not a defense. I am wondering maybe we could get a little of your opinion and advice in that regard.

Mr. STEIGER. I did not want to leave the impression that entrapment was a foolproof defense because, as you point out, there is now ample law that would indicate that it is indeed a question of judgment and there are situations in which entrapment has not been accepted as an admissible defense upon review. Unfortunately, I cannot cite the matters, but I will get you them because I think they are worth having.

The entrapment has not been a problem in the prosecution of most organized crime situations. It has been a problem in street crime situations where the enforcement people have been disguised and where they have posed as victims, and where they have ended up in a situation where all of the evidence was based on the transaction.

Now, that has not been an infallible defense either, but in some instances it has been admitted and it is a very narrow line, and in fact you may recall we had an experience here in Washington, I think just last spring, in which female police officers posed as prostitutes, soliciting rides, and arrested people who accepted their solicitation. Well, that was determined in District of Columbia court, of course, the Federal court, that was indeed entrapment.

So I do not think that society would be served by either narrowing or broadening the entrapment statutes. I think it serves now, while it is not automatic, I suspect most applications of law that require judgment are not definable by such rigid parameters that the perpetrator, or the enforcer, would know automatically whether or not it would apply.

I have no suggestions. I want to make it clear that I do not suggest that mitigating entrapment rules of evidence or statutes would serve society. I do not believe that.

Mr. MARAZITI. Thank you very much.

No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONYERS. Could I ask you about the fear of crime as opposed to crime as a concept? Did you run into any evidence that the fear of crime itself is as inhibiting and decimating to the community and its citizenry as much as the actual crime rate?

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, there is no way to get a quantitative handle on it but it is my personal feeling that the fear of crime and environment in which crime is suspected of thriving, whether it does so or not, is much more destructive of the community than the crime itself. It is not equal to it; it is greater than. It drives out the affluent, or those able to leave, and thus compounds the problem because the one thing we learned, vis-a-vis street crime, the one thing that is consistent throughout all—and you will find it in the report—invariably the greatest number of victims of street crime are the poor. We have a false image nationally of street crime somehow being a threat to the middle class. Well, the threat is directly to the community involved and the greater the poverty level of the community, the greater the street crime activity, the less reported street crime there is as opposed to actual crimes committed. The fear syndrome which you mentioned is visible; it is tangible; you can see it.

So I guess my response to your question is that, yes, the fear syndrome is very real and it compounds the problem tremendously.

Mr. CONYERS. Finally, Mr. Steiger, have your studies indicated any necessity to involve the community in the war against crime?

Mr. STEIGER. Again, Mr. Chairman, the experience of the committee was that one of the effective devices against street crime was the use of a telephone number that a citizen could use to phone in anonymously suspicious, or report activities that appear to be suspicious.

Mr. CONYERS. I thought that was reported to be unsuccessful in some areas. I think New York—

Mr. STEIGER. I think it varied tremendously again with the community involved and was not a function of size, necessarily, but again a function of the quality of the people involved.

And we did have—well, St. Louis is a far cry from New York, but they obviously have an urban concentration in St. Louis, and they, for example, reported significant success and they have expanded it and they now involve the citizens in numbering, identifying their household objects, with the idea of preventing or making recovery of stolen objects simpler and that sort of thing, all of which was an outgrowth of the number to report the criminal activity.

Again, I do not think there is any invention, Mr. Chairman, that we can give this Nation that is going to solve crime. I think it is going to have to be, No. 1, a recognition it exists and won't go away unless we apply ourselves, and No. 2, it would be my suggestion, the more of the community that is involved and sees some success, the more the fear syndrome dissipates.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you so much. I know you will be watching our activities as we develop. We hope you will feel free of stay in touch with this committee, Mr. Steiger, and speak of your past experiences. We welcome your testimony and the discussion that has followed from it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you very much. I appreciate your tolerance.

Mr. CONYERS. We see your former chairman has arrived, and we want to welcome him to the witness table. He is an old friend and a familiar face before the Judiciary Committee. We know that he has expressed his interest, indeed his enthusiasm, in bringing to those members of the committee who have an interest in picking up the experience of the members of the Select Committee on Crime, a feeling for the subject, how we can prioritize some of their recommendations, and how we can help to pick up from where they left off in a very impressive, very energetic line of work.

We have here with us Chris Nolde and Bob Trainor, who now serve with the Judiciary Committee and were previously with the Select Committee on Crime.

So we want to hear from the chairman. I remember that, when the reordering of duties within the Congress was first contemplated, the Congressman from Florida offered his services and his time to help us do what we finally have gotten around to doing here this morning.

So without any further ado, welcome. We would like you to begin to bring to us some of your insights from your long tenure as chairman of the Select Committee on Crime.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME**

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I thank you very much for your cordial and kind words of welcome. I want to commend your distinguished committee for your determination to do everything possible to curb crime in this country, which is of so much concern to the people of the country today, and to proffer you every assistance that I can possibly render. I am sure

that other members of the committee are also anxious to help you in every way they can.

I am pleased that one of the distinguished members of our committee, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, has just appeared here and given you his recommendations. I am particularly pleased that you have here a member of your able staff, Mr. Chris Nolde, who was our last chief counsel, did an excellent job, and his assistant, Mr. Bob Trainor, who also did a splendid job as counsel for the committee.

Mr. Chairman, if I could just summarize briefly the two great streams which contribute participants in the criminal world—that is, the two great sources, maybe I should say, from which those who perpetrate crime come—are the young people who are just coming in to a criminal career, most of them school dropouts. In fact, about half of the serious crime in this country today is committed by young people, two-thirds by people under 26 years of age, and about half of it by people under 18 years of age.

The other source of the perpetrating crime people in our population are the prisons, what we call the correctional institutions of the country. They are the recidivists, as we call them, the repeaters, and you will find ordinarily that those people in the prisons of this country today who are there for as long as 10 years or more are there for the fourth time.

I attended last year a conference at Dixley in England, where the British and American people interested in this area participated, and it was generally agreed that in both of our countries, the long-term inhabitant or inmate of those correctional institutions was incarcerated for the fourth time. Now that meant that at least three times prior to that last incarceration, that individual, most of them men, had committed one or more crimes because, ordinarily, many crimes are committed by an individual before he is arrested and/or convicted. So the problem is if we can just stop the fourth crime being perpetrated by that individual, it would make quite a contribution.

So if you are going to try to summarize the two groups who primarily constitute the people who perpetrate crime in the country, it would be the young man, generally, coming into a criminal career, and the inmate of a correctional institution or penal institution, coming back into a criminal career after having already been convicted one or more times and having served a time in a penal institution.

So if you will just try to concentrate your effort, I think those two areas would be the areas on which to concentrate.

In respect to the young people coming into the crime population, as I said, most of them are school dropouts. They usually drop out of school somewhere from about the sixth to the ninth grade, I would say, and in a lot of instances, because they simply are not fitted for an intellectual or academic career, they do not have the kind of incentive to get into a proper vocational program, for example.

In my State of Florida, I believe in all of the counties, except my county of Dade, you do not enter vocational training until you get into the 10th grade. By that time most of the dropouts have already dropped out. It is too late then. And yet, just the other day before the Rules Committee, when the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, our distinguished colleague, Mr. Perkins, was presenting the educational bill that we had on the floor yesterday, with the vote

on next week, I asked what was being done, what was available under that bill to prevent school dropouts. Well, he said, there were two areas in the bill where perhaps some additional funds could be obtained by the school authorities.

But from other sources I have learned that the congressional appropriation to try to prevent school dropouts has been reduced by half. It was \$4 million a year, it has been cut to \$2 million a year. It has got to increase several times, as it should have been; instead it has been cut in half.

Mr. CONYERS. I was going to suggest that \$4 million sounds like a relatively small amount, if you are approaching that problem on a national level.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, it is.

I forgot, I believe Mr. Nolde or Mr. Trainor would know, is it 52 million children we have in the public schools of this country, something like that?

Mr. NOLDE. Approximately 62 million.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it is something like that. You can see how many will be school dropouts from that large population. And to allow only \$4 million to try to prevent that student from becoming a school dropout.

We know what happens to a large degree. Maybe home conditions contribute to it; maybe environmental conditions make their contribution; the boy, usually it is a boy, he begins to fall behind in his class; maybe his classmates begin to titter about some of his improper answers to questions; sometimes the teacher may not be as understanding or sympathetic as she or he might be; and his interest is not challenged.

I was just thinking about it the other day. If I had happened to have had a father who was a craftsman and who was determined to see his son, his oldest son, follow him in his trade, my life would have been ruined, because I have no aptitude for that kind of activity. Or for farming. On the other hand, there are other failures when sometimes maybe a father tries to make his son an academician or professional man, when he is better qualified to be a mechanic.

I spent an hour late the other evening, nearly midnight, talking to a mother and father about a son, he is a very prominent man, about a son who had finally been put in jail after he had taken a car and been engaged in drug activities. A fine family, and I finally began to probe this mother and father as to what could be the cause of this young lad's trouble, his difficulty. They finally revealed that boy had a remarkable knack of mechanical ability. He could fix a car, he could fix a radio, TV, he had a remarkable capacity.

I said, "Well, the trouble with this boy is you haven't gotten him into the right kind of activity. The boy has a lot of ability."

Now, the school should have been able to analyze that boy better and provided some activity that would have interested him. Maybe they should have special counselors in difficult cases, but as it is today, the teachers have so many students, they are so crowded, so pressed to deal with the large number of problems that they have, including the drug problem, they just do not have very much time for individual attention to the problem child.

And yet, right there is the place to stop a lot of crime. Not more policemen on the beat to try to catch the boy later on when he starts to rob a service station and get a little money when he does not have any money, and he wants a pair of alligator shoes or something else, but you get money more often to put more policemen on the beat. Although I think we should still have more than we have, as far as that is concerned, but the best investment of our money would be preventive. Try to keep them from getting into a crime career.

Then the other one is to keep them from going back into prison. Our Select Committee went up to Attica the Friday of the week where the tragedy occurred, and we were permitted to go through the prison. We talked to a lot of inmates. I was talking to one prisoner behind bars and I said, "Look here, once you get out of a place like this, confined behind these heavy bars, in this walled structure with the high wall around it, the outside, and guards at various corners of it and all." I said, "Once you ever get out a place like this, why in the name of goodness does a man ever want to come back or allow himself to come back?"

He hesitated a minute and then he said, "Well, it is perhaps not as easy as you might think." He said, "Those of us who are incarcerated in here for a considerable period of time, many of us have become estranged from our families, from our friends, we have become strangers to our neighborhood and our community. We have pretty well broken the contacts that we previously had."

"We finally get out of here, maybe after several years' confinement, with a cheap suit of clothes and 40, 50, 60 dollars"—whatever it is they get—"and we go out. We naturally tend to go back home.

"A lot of us don't find our families there again, we are not able to reestablish cordial contact, we look around for a job and they ask have we ever been incarcerated, ever been convicted of any crime. And if we say no, they will later find out about it and we will be fired, and if we say yes, most employers don't want to hire us, and in a little while we get lonesome and nobody seems to care about us, and our money runs out, and finally, in our lonesomeness, maybe we look up some old fellow we have been associated with back in the past in our crime career, and for the lack of money maybe and the lack of a job, and the lack of companionship and the lack of understanding the first thing we know, we are back in the commission of crime and back incarcerated again within these walls."

Now, New York, I think, does do a very salutary thing. They do provide for the restoration of citizenship, I think, to an inmate as soon as he is released from the institution.

In my State, I do not know whether it is still that way or not, but it used to be you could not exercise the privilege of a citizen unless you were restored to your civil rights by pardon by the Governor, upon the recommendation of the State parole board. And you had to go through a procedure to do that. I do not know whether that is still the practice or not, but it ought to be clear that once a man is released he ought to be a citizen again, given an opportunity to prove himself worthy of citizenship.

In addition to that, at Attica, I won't emphasize the fact that 55 percent of the population was black and there was not a black guard in the whole institution, 5 percent were Puerto Rican and there was

one Puerto Rican guard, which, obviously, had its impact upon the people who were in there. But the superintendent of the prison told us, in the committee hearing and privately, he said, "I know how to run a model prison but I don't have any money."

The prisoners spent 62 percent of their time in their cell. They did not have a single athletic director for the institution. They did not have near enough training jobs for the inmates to take some sort of training program. They had hardly any kind of an educational program that was available.

Well, we stopped to see Governor Rockefeller on our way down to Attica, and he said, had the chairman of the State crime committee there, one of the Senators, and the Governor said, "Gentlemen, you don't need to tell me New York needs to modernize its prison system." He said, "I know that as well as anybody." But he says, "Senator, how much do you recollect it will cost, \$100 million?" The Senator said probably nearer \$200 million. He said, "Where is the money coming from? We are already running a State deficit. We just don't have the money."

So I said they are not trained in prison for useful, active lives once they get out. And then there is no care provided for them and somebody to sort of look after them once they get out, to try to keep them from getting back into crime.

That is the reason our committee recommended that the Federal Government pay half of the cost of doing away with the big, old prisons like Attica in New York and Raiford in my State, which is actually the same in character, twice as many people there as the institution was built to accommodate. Nothing like proper employees and guards and that sort of thing.

Anyway, that the Federal Government pay 50 percent of the cost of building small institutions to be located in the urban areas, so that a man would be confined in the area generally from which he came, so that his family and friends could keep some sort of contact with him.

And the institutions would never accommodate more than 400, preferably 300, and you do not have to have one of these magnificent gothic structures. Any sort of an institution, where only a relatively small percent of the inmates need maximum security anyway, so they could get all sorts of old buildings, other facilities in the various communities, to be the nucleus, at least, of new institution, smaller in character than these big old ones, located where you can get the proper guards and the proper employees to work with the prisoner, where you can have training programs available in local institutions that these inmates could participate in, and where when they got to the part where they were worthy to be released for job participation, there would be jobs available.

There are not any jobs available at Raiford or Attica to speak of, for the inmates.

So our theory was, if the Federal Government would pay half of the cost, and that is one of the things, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think would be one of the most meaningful recommendations that your distinguished committee could make. If we could inaugurate a program under which the Federal Government, to encourage the States, most of whom have that problem—some are better off in a way comparative than the Federal Government—if we

could encourage the States to commit their money to building this type of institution, with a modern point of view reflected in the character of that institution, and leave it to the States to build these institutions and with the Federal Government's general supervision and approval, once we get them built, then let the States operate them.

They can provide the money to operate them, but if we do not give them the incentive to build this new type of institution, they are going to keep the Atticas and Raifords and others of comparable character all over the country.

Mr. CONYERS. Does not LEAA have funds to be devoted to correctional institutions and facilities?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, but the amount is relatively so small that it is obvious that it cannot have much impact upon the situation. Altogether, LEAA, I think, only has \$700 or \$800 million available, and with all of the other demands upon these funds, they are helping the States in a few instances, but you will see that only a relatively handful of new institutions of modern character have been built.

Now the Federal Government is trying in general to build this kind of an institution in the future, although I regret to observe that some of the new institutions built by the Federal Government are still not in relatively rural areas when they ought to be in urban areas. And then the federal system is so large that a man will come from Miami, be in a prison way out in Idaho, or in the Middle West, that is too far for his family to visit him. I think it would be better probably for the Federal prisoner maybe to be authorized to be in these local institutions, generally in the areas from which they come, provided they measure up to Federal standards in character.

Mr. CONYERS. I understand you to be saying that your experience is that our prison institutions, both Federal and State, are not only not correctional, but are failing in their purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. The President, I think, was right when he, a year or two ago, characterized our prison system as colleges for crime rather than correctional institutions. Because many many of these men who get into these institutions immediately become, most of them if they stay there any appreciable length of time, by the general quality of the environment and the manner in which the institution is operated and the like; they usually become hardened, and in addition to that, they become associated with some of the worst criminals there are in the area.

I know at Attica we saw a 19-year-old white boy there; there he was with the worst criminals in New York that were confined in the Attica prison. Obviously, he was thrown with these men at times when they were permitted to get together. What must be the impact of some of those more dangerous and more violent criminals upon an impressionable young man of 19 years of age?

And down in Raiford, a judge who got himself admitted into this institution so he could just watch what was going on, told us about a tragic scene that he saw at Raiford, where a young boy, having on some white coveralls, was one day observed to be standing crying like a baby, with blood all over the front of his clothes, where he had mutilated an organ of his body.

Now there was that young lad who obviously needed psychiatric treatment, and that kind of behavior in a great public institution. I recollect they did not have time to examine each one of them personally and see what his needs were.

So to a great degree, Mr. Chairman, as you indicated, and as the President said, the present prison system of this country is making worse criminals than they got.

Now that is a shocking statement because that is the end of the line. That is the reason a police officer goes out and risks his life to capture a man, to arrest him, that we spend all of the money that we spend on the grand jury system and the trial system, the court system, the probation system, and finally we get him incarcerated, which is the end of the line.

That is the thing about which all of the fuss was before, to arrest him with some sort of presumption that if we got him incarcerated, that was to have some salutary effect, either punitive, character, we frighten him, intimidate him, teach him—you cannot put your fingers on a hot stove without being burned. You have been guilty of crime, you have been punished now.

But the unhappy result is, although it poses the great enigma that we have in society about what we should do, but the unhappy result is that in general, not always, but in general, the men that come out of these institutions of that character are worse after they come out, more dangerous, more experienced and capable criminals after they come out than they were before they entered.

Now you say, what can we do? I do not know the answer to that question and I do not know anybody who does. Back through history we have tried all sorts of torture and all sorts of mayhem and brutality and that did not stop crime. Then we developed what we thought was the system that would allow a period of penitence, that the Quakers of Pennsylvania developed, thinking it would give a man an opportunity if he sat in a cell and had a chance to read the Bible, that his conscience would become contrite and when he got out of there, he would never again commit crime against the laws of God and man. Well; it has not worked out.

Then we finally made warehouses, largely to get them out of the way. Warehouses out of our penal institutions. But as Governor Rockefeller said, you never could get enough money from the legislature; the institutions that would like to improve our correctional institutions cannot get enough money out of the Congress to do more than patch it up a little bit. And consequently, by and large, the system goes right ahead, people being the victims of crime every day.

And if somehow or another your committee could put clearly before the Congress and the country, we are paying the cost of crime whether we appropriate the money or not. Every victim of crime, if you could add up the damage, the measurable damage to the victims of crime, look what an enormous amount the people of the country are paying. And wouldn't we be justified, wouldn't they be advantaged, if instead of their having to pay so much personally and sometimes it means their lives, or sometimes in the case of women it may mean a nervous system for the rest of her life, being out of equilibrium, it may be the loss of everything that an individual has, if we could just get the public to realize that it would be in their interest to spend as much as we can

wisely spend preventing and trying to curb crime to be committed by recidivists, then all we need to do would be to use our heads to try to figure out the best thing we can do.

At least one of the things that seems to be bearing fruit is to change the nature of these penal institutions, to homebased institutions located in urban areas and the like.

Now, we had a very vivid example of that. There was a Dr. Miller in Massachusetts who absolutely closed down all of the big correctional institutions for juveniles in the State of Massachusetts. They were spending, I have forgotten how many thousands of dollars on each one of the juveniles that were incarcerated in those institutions. Mr. Miller said we can put them in local institutions, some of them we send to college. They paid the room and board and the tuition of some of them they sent to college.

He said if we will do away with these big old institutions that we have got, we can have enough money, we would be able to have enough money and still spend less than we have been spending, to give all of these people a college education almost and send them to Europe in the summer on a vacation and still spend less on the individual.

Now, we have been spending under the old system, which made a lot of the youth come out worse criminals than when they entered.

So I think our experience and the knowledge of the people who are very intelligible in this subject has confirmed that we could reduce recidivism from inmates if we changed the nature of our correctional institutions and put in more modernized techniques in the operation of those institutions located in urban areas.

Now, as I said, if I was going to summarize at all—and these things are incidental and I am going to run through those very quickly—but if you summarize at all, you would go back to the boy. We had this volunteer program—there are so many aspects of the juvenile problem—but we had a vivid instance of where a man who was very successful, he sold a lot of records and made a lot of money, that fellow got interested in boys who were delinquent boys. That man took 6 months of his time and five boys who had been in trouble, and a photographer, and took that group on a canoe trip from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean, taking about 5-months time. Five or six months time. Now, you can imagine those boys did not have very much time to think of crime when they were going through the excitement of a trip like that.

I was speaking to the Florida Bar Association not long ago in Florida, and I said, "Gentlemen, the next time you are going to take yourself and your son on a fishing trip or a hunting trip, ask your son or sons, listen, son, do you have a friend in school who is beginning to get into a little trouble or maybe dropped out of school that you think might like to take this trip that we are going to take this weekend? If so, invite him along."

I said, "Imagine what it would mean to that boy that is a school dropout to be invited into the company of that kind of a family and have an opportunity for that exciting, wholesome recreation that that family, the father and the sons, will enjoy. You may save a life there and you may save a victim from the perpetration of crime by that individual."

So the whole volunteer program, the improvement of the school system. Then, of course, the techniques when an individual is first apprehended, a lad, instead of a prosecutor sending him right on in, even to a juvenile court, or into the senior system of the courts of this country, give him a chance. Hold his prosecution up and put him on probation and allow him, if he needs education, let him get into some of the educational institutions in the community. If he needs health care, dental care, some other health care, put him through the public health services of the community. If he needs vocational training, put him through the vocational training program in the high school or in some other school in the area. But you have always got that check on him. If he does not behave, if he does not try to take advantage of his opportunity, you can always pull him back and put him through the system again.

There are just many of those systems that we heard about all over the country, but if you could just go back and try to save that boy, sometimes a girl, and save these fellows that come out of institutions, we could reduce crime more than any other way that I know of.

I am going to run through just a few of these details, Mr. Chairman, but the drug thing is a problem onto itself. We held six hearings on drugs in the school—New York; Miami; Chicago; Kansas City, Kans.; San Francisco; and Los Angeles. In every one of those areas we found the school authority, as in my county of Dade, the school authority had ignored a request of the county commission that they make a survey to find out what the problem about drugs in the schools really was, how serious was it. They ignored it. The same way in New York. Even the legislative committee had been trying to find out and they had not gotten any results either about the matter.

But when we held these hearings and turned the public scrutiny upon the fact that the school system was not doing enough—for example, in New York they were not even obeying the law which required them in the case of a drug addiction being reported to report it to the medical authority—but when we turned the scrutiny of the press and the media upon the problem, within less than a year every single one of those cities had programs underway dealing with the drug problem that was a very salutary approach to the problem.

I know in my county of Dade they are recommending nearly a million dollars to be spent on the drug program, trying to do something about it. It involves, of course, getting drug counselors, somebody who knows something about drugs, to help the teacher because the ordinary teacher does not know how to handle it. It offers, also, training to the parents.

I remember very well in Miami, and in San Francisco, a mother, in the instance of a mother in Miami with tears streaming down her cheeks. She said, "Why didn't somebody tell me what was wrong with my son before he went in a room where my little year old daughter was sleeping one day and choked her to death before I could get in through the locked door to stop him? Why didn't somebody tell me." Later they got him on a drug program and apparently the boy came out all right, but he did not bring back the little girl he had strangled to death.

The same way in San Francisco. This mother said "I knew there was something wrong with my boy, I just thought he was a growing boy and I didn't know just what the significance of it was."

So, obviously, you need to try to educate the parents as well into recognizing the drug problem and the like.

The drug problem is a very serious problem. We have this right now, the use of drugs, the heroin use is diminishing. It started diminishing in the colleges and then it got down into the high schools and some in the grammar schools.

Incidentally, in nearly every place we held a hearing, the students testified, "If we ran out of drugs, a sure place to get it was in school. We could always get it in school, every day we want it." From heroin down to amphetamines.

But now there has been a general reduction in heroin, but the students in the schools, it is getting down into the grammar schools. They have begun to use barbiturates and amphetamines more than they use the heroin, the other drug. Some marihuana, of course. Marihuana is a problem onto itself. In general, my own feeling is that I would not favor the legalization of marihuana, because we had a judge in Massachusetts, Chief Judge of the Superior Court, and the judge said, "You just don't realize the instances that we found of where people have their personality affected by the taking of marihuana." And he said, "Furthermore, one of the dangers of marihuana is the ready availability of it."

"Now," he said, "probably in this room today many of us may take a drink before the end of the day. But," he said, "I dare say you wouldn't find a bottle of liquor large or small on the person of anybody in this room."

Yet marihuana cigarettes can lie in any lady's handbag, in any gentleman's pocket, readily available; all they have to do is reach in for it like a cigarette. And he said, "I think great consideration should be given to the availability, the readiness with which it's available to marihuana."

But anyway, we did think and we had some little influence, perhaps, on the Federal changed policy of reducing the severity of the penalty.

Mr. CONYERS. In other words, you make a distinction between making it legal and decriminalizing it?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. That is right.

Mr. CONYERS. The statutory impact.

Mr. PEPPER. That is right. The severe penalty is a mistake. We, in holding a hearing in Omaha, Nebr., on this subject among others on drugs in the school, found that the Legislature of Nebraska had passed a law providing for a week in jail for the possession of marihuana. And during the week the individual incarcerated would be taught something of the dangers or possible harm of it. But ordinarily, this chief judge in Massachusetts, he said "Here in Massachusetts it is a penalty of a minimum of a year in prison," but he said, "I don't know of a single case in Massachusetts where the first person possessing marihuana cigarettes has been incarcerated for a year. The judges just won't give them that sentence. They don't feel like it is proper to do that."

So I think if there are sentences, they ought to be light sentences, and there must be a great deal more study of the subject to make a

factual and sound determination as to just what hazard there may be in legalizing and therefore encouraging the use of marihuana.

I personally was impressed by a professor in one of the California universities who told us in San Francisco, he said, "I think I can tell the students in my classes who use marihuana." And he spoke about the tendency to giggle a little bit more than they otherwise would and certain characteristics that he thought he could observe in those who did use marihuana.

Another one of the difficulties about it, as pointed out by the police to us in Boston, you go buy a cigarette, you know pretty well what you are getting. You buy a certain kind of cigarette, you know you can depend upon that being pretty representative of that type of cigarette. But, he said, you go buy a marihuana cigarette from somebody, you don't know whether it is double strength, a fourth strength, or half strength, or what it is, or what the quality of the material in it is. So the individual may be getting twice as much as he thinks he is getting, when he actually gets it.

So we did not come to any firm conclusion about it. We did not think it should be criminalized anything like to the extent that it is at the present time. We think there should be more study of the subject, and that more effort should be put on trying to persuade people that it is dangerous to become addicted to the use of it because nobody really knows yet what would be the effects upon the individual for a long term use of marihuana, because we have not had much experience yet.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we went through this whole matter of street crime. We had 13 police departments in the country represented before the committee in our last hearing to tell about innovative programs that they had put into effect. Now I am talking about dealing with the system itself, how the system itself can be improved. And it certainly needs a lot of improvement, including the court part of the system.

But the police of the country are generally trying to improve their techniques. The LEAA has been helpful to many of the police departments in doing that. For example, I remember Chief Kelley's Department, Kansas City, Mo., his police came and testified. We had them from New Orleans and Chicago, and many of the other cities of the country, different ones had developed different techniques that they thought had been more effective in dealing with crime.

Some of them, they let the patrolman use their patrol car when they were off duty so that the presence of the car around in the community would tend to deter the commission of crime.

In other instances, as in New York, for example, they had excellent programs of volunteers. They have 4,000 or 5,000 volunteers in the city of New York. They have been very valuable to the police department. Some of them travel in the patrol cars and the like.

Then the other types of programs where young people volunteer to work in the community with the police officers. There are many variations of these innovative programs with the police and we set that all out in our street crime.

We recommended that it not be required that there be a grand jury in every case for indictment, because we thought that rather an unnecessary burden to the prosecuting authority; that in general,

certainly lesser offenses than a major felony might well be handled by informations filed by the proper attorneys, district attorney or State's attorney, whatever you may call them.

Then with the prosecuting attorneys, we had one very able judge from the Western U.S. District Court of Texas, who told us about how he had been able to encourage a number of pleas by notifying the attorney for the defendant, require him to get an attorney before trial, before arraignment, as a matter of fact, and then asking that attorney to meet with the district attorney and see if he had any motions, any dilatory motions to file, and the State would disclose what its case was to the defendant. Eventually, under the modern procedures, they practically have to do that anyway before they go to trial.

So the State's attorneys were finally persuaded that in the long run it would be desirable for them to make a disclosure of what their case was. Many, many times after that occurred, the attorney for the defendant advised the defendant he had better come in and plead guilty and get the best sentence that he could. A legitimate form of sort of plea bargaining, but based upon the record, based upon the testimony that the State could present.

And he said now he has been able to get all of the lawyers, this understanding judge has been able to get all of the prosecuting attorneys in his district and all of the defense attorneys in his district to have these, what they call in civil law pretrial conferences, and it has been getting a lot of the cases off the docket and expediting the disposition of cases.

Then we had a number of judges who were willing to see the deficiencies in the judicial system that we have now. With some, particularly one of the jurisdictions of your committee at least in the Federal crime, we had some court of appeals judges, a Judge Brown in Arlington, who is on the court of appeals here which encompasses Virginia. He was saying that a lot of the paperwork that we now have in appeals is not necessary. He and some other judges said we could do away with a lot of the oral arguments. He had a letter from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, which is my circuit, and he said we have reduced our oral arguments by 40 percent in my court in the measures we have taken toward that end, and yet we have tried to protect the rights.

But looking through the cases, where we did not think there was a meritorious case to be made, the need for an argument, we just advised there will be no oral argument in that case because, after all, the public interest must be considered in this matter as well, to try to get the docket diminished and get cases disposed of already.

Then they told about, as it is now—when I first started practicing law I used to try a lot of criminal cases. Well, you know, now you have a court reporter and it takes the court reporter who is nearly always behind several months ordinarily to get the record transcribed, and it takes a year or 2 to dispose of an appeal. Well, in England when a man is convicted, he goes right off to prison, if he is sent to prison, and while his appeal is pending he is in prison. But in this country he is out on bond, ordinarily, and no telling what offenses he may commit while he is out on bond.

So we need to get the judges to be willing to take a look at their own system and what they are doing and how the system operates and candidly look at it from the viewpoint of improving it and not just doing what they have done all of the way here before this.

Mr. CONYERS. Congressman, don't we have the other problem, of course, of people who are poor being charged with a crime and who cannot make the bond and, therefore, are incarcerated frequently with hardened criminals, to a very detrimental result?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. That is absolutely true, Mr. Chairman. I am not at all sure that the money bail system is an effective way of determining whether people should be let out or not. Here there are all of these defendants here that were recently indicted, who were formerly public officials, every one was let out on his own recognizance. He did not have to put up any money bail or anything like that.

Well, I have no doubt but what the judge acted with propriety because those men are not going to run off, I am sure. I do not think they would. And I think the judge ought to exercise that same discretion generally in the mass of people.

Undoubtedly you are right, if you go through the prisons of this country—and I am not talking about the countries of the world, but our own United States of America—who are they? They are generally the ill-educated, the illiterate, a lot of them have physical defects, very few of them have means of livelihood that can assure that they will have a decent income upon which to live. They are basically the flotsam and jetsam of the population, and they keep coming in and out and out and in, again and again and again. It is a very serious problem.

You see, of course, a few that have been well do to, well educated, that got into an income tax trouble or some other problem, but a relatively small number and they are generally in some other kind of institution, not with the rank and file of the prisoners.

So somebody ought to be looking at that. Why is that true? Is the system not being operated fairly or are there things we ought to be doing to help people in this country to try to live better lives and not to get into careers of crime. But what do we do? We just go along and go through the same old system again, sending the person to prison, letting him stay a while, letting him come out and sending him back again; letting him come out, sending him back again, and everybody talking about crime; but as somebody said about the weather, we are not really doing very much about it.

And yet if we really got to the roots of the problem, we could do a lot about it. But it would probably cost us more money.

But in the long run, it would save money for the people altogether. My wife and I lost here in Washington a few years ago, \$6 or \$8 thousand worth of our property, the best things we had. We were going on a vacation and our station wagon out in front of the apartment, in broad daylight, and somebody came and got it all.

Well, that cost us. That would have been my share of taxes for an anticrime program for a good long while and I would still save money. And there are a lot of other people similarly situated.

So what I have done, Mr. Chairman, these were general subjects we covered and I had Xeroxes made of this, distributed to your com-

mittee. We first deal in respect to street crime; police recommendation; corrections, juvenile and adult; prosecution and court recommendation. Then we deal with marihuana, heroin and heroin research.

By the way, our committee has been graciously acknowledged by the drug abuse prevention program out of the White House for being primarily responsible for getting about \$40 or \$50 million from the Congress for further research in how to deal with the problem of heroin.

Our witnesses were not satisfied in general that methadone was the answer to the problem of heroin because it is addictive itself. And if you get off of methadone, the chances are you will get right back on heroin again. So they are making some considerable progress in research now to get something very much better than methadone that will not have bad side effects and will be more effective in dealing with heroin addiction and will not be addictive in character.

By the way, I noticed the Turkish Government has just announced the people over there, the farmers, are beginning to grow the poppy again. If our Government can use any measure, any persuasion on the Turkish Government to forbid that, we certainly ought to do it. I thought we had gotten them to stop that for a while in consideration of our helping the farmers to develop other profitable crops that we thought would be a good substitute for the growing of the poppy. It will be a great world tragedy if they start growing the poppy again, because it will be coming back into this country very soon.

Then amphetamines. We recommended, and that has now just about been consummated, I believe, that we put amphetamines up in the category 2 rather than in 3, so that they will be very severely limited in the uses that can be made of it. There is no reason, these amphetamines, they are not really of any use except for obesity and about all you get is lose a few pounds and gain an addiction that will probably be with you the rest of your life if you get accustomed to taking these highs. And two other things, two rare diseases where it is appropriate to use this, hyperkinesia, I believe it is, and narcolepsy.

They are very rare things. In fact, we had a hearing on that and the doctor said a few hundred, as a matter of fact, at the outside a few thousand amphetamines would serve the needs of the whole country medicinally, and yet we are putting out millions, hundreds of millions of dollars from the drug houses of this country.

I mentioned drugs in our schools, reform of our correctional system, juvenile justice and correction, techniques for converting worthless security into cash.

We showed how these nice little criminals and gangsters were able to take a corporation called Baptist Foundation of America, out in the Southwest, that sounded like it was an instrument of the Baptist Church, which happens to be my faith, which it wasn't, and they took some \$20 million from institutions around the country in a series of fraudulent transactions.

And we recommended a number of things, one of which had to do with the accounting firms, some of them in this case were most important and prominent firms, to readily lending their names to some of these security issues, to indicate while perhaps not technically saying so, to indicate that they gave their approval to this issue. We recommended some safeguards on that.

Now, the last one, organized criminal influence in horseracing you might say, well, what in the world does a crime committee get in horseracing for?

One of the things is, the States of this country derive \$500 million a year in revenue from legitimized parimutuel horseracing. It is a very great source of income and more people in this country attend horse races for recreation than any other sport that we have in the Nation. So we thought those made an inquiry relevant.

We divided our recommendation into two categories. The first, about the only legislative recommendation we made for the Federal Government, and I think that is almost unanimously approved by the racing industry, the racing commissioners and the people who participate in racing, is that it be a Federal offense as well as a State offense to do anything to try to fix a horse race.

In other words, this gives the added force of the Federal Government as a deterrent because the horseracing industry of this country is so fluid and so many people involved in it, they are flowing from one State to another, just like water almost, or air. And for one State to get a felon to come back—he commits an offense in New Jersey and he runs down to Florida, New Jersey has to extradite him from Florida and it takes a long time and that sort of thing. But if the FBI, if the Federal Government can indict him and he can't run away from the Federal Government and stay in the United States, why I think they all agree that that would be a very salutary thing.

I know we were up at Saratoga and down at the Derby in Kentucky and a lot of the outstanding races, the people of this country I think you could get, if you wanted to have a hearing on it, I think we could help you get witnesses who could come and testify about that.

The other is simply a recommendation to the States, so that would not come within your purview.

So that, in general, is a little bit of a summary, Mr. Chairman, of what we did. I am sorry to have taken so much time.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, it was a very thorough and extremely interesting one. We are indebted to you. I would like to recommend that you try to come back and join us, Mr. Pepper, after we have had a chance to examine this very detailed set of recommendations, particularly those that apply to us.

I would like to recognize now for any observations, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fish.

Mr. PEPPER. Excuse me just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

I have to have somebody check the floor. I was to handle the rule over there on some of these State Department bills that are up. Could some member here from my office check over there?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank our witness for an extraordinary inspirational talk, and I think the record should show, for the 1 hour we sat here and followed what you said, Mr. Pepper, you never once referred to a note or piece of paper.

Like the chairman, I would like some time to digest one of the great reports on how we could be helpful in the fight on crime. Thanks very much.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much, Mr. Fish.

Mr. CONYERS. I would like to recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Froehlich.

Mr. FROEHLICH. No comments.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Pepper, I have been fascinated by the tremendous knowledge and your splendid analysis, and many times I was tempted to ask a question but I said, "No, I will not interrupt him because he has such a vast wealth of information here."

I join the chairman and I am glad he did mention it, that you come back to us and be available to us. There are so many points and so many questions I would like to discuss, which I do not think we have the time, except I would like to ask you about the thought that the judges and the people in law enforcement should take a look at their system to see what we can do to improve it.

I completely agree with your idea of plea bargaining. I have handled a number of criminal cases, both in defense and prosecution, and so much time and money is wasted on preliminaries. In New Jersey we have the appearance before the magistrate, and probable cause hearing, and then we have the grand jury, and then we have the defense counsel making all types of motions to quash and so on. Then we have motions before trial and then we have motions during trial. All of these things being done, really, for defense counsel to gain time and to perhaps make a dicker.

Now, in New Jersey we progressed but we have not progressed, I think, far enough. The point I am trying to make is I am wondering if we could work on and develop some system where as soon as the defendant is apprehended and he has counsel, if that counsel could not go and meet with the prosecuting attorney—

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. MARAZITI [continuing]. And say, "Listen, I have talked to my client, let's go to a judge." Because why does the defendant agree to begin to plead guilty? Most of us know, defense counsel, whether he is going to be convicted or not, but we do not want to do it. We want to know the penalty. So I could say to the court, "What is the penalty going to be if he pleads guilty?" Is it going to be 30 days, or maybe we don't permit jail here. He has got a family to support. It is a \$500 fine or 10 days in jail. Plead him guilty immediately and save all of that money and time.

If it did not work out, if the client were not agreeable, I think the ends of justice could be followed by saying that the particular judge who heard this conference will be disqualified from sitting in the case.

So I concur tremendously with this point you make and the others because I think a great deal of money can be saved. This is the way to clear our criminal calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. You are so right, and the dockets could be cleared of a lot of cases that were clogging it up.

Mr. MARAZITI. Right. Again, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, may I again mention my appreciation of your thought to keep in close contact with Mr. Pepper. I am sure that with his assistance, this committee can do a great deal.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, it will be my pleasure and privilege to work with your committee in any way I possibly can. I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. CONYERS. It is very valuable to all of us. As you know, Mr. Pepper, we have enjoyed your relationship with our subcommittee. And on this note, the subcommittee will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

### STREET CRIME—REDUCTION THROUGH POSITIVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSES

- I. Police Recommendations
- II. Corrections—Juvenile and Adult
- III. Prosecution and Court Recommendations
  - Marihuana:
    - Findings
    - Recommendations
  - Heroin and Heroin Research:
    - Findings
    - Recommendations
  - Amphetamines:
    - Findings
    - Recommendations
  - Drugs in our Schools:
    - Findings
    - Recommendations
  - Reform of our Correctional Systems: Recommendations
  - Juvenile Justice and Corrections: Recommendations
  - Techniques for Converting Worthless Securities into Cash: Recommendations
  - Organized Criminal Influences in Horseracing: Recommendations

### STREET CRIME: REDUCTION THROUGH POSITIVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSES

#### I. Police Recommendations

1. That the Congress take a more active role in the "oversight" and monitoring of all federally supported law enforcement activities and programs and that such oversight and monitoring specifically include the periodic review of the effectiveness of LEAA funds and programs which support police and police related activities.

2. That state Law Enforcement Planning Agencies, in the preparation of their Annual Comprehensive Law Enforcement Plans, give priority attention to programs which are designed to reduce street crime.

3. Law Enforcement priority should be accorded to the establishment of low visibility (civilian clothes) police patrol projects such as New York City's City-Wide Anti-Crime Section. We believe programs of this nature can be a highly effective street crime deterrent and that such programs can bring about a significant reduction in muggings, assaults and robberies.

4. Law Enforcement priority should be accorded for the establishment of special Rape Analysis and Investigation units staffed by policewoman.

5. Law Enforcement priority should be accorded for the establishment of special police units to provide intensive counseling to hard core delinquents. Such units should draw on other disciplines but—because people under 18 years of age constitute such a substantial law enforcement problem—we think these units should be part of police agencies.

6. Law Enforcement priority should be devoted by police agencies (in cooperation with courts, correctional agencies and state law enforcement planning agencies) to undertake thorough studies of criminal recidivism within their respective jurisdictions. We think that such studies (like the Dallas Repeat Offender Study) have major implications for police operations and for the criminal justice system as a whole.

7. Law Enforcement priority should be accorded to the establishment of police legal adviser units in all medium and large police agencies and that such units be established on a consolidated, regionalized basis to serve small police agencies. Adequately staffed legal units are—we think—a necessity for effective law enforcement and, we further recommend that police lawyers be used to screen all arrests for serious crimes in order to "wash out" those offenses which, because of defects in the arrest, could not be successfully prosecuted.

8. Law Enforcement priority should be provided for the creation and staffing of mobile Evidence Technician units in all medium and large size law enforcement agencies. The size of such units should be determined by the size of the police agency which they serve, the population of the jurisdiction they serve and the yearly average number of Index Crime offenses which have occurred in that jurisdiction within the recent past. Mobile Evidence Technician Units, staffed by trained evidence technicians, should—as a goal—respond to at least half of all Index Crime scenes.

9. Law Enforcement priority should be provided for experiments in "community sector" and "neighborhood team" policing programs and that funding for such programs specifically provide for independent evaluation.

10. That all major police agencies establish major street crime felony units which would devote their total attention to the investigation of serious street crimes. Such units would (like specialized homicide or robbery squads) concentrate on high rate areas of street crime and would be responsible for all police aspects of such cases.

## II. Corrections—Juvenile and Adult

1. The committee recommends to the States that they abolish unnecessary juvenile prisons and institutions commonly known as training schools, reform schools, and industrial schools, where young offenders are incarcerated in a prison-like environment and replace these institutions with smaller, community-based facilities which emphasize the rehabilitation of the offender.

2. The committee strongly urges the States to reevaluate the current juvenile corrections policy and accordingly the committee advocates that no juvenile be incarcerated for a "status" offense.

3. We are of the opinion that new and costly facilities are neither necessary nor desirable in most cases and we endorse some State policy of attempting to utilize existing buildings (former nursing homes, motels, residences, etc.) rather than to seek new, modern, impersonal facilities. We are convinced from the testimony we heard that the commitment, character and motivation of adult staff members is far more important than the physical characteristics of housing insofar as juvenile rehabilitation is concerned.

4. This committee encourages the States which have not already done so, to include the "Outward Bound" concept of juvenile rehabilitation in their correctional program.

5. We recommend that Federal, State, and local governments provide appropriate training for volunteers and the administrative framework for seeing to it that volunteer and probationers in need of volunteer services are matched.

6. All police departments should include in their training programs intensive and extensive preparation in working with juveniles and understanding their problems.

7. All police departments should have a special division to deal with the youthful offender.

8. Police officers should participate in community affairs, and especially those dealing with young people.

9. Juvenile courts should employ "intake consultants" to screen cases before they are adjudicated.

10. Whenever possible, preadjudicatory incarceration of youthful offenders should be avoided, but when a youthful offender is incarcerated, he should always be strictly segregated from adult offenders.

11. Should it be necessary to place a young person in an institution prior to adjudication, such institution must have complete diagnostic facilities to enable the court and Government authorities to examine the young person and possibly resolve the most preferable way of dealing with him.

12. All juvenile courts must be urged to streamline their procedures so that case backlogs are eliminated.

13. Juvenile courts should by legislation be elevated to the level of the highest trial court in the jurisdiction.

14. The entire sentencing structure of the juvenile justice system must be reexamined.

15. Special training should be instituted by the juvenile courts for attorneys (both prosecution and defense) practicing before it.

16. The quality and number of juvenile court probation officers must be increased.

17. Each juvenile court should have available psychiatric and psychological testing and counseling services.

18. Youth groups such as boys' clubs, PAL and the "Y" should seek out young persons with a potential for delinquent behavior.

19. Each community should establish a Volunteer Youth Services Coordinating Council.

20. Communities should establish youth auxiliary groups.

## III. Prosecution and Court Recommendations

1. In an effort to relieve the judicial system of its heavy caseload and growing backlog, screening programs should be implemented in all prosecutor's offices to eliminate, prior to formal entry into the judicial system, all cases where there is clearly insufficient evidence to sustain a conviction. In addition police legal advisers should be utilized wherever possible to conduct "station house" screenings of arrests.

2. As a means of providing selected first time offenders with an opportunity of proving their ability and willingness to comply with the laws of the community, court prosecution diversion programs should be established. These programs, operating under clearly defined and uniformly applied eligibility requirements, should allow selected defendants to receive rehabilitative counseling, supervision, and treatment. Participation in such diversion programs should not be so restricted as to preclude from participation those who have the greatest need for assistance who evidence a willingness to be helped.

3. Comprehensive treatment programs should be established to treat drug addicts on a voluntary basis and as an alternative to incarceration. Consideration should be given to the establishment or involuntary civil commitment programs for drug offenders. Drug offenders who are incarcerated under the criminal law should also receive drug rehabilitation treatment while serving their sentences.

4. Reporting, monitoring and evaluation regulations must be strictly adhered to in all diversion programs. Monthly reports must be filed by the administrator of the diversion or treatment program detailing the probationers progress and willingness to cooperate.

5. The criminal justice system should be encouraged to make optimum use of available community resources and services in its effort to establish treatment and sentencing alternatives.

6. Extensive use should be made of already devised computer systems by prosecutors and the courts to assist in scheduling, equalizing caseloads, determining priorities and for compiling statistics needed for the orderly and efficient operation of the criminal justice system.

7. In the interest of both the public and the defendant, limitations must be placed on the time span between a defendant's arrest and the commencement of trial. The interval between arrest and trial should not be longer than 60 to 90 days. Unjustified failure of either counsel to comply with the time limitation should be met with severe sanctions.

8. An omnibus hearing procedure which includes continuing pretrial discovery should be established to consolidate the numerous hearings often required prior to trial without the need for written motions. This procedure is encouraged as a means of eliminating "trial by ambush" and to increase the probability of pretrial disposition.

9. Until courts can dispose of all cases within a reasonable time the courts and the prosecution must give priority treatment to expediting those cases involving violent crime. Moreover, the courts and prosecution should promptly move on cases where the defendant is unable to make bail and is forced to be detained prior to trial.

10. The mandatory use of the grand jury should be abolished, where constitutionally permissible. The grand jury should be empaneled only in those instances requiring intensive investigation into matters that would otherwise go unchallenged. Defendants generally should be charged by means of an information.

11. The examination of prospective petit jurors should, under most circumstances, be conducted by the presiding judge. Counsel should be afforded, however, the opportunity of submitting questions to the judge prior to the initiation of the voir dire.

12. Where a negotiated plea is offered and in sentence bargaining situations, the complete agreement upon which the plea or sentence is based must be presented to the judge in open court for his consideration. In every case where an agreement is reached the record must contain a full disclosure of the terms of the agreement and the judge's reasons for accepting or rejecting the offered plea or sentence.

13. Skilled court administrators should be employed to bring to multi-judge courts efficient management and operations techniques. The establishment of a

court administrator's position should relieve other judges from the burden of managerial duties to concentrate on hearing and deciding cases.

14. To expedite dockets and to identify responsibility for each case courts should give consideration to the adoption of the individual calendar system.

15. Experimentation with videotaping trials and court proceedings and the use of other technological devices should be encouraged, and implemented, where feasible.

16. The Committee finds that undue delay prevails in most appellate courts today. The courts should carefully examine appellate procedures to determine what should be done to hasten the disposition of criminal cases on appeal.

17. In order to expedite the disposition of cases before the appellate courts, the courts should be provided with a staff of experienced attorneys.

18. In each major urban area, regularly scheduled meetings between representatives of the various members of the criminal justice system should be held. At these meetings complaints should be voiced, opinions expressed and policy formulated. The purpose of constant and completely open dialog is to encourage cooperation among the various components of the system.

#### MARIHUANA

##### Findings

*Effects of Use.*—The Committee concluded that not enough is known about the physical effects of marihuana use to enable the Committee to recommend abrogation of all criminal penalties for possession, use, distribution or importation of marihuana.

*The Drug Culture.*—The Committee found that use of marihuana introduces young people to the "drug culture", a social setting which increases the likelihood that an experimenter will become a user and that a user of marihuana will become a user of stronger drugs.

*Drug Education Programs.*—The Committee found that drug education programs are unsuccessful with regard to heavy use, and with regard to further use by experimenters.

*Criminal Sanctions.*—The Committee found that the present system of criminal sanctions for use of marihuana is unevenly applied, ineffective, and breeds a distrust and lack of respect for the entire criminal law system.

##### Recommendations

1. That a comprehensive report on the physiological effects of marihuana be prepared by medical personnel within the executive branch.

2. That study be given to drug education programs and that federal funding for such programs be made available to the states.

3. That the Federal government aid the states in which marihuana grows wild to eradicate the weed.

4. That penalties, both federal and state, for the possession of marihuana, particularly for first offenders, be reduced to a misdemeanor status, and that incarceration be combined with drug education and limited to seven days.

#### HEROIN AND HEROIN RESEARCH

##### Findings

*Extent of the Problem.*—While narcotic addiction appears to be epidemic in our urban slums among economically deprived young people, it is, in fact, an endemic problem afflicting people at every level of our society.

*Addiction as a Cause of Crime.*—The Committee found that heroin addiction is responsible for an enormous amount of crime, against both persons and property: crime whose victims are frequently poor residents of the addict's own neighborhood. The Committee further found that additional large sums are spent on the incarceration of addicts.

The Committee heard startling statistics in its New York hearings about the cost of heroin addiction. There are an estimated 100,000 addicts in New York City, 98% of whom cannot support their habit without turning to crime. If each of these addicts steals to support his habit, approximately \$8.8 billion worth of merchandise must be stolen each year in New York City alone.

The people of New York spend \$28.5 million a year to support these addicts who are finally arrested and jailed.

Heroin related deaths in New York City in 1970 exceeded 1,000.

*Production and Importation of Opium.*—Production of opium is growing, as is its importation into the United States. At the same time, however, scientists have

concluded that there is actually no legitimate medical need for either opium or its derivatives.

*Effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System.*—The Committee found that the present American criminal justice system has not been effective in combatting the distribution and sale of heroin within this country. The Committee found that procedural safeguards built into the criminal justice system lead to substantial difficulties in the apprehension and conviction of heroin distributors. In particular, the Committee found that "bail-jumping" was common, as was intimidation of witnesses by suspects out on bail, and that the rule excluding evidence that is the product of an illegal search and seizure made convictions difficult to obtain when the accused distributors were brought to trial.

*Treatment Facilities.*—The Committee found that treatment facilities for drug addicts are inadequate, at both the federal and state levels. It found that, to be successful, a wide variety of treatment modalities will have to be available in each community.

*Research: Narcotics Antagonists.*—The Committee found that research into narcotics antagonists and other drugs to be used to control heroin addiction is needed, and increased federal support for such activities is essential.

*Heroin Paraphernalia.*—The distribution of heroin is dependent on the availability of substances used to dilute heroin, and devices used to package, prepare and inject heroin.

##### Recommendations

1. For federal action: (a) Full implementation of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 and the Narcotic Addict Grant Program of the Community Health Center Act to increase available facilities for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts. Increased aid to private rehabilitation and treatment programs.

(b) American pressure for a multilateral ban on all opium production, such ban to be negotiated either through the United Nations or among signatories to the Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961.

(c) If such a ban is not feasible, increased support of international control agencies such as the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the International Narcotic Control Board and the Division of Dangerous Drugs, and development of a system of licensing cultivation of and trade in opium.

(d) Increased work on tools of international detection, including satellite surveillance systems, an international computer bank to keep track of opium trading and devices to make detection of concealed heroin more feasible (such as systems involving chemical trace elements and remote sensor devices.)

(e) Work on development of "cash crop" substitutes for opium.

(f) Restrictions on granting of visas to persons whose routes of travel make them likely heroin traders, increased Customs surveillance of incoming and in-transit passengers, and reinstatement of the practice of maintaining manifest lists of all incoming international passengers.

(g) Modification of legal procedures in order to permit "restrictive bail" for narcotics suspects; to increase the penalties for "bail-jumping" to those of the underlying crime; to provide for trials in absentia of narcotics suspects who flee the jurisdiction; and to substitute effective civil remedies (in place of exclusion of evidence in criminal trials) for violation of rights against search and seizure.

(h) Evaluation of existing drug education programs to determine if they are effective in reducing drug abuse. Restraining further funding for such programs until evaluations are available.

(i) Development of a program of research to find acceptable and long-lasting narcotic antagonists. This program would provide 90% federal funding to drug companies with acceptable development programs, the federal share to be reimbursed from any profits to the company resulting from development of appropriate drugs. Initial federal funding for this program would be \$50 million. Provision of additional funds for the University of Michigan drug-testing facility.

(j) Passage of a "controlled paraphernalia" statute for the District of Columbia making it illegal to deal in or possess heroin paraphernalia in circumstances indicating an intent to distribute or use for drug abuse purposes.

2. For state action: (a) Development and implementation of programs under the Narcotic Addict Grant Program of the Community Health Center Act to increase available facilities for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts. Increased use of state civil commitment statutes.

(b) Passage of a "controlled paraphernalia" statute similar to that proposed for the District of Columbia.

*Findings*

*Effects of Use.*—The Committee found that amphetamines have limited legitimate use (narcolepsy and hyperkinesia) and tend to create conditions in which violent behavior may occur.

*Overproduction by Legal Manufacturers.*—The Committee found that the most substantial source of amphetamines is overproduction by legal manufacturers. It heard testimony that over eight percent of all prescriptions written in the country were for amphetamines, and that over 90 percent of young users of speed had been initiated into the practice with drugs obtained legally, stocked in home medicine cabinets.

*Clandestine Operations.*—While clandestine operations are not at present a major supplier of amphetamines, the Committee determined that the ease of manufacture of these drugs and the availability of the ingredients makes such operations highly profitable.

*International Controls.*—Amphetamines are presently subject to no international controls. Amphetamines are a relatively new problem, and until recently only three countries—the United States, Sweden, and Japan—have had difficulty with widespread amphetamine abuse.

*Mail Order Drugs.*—The Committee found that mail order drug houses, which are supposed to service only licensed physicians, are in fact extremely lax about assuring that orders come from such persons.

*Recommendations*

1. That amphetamines and materials used in their manufacture be placed under Schedule II controls under the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, and that production be reduced from the billions of units presently produced to the thousands needed for legitimate medical use.

2. That the United States work with other nations to adopt and enforce the draft protocol on psychotropic drugs, which would severely restrict import and export of amphetamines.

3. That, to prevent bribery at borders, a system of monetary rewards for seizures be established, and that if this is not successful Congress consider requiring shipments of amphetamines to be in bond.

4. That further study of the role of mail order drug houses in amphetamine distribution be undertaken, with a view toward prohibiting such trade if controls under Schedule II do not serve to close this channel of improper distribution.

5. That manufacturers, distributors, and dispensers be required to monitor their sales more carefully, and to report any suspicious orders to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

6. That inquiry be made into the abuse of barbiturates to determine what types of controls are necessary to prevent their abuse.

## DRUGS IN OUR SCHOOLS

*Findings*

*Extent of Problem.*—While the House Select Committee's preliminary examination indicated that the problem of drugs in schools was severe, further investigation demonstrated that it was indeed a crisis. The findings show that the chances are substantial that when parents send their child to high school each day, they are sending him or her into a drug filled environment—an atmosphere where drugs are bought and sold daily. The findings reveal that with little or no effort a teenager can obtain amphetamines, barbiturates, LSD, and marijuana. With some additional effort, cocaine and heroin are generally available.

The findings show that youngsters who become involved in drugs come from every racial, religious, socioeconomic and geographic segment of our society, contrary to prevalent notions that drug abuse is restricted to the "bad kids" or the "ghetto kids."

*Heroin.*—Heroin was found to be the most dangerous and deleterious drug used by school students; and perhaps the most addictive drug known. In all the cities and towns visited by the Committee, this deadly drug was readily available to high school students who wanted to buy it.

*Cocaine.*—Cocaine, the highest priced illegal drug, unlike heroin, does not cause physical dependence. In the main, however, it does create a strong psychological dependence in the abuser. In the recent past, a surprisingly large percentage of cocaine has found its way to college campuses, and the cocaine traffic is already reaching many high school students.

*Barbiturates.*—Like heroin, barbiturates are physically addicting. If the drug is withdrawn abruptly, the user suffers from cramps, nausea, hallucinations, delirium, convulsions, and sometimes death. The barbiturate addict exhibits marked social and emotional deterioration, resembling the chronic alcoholic. Barbiturates—especially when mixed with alcohol—can be extremely lethal and constitute one of the most dangerous drugs being used by school-age youngsters.

*Amphetamines.*—Although amphetamines do not induce physical dependence, withdrawal from large dose levels creates depression, both psychic and physical. Methamphetamine, commonly called "speed," is chemically related to amphetamine and continuous abuse can cause acute and chronic psychosis, loss of memory, and possible brain damage in the habitual user.

*LSD.*—LSD, commonly referred to as "acid," is an extremely powerful hallucinogen. Many medical authorities have concluded that chronic or continued use of LSD impairs the user's powers of concentration and thinking ability. This drug was readily available in each of the areas the committee visited.

*Mescaline/Peyote.*—Peyote and mescaline are hallucinogens similar to LSD, but they are significantly less powerful.

*Marihuana.*—The physiological and psychological effects of marihuana are substantial, but vary in intensity and kind among individuals and with a single person from time to time.

*THC and PCP.*—THC (tetrahydrocannabinol) is the principal euphoric ingredient in marihuana and was first produced synthetically in 1966. PCP (phencyclidine) is a tranquilizer for animals that is a relative newcomer among illicitly used hallucinogenic drugs.

*Drug Abuse Programs.*—The Committee found that well-conceived drug treatment and drug counseling programs can be effectively established for young people, and that the programs examined below, and new, more imaginative programs yet to be conceived and effectuated, are indispensable if drug abuse is to be dealt with. The following programs are not conducted by the public schools, but they do help school-age youth:

*The Seed Program—Fort Lauderdale, Fla.*—An intensive and exceptionally emotional 3-week group therapy program, followed by 3 months of continued outpatient involvement.

*Gateway House Foundation, Inc.—Chicago.*—Six separate small residential treatment facilities, comprising a single "therapeutic community."

*DIG—(Drug Intervention Group)—Kansas City.*—Different treatment therapy for different drug habits acquired by young abusers.

*Cook County State's Attorney First-Offenders Program—Chicago.*—Pilot drug counseling program for young people who are just getting into drugs.

*Cook County Sheriff's Program—Chicago.*—Drug counseling program similar to that of State's Attorney.

*Edu-Cage—White Plains, N.Y.*—An alternative to existing education, offered to dropouts and alienated young people on a non-residential basis.

*Alpha School—New York City.*—Combination of residential therapeutic community and state-accredited high school, designed to handle serious drug abuse and addiction cases.

*Other Programs.*—Jesus Movement, Yoga, and Transcendental Meditation. Factors contributing to drug program success:

1. Removal of the drug user from his old associations, environment or milieu.

2. Staff members who are close in age or situation to the user.

3. Group therapy with emphasis on encounter or confrontation techniques.

*The Schools Presently.*—The Committee found the schools' current response to the drug problems of their students inadequate on two counts: (A) school administrators were ignorant of the nature and severity of the problem, and/or refused to take responsibility for dealing with it; and (B) where drug abuse programs existed in the schools, they were inadequately funded, poorly planned, and ineffectually administered and "taught."

*Administrative Ignorance and Failure to Take Responsibility.*—The Committee found that the failure of the schools to deal with the problem is a principal reason why teenage drug abuse has expended so rapidly in the last two years.

*Drug Abuse Programs in the Schools.*—Our national drug educational program is a disaster. . . . Instead of an intensive, innovative, and comprehensive effort to curb drug abuse, we have a sporadic, confused, and disorganized attempt to give a meager amount of guidance to our school children.

*The Influence of The Overproduction of Drugs on Youth.*—The investigation revealed a direct connection between overproduction by legitimate firms of amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers, and other drugs, and the growing problem of drug abuse.

*Overproduction: Advertising.*—The Committee concluded that "there is sufficient reason for a thorough inquiry into the impact of advertising: on drug abuse by the young. An unquestioned fact is the vast extent of drug advertising. It constitutes a campaign costing in excess of \$211 million to promote a message that can be read to imply that drugs are an essential part of daily life. There is also no question that youth are susceptible to advertising, particularly on television.

#### *Recommendations*

1. Development of drug abuse programs along the lines of those examined.
2. Increased quantity and sophistication of school-based drug abuse programs.
3. Cut-backs in the manufacture of certain drugs by legitimate firms.
4. Scrutiny of the effectiveness of the voluntary advertising guidelines adopted by the radio and television industry.

#### REFORM OF OUR CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS

#### *Recommendations*

1. Measures to decrease dehumanizing conditions and treatment in prisons.
2. Expanded in-prison drug treatment facilities.
3. Greater use of corrections devices that decrease restraints on rights and liberties and increase involvement with the community.
4. Greater employment opportunities for offenders both in and out of prisons, including restructuring of the "state use" system.
5. More effective education and training for inmates and correctional personnel.
6. Gradual replacement of Attica-Raford type prisons with more modern, community-based facilities.
7. Reform of parole and prison-discipline procedures.
8. Establishment of correctional ombudsmen.
9. Greater centralization of each state's correctional efforts.
10. Increased riot control advance planning; and
11. Greater employment of the device of offender restitution.

#### JUVENILE JUSTICE AND CORRECTIONS

#### *Recommendations*

1. Measures to alleviate some of the contributing factors to juvenile crime such as poverty, poor housing, educational failure, and family and home breakdown.
2. Improvements in police functioning in the juvenile area.
3. Alternatives to arrest.
4. Improvements in post-arrest, pre-trial procedures, including age-segregated or offense-segregated incarceration.
5. Alternatives to judicial disposition.
6. Use of intake consultants.
7. Improve court procedures.
8. Correctional innovations such as in-community facilities, adapted group therapy, segregation of offenders by personality type, and home substitutes.
9. Broader consultation with families at every stage.
10. Increased intelligent use (at every stage) of various existing public and private community-based organizations and programs, as well as development of new ones; and
11. Improved education of the major participants in the juvenile process.

#### TECHNIQUES FOR CONVERTING WORTHLESS SECURITIES INTO CASH

#### *Recommendations*

1. Federal criminal legislation respecting use of fraudulent reports or statements.
2. Greater Federal legal stringency respecting marketmakers and quotations.
3. Greater Federal legal stringency respecting repeated securities violators.
4. A tightening of the standards of the accounting profession respecting reliance on materials furnished the accountant.
5. Broadening, on the Federal level, of the power to freeze and attach funds.
6. Mandatory Federal disclosure requirements respecting credit reports; and
7. Greater co-ordination of Federal securities enforcement efforts.

#### ORGANIZED CRIME INFLUENCES IN HORSERACING

#### *Recommendations*

1. More stringent controls respecting influencing the outcome of races.
2. Greater cooperation among racing commissions in ferreting out violations of racing rules and regulations.
3. The establishment of information centers concerning racing violators.
4. More stringent controls concerning misrepresentations.
5. More stringent controls on "exotic" betting combinations.
6. More stringent controls on undisclosed ownership of horses and racetracks.
7. Revision of licensing and "racing date" practices.
8. Controls on out-of-state ownership; and
9. Tightening of conflict of interest laws.

LIST OF HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME 1

Title of hearing	Date of hearing	Location of hearing	Major witnesses	Subject matter
The Improvement and Reform of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the United States.	July 28-31; Aug. 4-7, 11, 12; Sept. 17, 18, 1969.	Washington, D.C., Lorton, Va.	Robert H. Finch, Secretary of HEW; Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., Executive Director, ABF; Professor of Law, University of Chicago; John E. Ingersoll, Director, BNDD; George F. McGrath, Commissioner, Department of Corrections, New York City; John N. Mitchell, Attorney General; Charles Rogovin, Administrator, LEAA; Quinn Tamm, executive director, International Association of Chiefs of Police.	Overview; Statistics; fear of crime; juvenile crime; cost of crime; guns; drugs, administration of police departments.
Crime in America—Drug Abuse and Criminal Justice.	Sept. 25-26, 1969.	Boston.	John J. Buckley, State director, Massachusetts Council on Crime and Correction; Richard Callahan, regional director, DNBD; John Gavin, commissioner of correction, Massachusetts; Francis G. Poitras, judge, Boston juvenile court; Robert H. Quinn, Massachusetts attorney general; Francis W. Sargent, Governor, Massachusetts; G. Joseph Tauro, chief justice, Massachusetts Superior Court; Kevin White, mayor, Boston; Dr. Norman E. Zinberg, Tuft University.	Increase in use of drugs; drug rehabilitation and education; Federal role in improvement of local corrections institutions.
Crime in America—Youth in Trouble.	Mar. 19-20, 1970.	Baltimore.	Richard A. Batterton, deputy secretary, Maryland Department of Health and Hygiene; William L. Brown, director, learning center, Anne Arundel County Board of Education; Ralph V. Chase, director, Baltimore City Street Club Service; Judge Robert I. H. Hammerhan, Division for Juvenile Causes, Circuit Court, Baltimore; Robert C. Hilson, acting director, Maryland Department of Juvenile Services.	Juvenile crime; drug abuse; juvenile correction; relationship between police and youth.
Crime in America—Views on Marijuana.	Oct. 14-15, 1969.	Washington.	Dr. Robert W. Baird, director, Haven Clinic NYC; Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary, HEW; Dr. Jesse Steinfeld, Deputy Assistant Secretary, HEW; Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director, NIMH.	Role of marijuana in abuse of hard drugs scientific data on marijuana.
Crime in America—Illicit and Dangerous Drugs.	Oct. 23-25, 27, 1969.	San Francisco.	Dr. Joel Fort, professor, Berkeley; John L. Kelly, deputy Reg. Director, BNDD; William E. McIntosh, Jr., executive vice president, Eli Lilly Int. Corp.; Roger C. Smith, founder of drug treatment program.	Overproduction of amphetamines and barbiturates; Federal role in restrictions on production and use of "legitimate" drugs.
Crime in America—Why 8,000,000,000 Amphetamines?	Nov. 18, 1969.	Washington.	Dr. Sidney Cohen, Director, Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse, NIMH; Dr. George R. Edison, director, student health service, University of Utah; Dr. John D. Griffith, Vanderbilt University; Dr. David C. Lewis, Harvard Medical School; Dr. Benjamin J. Sheppard, executive director, Catholic Services Welfare Bureau, Florida.	Legitimate and illegitimate use of amphetamines.
Crime in America—Response of a Midsouth Community.	Nov. 20-21, 1969.	Columbia, S.C.	William D. Leeke, director, South Carolina Department of Corrections; Fleming Mason, coordinator, South Carolina ETV law enforcement training program; Prof. Webster Myers, head of Governor's task force on the courts; Mary Ann Overcash, STAND (drug abuse program); Carl R. Reasoner, executive director, law enforcement assistance program of South Carolina; Judge J. McNary Spigner, Family Court of Richland County, Columbia, S.C.; J. Preston Strom, chief, State of South Carolina	Focus on new South Carolina correction system, including extensive vocational programs, prerelease centers, and programs to mobilize community support for underfinanced juvenile justice systems.
Crime in America—Aspects of Organized Crime, Court Delay, and Juvenile Justice.	Dec. 4-5; Dec. 8, 1969.	Maine.	Law Enforcement Division; Olin Turner, director, Columbia Pre-release Center; Dr. Thomas D. Wyatt, director and chief drug inspector, narcotic and drug control division, South Carolina Board of Health.	Cocaine smuggling; treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts; school drug abuse program; street crime; and the juvenile justice system.
Crime in America—In the Nation's Capital.	Feb. 25-26, 27, 28, 1970.	Washington, Fairfax, Va., Riverdale, Md.	Dr. James A. Bay, Secretary, Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services; Mrs. Charles V. Bradley, chairman, Crime Commission, court observer's program; Earl Faircloth, attorney general, State of Florida; Bernard J. Garmise, chief of police, Miami; Judge Donald Stone, chief juvenile judge; Daniel P. Sullivan, executive vice president, Crime Commission of greater Miami; Judge Frank Orlando, presiding judge, Broward County Juvenile Court, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	Street crime and its effect on the daily lives of citizens; drug problems; law enforcement: juvenile delinquency.
Crime in America—A Mid America View.	Oct. 9-10; Oct. 11, 1969.	Omaha and Lincoln, Nebr.	Francis J. Aluise, chairman, Prince Georges Board of County Commissioners; James Bowman and Charles J. Snowden, roving leaders, Rockville, Md.; Judge Frank L. Deirhof, Fairfax County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court; William G. Farran, commanding officer, Sixth district Metropolitan Police Department; Anthony C. Quadro, chief adult probation and parole officer of Northern Virginia; Dr. James L. Jones, special assistant to the major for youth opportunity services; Dr. Sidney Shankman, director, Alexandria Community Mental Health Association; Margie R. Wilber, founder, Crime Stoppers Club, Inc.; Roland J. Williams, executive director, Project Build, Inc.	Narcotics and dangerous drug abuse; rise in violent crimes; increasing involvement of juveniles in criminal activities. The committee focused on the development of suggestions for areas in which the Federal Government can assist local government in fighting crime.
Crime in America—Heroin Importation, Distribution, Packaging and Paraphernalia.	June 25-27, 29, 30, 1970.	New York.	Richard B. Anderson, chief of police, Omaha; Jack Clayton, executive director; Urban League; Judge Seward L. Hart, Juvenile court, Douglas County, Omaha; Dennis Jackson, director, counselor, Operation Bridge, Inc.; Dr. Emmet Kenney, director, adolescent center, Nebraska Psychiatric Institute; Peter V. Knolla, director, Douglas County Youth Center; Maurice Sigler, warden, Nebraska panel and correctional complex.	Importation of heroin; distribution system; restrictions and availability of heroin paraphernalia; methadone.
Crime in America—Youth Gang Warfare.	July 16-17, 1970.	Philadelphia.	Dr. Vincent Dote, Rockefeller Institute; William Durkin, regional director, BNDD; Samuel S. Leibowitz, former justice, New York, State Supreme Court; Sister Mary Keough Philippa; Albert Sealey, U.S. Customs Service.	Gang warfare among youths; projects to combat the problem.
Crime in America—The Heroin Paraphernalia Trade.	Oct. 5-6, 1970.	Washington.	Charles W. Bowers, executive director, Philadelphia Urban Coalition; Paul D'Ortona, president of Philadelphia City Council; Robert J. Gemignani, Commissioner, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, HEW; Judge Clifford Scott Green, Juvenile Court, Court of Common Pleas, chairman Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, Regional Planning Council, Philadelphia; Frank L. Rizzo, Commissioner, Philadelphia Police Department; David L. Skoler, Director, Office of Law Enforcement Programs, LEAA, U.S. Department of Justice.	Federal and State regulation of the distribution of heroin paraphernalia; workings of the paraphernalia trade.
See footnote at end of table.			Frank Mazzone, detective sergeant, Maryland State Police; Meyer Oxman, president, Reyman Drug Co.; Hazen L. Richardson, Jr., director, pharmaceutical products marketing, Parke-Davis & Co.	

35

37

LIST OF HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME—Continued

Title of hearing	Date of hearing	Location of hearing	Major witnesses	Subject matter
American Prisons in Turmoil.....	Nov. 29-30, Dec. 1-3, 1970.	do.....	Walter Dunbar, executive deputy commissioner, New York Department of Correction Services; Dr. David Fogel, commissioner, Minnesota Department of Corrections; Judge Richard Kelly, Sixth Judicial District, State of Florida; William D. Leeke, director, South Carolina Department of Corrections; George F. McGrath, commissioner of corrections, New York City; Vincent R. Mancusi, superintendent of Attica correctional facility; Russell G. Oswald, commissioner, New York Department of Correctional Services.	Prison conditions and their effects.
Narcotics Research, Rehabilitation and Treatment (parts I and II).	Apr. 26, 28, June 2-4, 23, 1971.	do.....	Dr. Robert L. DuPont, director, D.C. Narcotics Treatment Administration; Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, director, Illinois Drug Abuse Program; Dr. John C. Kramer, University of California (Irvine); Dr. Julian E. Villarreal, University of Mich., Medical School.	Drug Rehabilitation programs; state of medical knowledge about drugs; heroin control and antagonist drugs.
Organized Crime—Techniques for Converting Worthless Securities into Cash.	Dec. 7-9, 1971.	do.....	Ernest Fennell, executive assistant, Insurance Commission, State of Arkansas; Norman Forsyth, former president, Dumont Data-camp; Stuart Goldberg, former securities attorney; Joe B. Hunt, insurance commissioner, State of Oklahoma; Harold T. F. Ading, vice president, for Reporting Policy, Dun & Bradstreet; Lawrence R. Tapper, deputy attorney general, California Department of Justice; Reverend S. Taylor Sullivan, formerly vice president, Board of Trustees, Baptist Foundation of America.	Organized crime in the banking, securities, and insurance industries; roles of lawyers and accountants in helping to develop schemes to defraud the above industries and the general public.
American Prisons in Turmoil.....	Feb. 25, 1972.	New York.....	(See above).	(See above).
Organized Crime in Sports—Racing.....	May 9-11, 15-18, 22-25, 30-31; June 1, 7, 13-15, 1972.	Washington.....	Joseph (the Baron) Barboza, former organized crime enforcer; William Baum, captain, intelligence division, New Jersey State police; Anthony Ceardono, head of crime syndicate, St. Louis, Mo.; Charles Ginsberg, Jr., chairman, Ohio State Racing Commission; James Inglis, former racing commissioner, State of Michigan; Alexander MacArthur, chairman, Illinois Racing board; Various owners of racetracks and horses.	Ownership and operation of racing events; rigging of races to affect gambling activity.
American Prisons in Turmoil.....	June 15, 1972.	Washington.....	(See above).	(See above).
Drugs in Our Schools—I.....	June 19-20, 21, 27, 1972.	New York, Washington.	Abraham D. Beame, comptroller, New York City; Dr. Robert Doud, New York City Department of Health; Dr. Harvey Scribner, chancellor, New York City public schools; Ira Silverman, investigative reporter, NBC news; Stephan Spinelli, undercover police agent, New York City.	Drug abuse in schools; relation between schools and law enforcement officials; school board policies toward drugs; drug educational programs.
Drugs in Our Schools—II.....	July 5-7, 1972.	Miami.....	Art Barker, president, the Seed, and Seed participants; Rev. Frederick C. Harrison, executive director, Spectrum Programs, Inc.; Hon. Alfonso C. Sepe, judge, criminal court, Dade County.	Drugs in schools; drug treatment and rehabilitation programs; residential treatment programs.
Organized Crime in Sports—Racing	July 18-20, 25-27, 1972.	Washington.....	do.....	Do.
Drugs in Our Schools III.....	Sept. 21-23, 1972.	Chicago.....	Dr. Irving R. Abrams, medical director, public school system, Chicago; Carl V. Charnett, director, Gateway Houses Foundation; James Gottreich, director, youth services, division, Cook County sheriff's office; John T. Sullivan, assistant State's attorney, Cook County.	Drugs in schools; drug treatment and rehabilitation programs; law-enforcement treatment programs.
Drugs in Our Schools—IV.....	Sept. 28-30, 1972.	San Francisco.....	Dr. Joel Fort, founder, Fort Help; police undercover agents; probation officers; students.	Do.
Drugs in Our Schools—V.....	Oct. 6, 7, 1972.	Kansas City, Kans.	Walter Hirsteiner, president, Board of Education, Johnson City, Kans.; Dr. Wm. V. McKnelly, Jr., director, psychiatric outpatient department, University of Kansas Medical School; Dr. O. L. Plucker, superintendent of schools, Kansas City, Kans.; James F. Walsh, director, juvenile court services, Jackson City, Mo.; Students.	Same as above (Miami).
Drugs in Our Schools VI.....	Dec. 8, 9, 1972.	Los Angeles.....	Juan Acevedo, director, narcotics prevention project, Los Angeles; Dr. Wm. J. Johnston, superintendent, Los Angeles school district; Dr. Thomas T. Noguchi, chief medical examiner-coroner, city of Los Angeles; students, teachers.	Same as above (Miami).

\*This list does not include the Street Crime hearings held in Washington in 1973.

**END**