Return to P10-L

0133

STATE GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COMMITTEE
IN
CRIMINAL ADMINISTRATION

GRANT NO. 072

YEAR-END REPORT

MICHIGAN COMMISSION ON CRIME,
DELINQUENCY AND CRIMINAL ADMINISTRATION
352 Hollister Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

August 31, 1967

C O N T E N T S

GRANT NO. 072
YEAR-END REPORT

August 31, 1967

STATE GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COMMITTEE IN CRIMINAL ADMINISTRATION

MICHIGAN COMMISSION ON CRIME,
DELINQUENCY AND CRIMINAL ADMINISTRATION
352 Hollister Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

Submitted to the United States Department of Justice, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, upon expiration of the first year grant of $25,000.00 and in support of application for a grant of $40,000.00 for the second year of operation with the State of Michigan to provide equal support.

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The first convening of Michigan's Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration occurred on September 15, 1966, in the chambers of the Supreme Court at Lansing. On that afternoon the then 45-member Commission received its charge[1] from Governor George Romney. He had created the Commission by Executive Order[2] and appointed the membership in late July 1966. His address set out his hopes for the Commission, and by suggesting the areas in which he wanted the Commission's advice, the Governor outlined the scope for the Commission's inquiry and recommendations[3].

During the year previous, discussions in the offices of the Governor's State Human Resources Council led to the recommendation to establish a comprehensive "commission on law enforcement and the administration of justice." The planning evolved a commission structure headed by a chairman who would report directly to the Governor, and four regular commitees on: Impact of Crime; Police and Public Safety; Administration of Criminal Justice; Corrections, Probation and Parole.

---

[1]Governor Romney's address, September 15, 1966. See Appendix Item A
[2]Executive Order No. 1966-7 of July 14, 1966. See Appendix Item B
[3]"Proposed Structure and Plan of Operations." See Appendix Item C

At this first meeting, Governor Romney announced his desire for a committee to study and recommend on "organized crime." He named its chairman, and promised the appointment of additional persons to form that committee. By early October, the Commission's membership had been raised to 56 people, two-thirds of whom had made careers in an element of the crime control spectrum, the remainder were lay citizens whose work or civic interests made a natural connection with the Commission's purpose.

The announcement of the pre-determined committee assignments was made at the September 15, 1966 meeting. Time was reserved at its end sufficient for each committee to decide organizational matters and to select content for their next meeting. Thereafter, each of the five committees has met on a regular monthly schedule, although a few extra meetings have been called as the situation demanded

An Executive Committee consists of Commission chairman John B. Martin of Grand Rapids, vice chairman Donald L. Reisig of Lansing, and the chairmen of each of the five "permanent" committees. The Executive Committee had, one week earlier selected the Commission's executive director, Mr. Louis Rome, and he was introduced to the Commission at the September 15, 1966 meeting.

1966 CLIMATE FOR CRIME CONTROL PLANNING IN THE GRANTEE STATE

The subject of crime prevention and crime control, for reasons that are sufficiently self-evident to obviate need of listing here, held the interest and the imagination of the Michigan public during the summer of 1966. —Today, there are many indications that the concern is even greater. In fact, a number of events during this last year may have gone far to help Michigan communities focus constructive concern on the problem of crime.

Viewed as a community problem to be attacked, "crime" may seem to lack manageable boundaries and, thus, is met with citizen apathy. Nonetheless, there always have been forces at work in Michigan which contributed to the strengthening of

institutions of social control. In 1966, Michigan's climate for crime control and criminal justice planning was quite favorable.

During the past three years, we can cite several important developments authored by either public or private agencies, or sometimes both, which will enhance social order. The following list is not all-inclusive, and it does not pretend to say these are the most important of all. It does say that, in a context of these accomplishments and as a part of a total effort, the Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration does operate among friends.

— News media interest has been consistent, issue oriented, and in the main has avoided sensationalism.

— The executive leadership of state government, Governor George Romney, recognized that crime, as one among many social problems, would yield to the forces of a committed citizenry. In establishing a State Human Resources Council in the Executive Office, a discourse at high level began to develop and disseminate ideas on maximizing the contribution of the state's human resources toward solving the public's problems. The Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration is an outgrowth from the Council's discussion. Crime control is viewed as a matter of utilizing human resources.

— Recognition for the practical benefits of improved police training led the legislature in 1965 to create the Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council, which began operation in September 1966. Furthermore, a large capital investment had begun toward a computerized law enforcement information network to enhance the capabilities of local police departments.

— Problems of lower court administration are under massive review as important lay and state bodies undertake the mandate of Michigan's new Constitution which has abolished the office of the justice-of-the-peace effective January 1, 1969. Michigan's new Constitution sets a framework of a judiciary within one unified court system. A special, prestigious committee of the Michigan State Bar has drafted a comprehensive reorganization of all "lower courts," civil and criminal, into "District Courts," to be courts of record with lawyer judges. A series of legislative hearings were held last winter and spring. A special session of the legislature has been called for October 1967 to act upon the several draft proposals.

— Revision of the substantive penal code has occupied another committee of the State Bar for three years. By the close of 1966, the final drafting of a proposed code had begun. (The code draft for submittal to the State Bar and to the legislature is being printed at this very moment.) Its introduction as a legislative bill is expected at the start of the 1968 legislative session. The draft speaks concepts new tc the ancient traditions of Michigan's criminal law.

— Discussion of a complementive revision of the criminal procedural code was underway. As to that aspect of criminal law reform, a final draft can be anticipated in 1969.

— The above-noted revision of the penal code also contemplated innovations in sentencing methods. The deliberations through 1966 had provided a statutory framework which would be a Michigan version of the Model Sentencing Act. This effort occurred with the cooperating energies of

the Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council and the Michigan Corrections Commission, who gave a public viewing of the proposals at a "Conference on Sentencing" on December 5, 1966 (and provided an opportunity for a public address on the work of the Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration.)

STAFF ORGANIZATION

From September 19, 1966 through February 5, 1967, Commission staff was its executive director and a senior secretary. On the occasion of heavy typing demand, the clerical staff of the Human Resources Council was available. There was, as well, considerable consultative assistance from the Human Resources Council's executive director, from the Program Development staff of the Governor's Office, and from State department heads and their several subordinates.

The Commission's executive director, Mr. Louis Rome, holds graduate degrees in both social work and law. He had been a psychiatric caseworker, juvenile court administrator, public welfare consultant and, most recently, a trial attorney in a public prosecutor's office. The senior secretary, Mrs. Mary Phillips, has 15 years' state government experience which was believed necessary for an office with considerable potential for clerical expansion.

Mr. James Shonkwiler joined the staff as associate director on February 6, 1967. He had been an attorney for four years, in private practice and an assistant prosecuting attorney who specialized in criminal appellate and civil matters.

The plan, upon Mr. Shonkwiler's arrival, was for each man to carry primary responsibility for two committees of the Commission and for both to share the staff work for the fifth committee (Crime Impact and Prevention). That plan has not been followed, more by happenstance than design. The practice has evolved

that both men usually attend committee meetings, share duties as committee resource persons, and develop materials for committee review. Mr. Shonkwiler has carried the bulk of meeting minutes' preparation since March 1967.

The current thought would have any addition in professional staff result in a formalized assignment of staff to particular committees, and all staff service to the committee would, thereafter, be the responsibility of the one staff person. The present method probably overspreads the two-man staff as generalists, and works against their individualized concentration on the technical needs of particular committees. On the other hand, should there be a sizable staff expansion, there will be two executives immediately geared to see the forest as well as the trees.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION, MEMBERSHIP AND MEETINGS

As mentioned in the Introduction, certain decisions had been made by the time of the first meeting of the total Commission on September 15, 1967:

Committees' titles to guide committee function and scope had been set. Committee chairmen had been selected and their assent had been obtained. Each Commissioner's committee assignment was made. Each committee would meet monthly at a time and place to be chosen by the individual committee. Agenda and priorities for study and action were to be determined by the initiative of the individual committees. Each committee would report its work product to the quarterly meetings of the total Commission. A rule soon developed that the total membership must have committee proposals in hand ten days before the quarterly meeting. Committee products would be given public notice only after the considered approval of the total Commission, whereupon each would be reported as a position of the full Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration. Recommenda-

tions to the Governor, position statements and other pronouncements were to be made available to and discussed with the Governor and his staff immediately upon Commission action.

Three items were provided to assist the Commission membership relate to their function and program:

(1) Executive Order No. 1966-7, by which Governor George Romney established the Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration and defined its functions. (Appendix B)

(2) A four-page mimeograph titled "Proposed Structure and Plan of Operation" which repeated the functions listed within the Executive Order, gave numerous illustrations of programs considered appropriate by those persons who had planned the establishment of the Commission and which set out a series of obvious issues or problem areas which were seen as critical to improving community control of crime. (Appendix C)

(3) A brief description of the United States President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice published by that body.

In retrospect, this amount of structure, which at that time was hoped not to be overly controlling, helped most Commissioners focus more readily upon their respective assignments. Discussion subjects were identified with comparative ease by the committees on Police and Public Safety, Corrections, and Organized Crime, perhaps because the membership found these committee titles self-defining. The Administration of Criminal Justice Committee spent several meetings in the process of arriving at a projected list of priority study matters.

The Committee on Impact of Crime initially sensed its scope of interest as all encompassing and difficult to delimit. It drew some aid from its self-

perception as an analogue of the President's Commission Task Force on Assessment of Crime. Because it had only a glimpse of that Task Force's activity, gathered from staff conversations with Task Force personnel, it could not know the precise nature of that effort until its Task Force Report was published in June 1967. So the committee undertook to assess the state of knowledge in Michigan about the volume, nature, causes of crime, and its impact upon the offender, our community, and our way of life. The committee said, "why acquire this knowledge unless we act upon it?" Because the committee wished to make value judgments from its findings, it concluded that a "prevention" theme would run with all of its deliberations and the committee was retitled, "Crime Impact and Prevention Committee." In fact, the committee has not developed any sizable, well organized body of data on the volume, nature or causes of crime in Michigan to this time because neither committee members nor staff devoted sufficient time to this purpose. Instead, committee focus has shifted to other matters, especially to consideration of the specific recommendations of the President's Commission Report.

There was some enlargement of Commission membership during the opening months. Several members were added on the recommendation of individual Commissioners, and it should be noted that Commission appointments of this origin in particular have made a constructive contribution. To be noted as well is the fact that about twenty per cent of the original gubernatorial appointees do not attend meetings with any regularity, nor have they become substantially involved in the process in any clearly observable manner.

Where meeting attendance has been less than five Commission members plus staff, Commission staff observed that irrespective of the choice of subject for consideration, the discussion has tended to be less than substantially productive. Despite committees who represent concerned professional leadership, discussion

must involve at least a half dozen persons if the product is to have depth, range, vitality and the understanding of the broad community. As the first year closes, consideration is being given to increasing the membership of particular committees.

The schedule of monthly meetings was maintained with only a few exceptions. Most committee meetings are held in Detroit, some in Lansing, but all Police and Public Safety meetings are in Brighton, a point half-way between. The planned omission of committee meetings for the month of July never occurred. The individual program situations in several committees, especially the call by Commission chairman John B. Martin, to complete by September 1 the examination of The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, required a somewhat increased meeting frequency as the close of the Commission's first year approached.

REVIEW OF COMMITTEES' EFFORT

The reader's understanding of the process and subject matter of the several committees' meetings may be gathered best through the minutes of meetings held during the last eleven months. The reader is directed to those matters which occupied considerable committee consideration by use of the indexes below. Each index lists the subject in order of its chronologic appearance in committee discussion.

In some instances, a committee sought action from the total Commission by proposing a specific recommendation to it. The several proposals for total Commission action are indexed on pages 21-23, and the ensuing floor discussion at the respective Commission meetings is to be found within the quarterly meeting minutes, and appended to this report.

CRIME IMPACT AND PREVENTION COMMITTEE:

Mrs. Ruth Lichterman, Chairman
former State Chairman, League of Women Voters
Huntington Woods

Judge Victor Baum
Wayne County Circuit Court, Detroit

Andrew W. L. Brown, Asst. Director
Community Services Department, UAW-AFL-CIO; Detroit

Mrs. Ruth Frank, National Board of Directors, Girl Scouts of America
Detroit

Harry R. Hall, President
State Chamber of Commerce
Lansing

Bishop Dwight E. Loder
Mich. Assn., Methodist Church
Detroit

William T. Patrick, Jr., General Counsel
Michigan Bell Telephone Company
Detroit

Mrs. Evelyn Upjohn, former member
Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council
Manistee

Rev. James E. Wadsworth, Jr., President
Detroit Branch, N.A.A.C.P.

William W. Wattenberg, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools

Mrs. Eloise Whitten, Board member
Brewster Public Housing Project
Detroit

Dr. Robert A. Williams
Director of Guidance Programs
Oakland Schools - Intermediate District
Pontiac

I-N-D-E-X

POLICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE:

Judge Horace W. Gilmore, Chairman
Wayne County Circuit Court, Detroit

Thomas E. Bell
Genesee County Sheriff, Flint

Col. Frederick E. Davids
Michigan State Police Commissioner
East Lansing

Ray Girardin, Commissioner
Detroit Police Department

Harold Johnson, Director
Neighborhood Service Organization
Detroit

William A. Johnson, Superintendent
Grand Rapids Police Department

Hubert Locke, Administrative Assistant
Detroit Police Department

Gerald Lyons, Inspector
Flint Police Department

Professor Louis A. Radelet
Michigan State University, School of
Police Administration, East Lansing

Consultant:
Noel Bufe, Executive Secretary
Michigan Law Enforcement Training Council
Lansing

I-N-D-E-X

ORGANIZED CRIME COMMITTEE:

Judge Edward S. Piggins, Chairman
Wayne County Circuit Court, recent "one man grand juror", Detroit

Arthur F. Brandstatter, Director
Michigan State University, School of Police Administration, East Lansing

Judge George Edwards
U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit; former Detroit Police Dept. Commissioner; former Justice, Michigan Supreme Court; Detroit

Hon. Frank J. Kelley, Attorney General of Michigan, Lansing

Capt. Raymond McConnell, Michigan State Police, East Lansing

Earl Miller, retired Detroit Police Department Inspector, Detroit

George E. Woods, former Assistant United States Attorney and grand jury prosecutor.
Detroit

The Organized Crime Committee, in number, is the smallest section of the Commission. With one exception, its members are persons with recent, deep involvement in investigative activities against organized crime in southeastern Michigan. In addition, Commission chairman, John B. Martin, sits with the committee, especially to inform the Governor of considerations in this area.

Organized crime activity in southeastern Michigan has little visibility to the general public; gangland in-fighting is very rarely observed or reported; knowledgable federal and local officials cite the Detroit "outfit" as the classic model of an efficient management whose clandestine nature is preserved by a consistent, absolute internal discipline. The vast majority of Michigan citizens are not directly affected by this organized criminality and are not impressed with its existence.

The first several Organized Crime Committee meetings contained an exchange of highly sensitive information. By committee decision, at its first meeting, no minutes were to be taken and no written summary of the meetings was to be produced. Later meetings have dealt more with discussion of practical and theoretical police and government problems in the context of organized crime. For the first time, notes were taken on the content of the July 13 meeting, and these have been developed into a summary statement which will be considered by the committee at its next meeting.

The committee has now reached the point of relating the existence of organized crime to other areas of government and society. There is recognition that organized crime will be sustained by urban communities until society faces other issues which indirectly feed into the strength of organized crime.

This committee obtained the Commission's endorsement of the need for adequate appropriations to enable (1) the Department of State Police to provide effective investigatory and surveillance staff against organized crime and, (2) the Attorney General to provide a permanent organized crime unit of sufficient size

in "popularity contests" for judicial posts. (The Administration of Criminal Justice Committee has requested, at its own initiative, staff study on the same matter.)

The Organized Crime Committee has reviewed the twenty specific recommendations on organized crime reported in Chapter 7, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Fifteen recommendations received full endorsement (see OC 1-4). The committee report to the quarterly Commission meeting on June 15, 1967, the floor discussion, and Commission action, are to be found at TC 24-27.

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE:

Judge Wade H. McCree, Jr., Chairman
United States Court of Appeals,
Sixth Circuit, Detroit

Frederick G. Buesser, Jr.
Attorney at Law, State Bar Commissioner, Detroit

Rev. James C. Chambers
Detroit

James C. Daner, Attorney at Law
Mt. Clemens

Judge Elvin L. Davenport
Recorder's Court, Detroit

William R. Hart, Court Administrator
Michigan Supreme Court
Lansing

Dr. B. J. George, Jr., Vice Chairman
University of Michigan Law School
Ann Arbor

Hon. Frank J. Kelley, Attorney General
of the State of Michigan
Lansing

Dr. Charles King, Dean
Detroit College of Law

Professor Harold Norris
Detroit College of Law

Judge Fred N. Searl
Kent County Circuit Court
Grand Rapids

Myron H. Wahls, Attorney at Law
Detroit

I-N-D-E-X

CORRECTIONS, PROBATION AND PAROLE COMMITTEE:

Donald T. Anderson, Chairman (1967-68)
Educational Director, Children's Charter of the Courts of Michigan, Kalamazoo

Professor Robert Barstow
Western Michigan University, Dept. of Sociology & Anthropology, Kalamazoo

Judge Mary Coleman
Probate Court of Calhoun County
Marshall

S. Joseph Fauman, Ph.D.
Eastern Michigan University, Dept. of Sociology, Ypsilanti

Jack I. Green, Chairman (1966-67)
Managing Director, Michigan Traffic Safety, Inc., Lansing

Robert L. Drake, Deputy Administrator for Probate Courts, Michigan Supreme Court, Lansing

Gus Harrison, Director
Michigan Department of Corrections
Lansing

Judge James T. Kallman
Probate Court of Ingham County
Lansing

Lewis Knaggs, Supervisor, Technical Services
Michigan Department of Social Services
Lansing

Francis A. Kornegay, Executive Director
Detroit Urban League

Judge Keith J. Leenhouts
Municipal Court, Royal Oak

Judge James H. Lincoln
Wayne County Probate Court, Juvenile Division, Detroit

Frank Manley, Jr., Director
Mott Vocational Guidance Program, Flint

Judge Arthur E. Moore
Oakland County Circuit Court
Pontiac

Dr. Herbert A. Raskin
Michigan Society of Psychiatry and Neurology
Detroit

Dan E. Reed, Legislative Counsel
Michigan Farm Bureau
Lansing

Consultant:

Al Ball, Executive Director
Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council
East Lansing

I-N-D-E-X

SUMMARY OF COMMISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT

In its first eleven months of operation the highlights of accomplishment by the Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration have included the following:

— The Commission has brought together, on a regular schedule, a membership of persons highly knowledgable of the problems of law enforcement and

administration of justice for the purpose of discourse concerning not only the objectives of the several institutions which have statutory responsibility in these areas, but also concerning the institutional staffing, equipment, methods and programming.

— The Commission has identified some of the most pressing problems of crime control, and has made a limited overview of the several crime control systems in order to establish priorities for study and action in Michigan.

— The Commission has examined most of the report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, has formed initial responses to many of the recommendations, and has made tentative judgments of the applicability of the approximately 200 specific recommendations to the Michigan situation. This will be a continuing process, augmented by further study of the President's Commission Task Force documents.

— It has noticed innovative local programs which offer promise for crime prevention and/or enhancement of criminal justice, and seem adaptable to other communities in this state. Commission endorsement has been accorded to a few programs and public reporting of this support has occurred.

— The Commission has made a very few specific recommendations for legislative enactment at its own initiative, has lent its support to several bills proposed by other agencies or groups and, in follow-up, has expressed its position to appropriate persons within the state legislature after discussion of the particular proposal with the staff of the Executive Office.

SUBJECTS OF TOTAL COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND DECISION (AT ITS QUARTERLY MEETINGS):

Selection of Executive Director.	TC 1-2
Expansion of Commission membership	TC 2
Role of Commission re Conference on "Citizen-Volunteer Participation in Probation and Related Programs"	TC 3
Commission use of the report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice	TC 6, 18, 21
Recommendation to obtain appropriations for special State Police and Attorney General staff in efforts against organized crime (Organized Crime Committee)	TC 7, 14
Recommendation to establish a Center for Law Enforcement Research and Planning (Police and Public Safety Committee).	TC 8, 14
Recommendation to establish a program for identification, recruitment and training of future police officers (Police and Public Safety Committee).	TC 9
Recommendation to upgrade police officers' salaries and educational entrance requirements (Police and Public Safety Committee).	TC 10
Recommendation to heighten police agency use of modern scientific equipment and detection techniques by implementing statewide computer network and grants-in-aid to local police agencies (Police and Public Safety Committee).	TC 10
Recommendation to obtain amendment to Motor Vehicle Code to allow motorists to plead on "citation" without necessity of complaint and warrant (Police and Public Safety Committee).	TC 11, 14
Recommendation to increase beginning driving age to 17th birthday or upon graduation from high school, whichever occurs first (Police and Public Safety Committee).	TC 11
Recommendations for immediate appropriation for juvenile detention homes' construction; expansion of state training schools' after-care facilities; state matching funds for all out-of-home child placements ordered by juvenile courts (Corrections Committee)	TC 11, 14

OTHER PRODUCTS OF THE COMMISSION EFFORT

Statewide Inventory of Local Law Enforcement

In February 1967, the Commission staff was invited to develop the "public safety" phase of a broad program of urban services' planning then being undertaken by the State Resources Planning Board with funds from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Two meetings were held with personnel of the several State agencies directly concerned to define the project's

objectives. Then, Commission staff drafted a statement of the initial planning method, which called for a detailed descriptive inventory of existing law enforcement resources of Michigan.

The Commission established a subcontract with a police administration research group at the Institute of Community Development, Michigan State University, to conduct the inventory phase of the project[4]. At the moment of this writing, the subcontractor is obtaining responses to the two-part questionnaire. The second part deals with current controversial issues of police operations, asks for candid comment, will be treated as confidential, and permits the responding agency to protect its identity.

One by-product of preparing and executing the inventory is already being realized -- that of a complete directory which identifies the law enforcement agency which serves every township, village, city and county in Michigan. It lists every political jurisdiction and tells (1) the communities which have their own police service and, (2) those which use another jurisdiction's police service by contract or by less formal arrangement. We know of no similar directory in recent decades.

The completed questionnaires will provide an accumulation of descriptive information on all local law enforcement agencies, including facts on personnel, facilities and equipment, inter-agency relationships and current problem areas. The project schedule calls for the final written report on December 1, 1967. The Commission anticipates utilizing the project's data within its studying and planning operations. Undoubtedly, the report will be valuable to police administrators and to every agency of state government which has an interest in furthering effective law enforcement.

- - - - -

[4]"1967 Michigan Law Enforcement Inventory of Local Law Enforcement"

Another study, financed entirely from the Commission's budget, is measuring "youth attitudes toward the police." The contractor, Western Michigan University, is researching the degree to which the attitudes of children in grades 6 - 10 toward police authority are affected by factors of age, race, sex, prior police contact, socio-economic level, local education, etc.

The contract has asked for an analysis and identification, if possible, of the age level at which attitudes toward police tend to crystallize among those children registering negative or positive attitudes. The study director, Professor Donald H. Bouma, will report on changes in these measurements in the last ten years (using his previous study as a bench mark.) The final report is expected by mid-September 1967.

Of the several uses to this data, one would conceivably be in the area of adjustments to school program content about police authority. Another might be police juvenile bureau change in method of approach to children and parents, depending on the child's age, race, sex, etc.

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL CRIME COMMISSIONS

Commission staff has appeared before the Wayne County Coordinating Committee on Crime Control and the City of Ann Arbor Mayor's Meeting on Crime to report on Commission activities and to offer the Commission's knowledge for the continuing use of the local group. There has been an informal invitation to assist in the formation this autumn of a broad-based crime committee for Oakland County.

Local crime control groups must operate within the context of local conditions and local resources. These are not the same statewide. The state Commission can, in some respects, be used as a model and its experiences can be the basis for local commissions to shortcut the trial and error method toward successful planning and implementation.

Commission staff believes the same process is true for the learning which the state Commission can gain from knowledge of the operation of local committees. To date, however, Commission staff is unaware of local crime control efforts of a comprehensive nature which are older than the past two or three months.

Nonetheless, the potential exists for such cross-fertilization in the future and it must be developed where opportunity occurs.

Catalyst to Local Projects

In February 1967, the Commission's staff made an impromptu call upon one of Lansing's three municipal court judges to raise consideration of establishing a probation staff service in that court, theretofore without one. The innovative aspect of the proposal was that the professional staff person would not supervise probationers himself, but rather he would recruit, train and supervise mature adult volunteers to act as "probation aides," who would themselves sustain the personal contact with the probationers. This was perceived as analogous to the "Big Brother" program, but with the emphasis on recruiting adults of similar occupation, social status, etc., to the probationer.

The judge discussed the matter with his colleagues. At the judge's request a follow-up conference was held, attended by the three municipal court judges, a state Corrections Department field supervisor, the county's chief probation officer, and the Commission staff. Six weeks later, without any other substantial effort on the part of the Commission staff person, he received a telephone inquiry from the Municipal Court clerk for an immediate answer on projected salary level for the probation staff position, and this was given. Prompted by this show of court administrative interest, and by the knowledge that the City Council's budget committee was considering the matter, the Commission staff telephoned another Department of Corrections official to open the search for a professional probation

supervisor. The one call, as "luck" provided, immediately identified one man with extensive experience in youthful-offender counseling who was then in the process of seeking related, new employment. So, within five months of the February staff visit, the City of Lansing had a new probation service in operation.

The Commission staff does not know whether it was the only initiator in this matter. Certainly, others helped as the matter was moved along. But it appears that knowledgable contact, at the right point in time and in a manner that permits the agency to develop its project at its own pace may catalyze the accomplishment of needed programs.

— — — — —

Another illustration of Commission staff assistance to a local effort stems from the Commission vice chairman's interest in promoting the handling of the chronic public-intoxicated person outside the criminal process. Commission staff wrote the director of the State Board of Alcoholism about this problem, citing the Hoy case which is pending in the Michigan Supreme Court, and raises squarely the legal issues decided in Easter 351 F2d 50 (D. C. Circ. 1966).

Two meetings with that state official led to attending a meeting of the Greater Lansing Council on Alcoholism who had made a rather recent and unsuccessful effort to establish a half-way house for post-hospitalized alcoholics. Commission staff was asked to another meeting held five days later because the Council's leadership had decided to shift its objective and to reach immediately for the creating of a civil detoxification and community referral center in Lansing. It would serve local needs; it could be a model for other Michigan communities; and it might be a locus of observation by the state legislature. Budget preparations are already underway and the promised assistance of a local medical unit has been secured . . . in the space of three months after Commission staff

first followed through on the vice chairman's suggestion.

Community interest in people who are embroiled in the wheels of criminal justice is high. Today, persons in positions of leadership may have unusual success in utilizing the opportunities at hand and thereby create new services of long range benefit and savings to all concerned.

Cooperating Effort with Michigan Youth Commission on Juvenile Court Improvements

Conversations in July 1967 between the staff directors of this Commission and the Michigan Youth Commission concerned the implications of the Gault decision for Michigan's juvenile courts. As a result, the two Commissions' chairmen immediately convened a meeting of 18 people who represented the professional interests directly affected by any call for improvements in the legal process and administration of juvenile courts.

The discussion centered on the need to evolve a set of juvenile "court rules," a means to provide legal representation to respondents, an adequate career service for probation staff, etc. The individual participants agreed to pursue this meeting's objective and to return in two months with researched statements for group response. One aim of this experience is to create a common posture with a united, limited set of priorities for the 1968 legislative session in this area.

Sponsorship of Statewide Conference and Related Public Appearances

The Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council recently invited the Commission's co-sponsorship of a statewide conference on crime control. It is to be held in January 1968, timed to the opening of the legislative session. Further conversations have led to broadening the co-sponsorship to include the major organizational leadership of the several public services who have continuous responsibility for

crime control (Sheriffs' Association, Prosecuting Attorneys' Association, State Association of County Supervisors, Circuit Judges' Association, Community Planning Councils and United Fund, etc.) Conferences of this type offer a forum for public response to a carefully designed program content and, in this instance, will call for the forming of consensus to select priorities for community action in crime control. A follow up "leadership meeting" is planned to develop implementation strategy on the chosen priorities.

— — — — —

A Governor's Conference on "The Citizen-Volunteer in Crime Prevention" was held in Lansing on November 10, 1966 for an audience of municipal court judges, city mayors' representatives and police chiefs. The planning and decisions had been made by a special committee of the State Human Resources Council in early 1966. When the Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration became a reality, the actual executing of the conference was made a first order of the new staff's business. The objective was to arouse interest in involving mature adult citizens in volunteer service to misdemeanor court probation programs, for assistance in parole programs, and as citizen "aides" in child protective-service committees. This was a "one-shot" exposure to the concepts and to illustrative local programs; there was no staff follow up, although there was some newspaper coverage to the speakers' statements.

— — — — —

The Commission's executive director has been a speaker to several large audiences during the year. These opportunities have been devoted to acquainting the public with the Commission, its interests, its committees' activity, the several problems it has faced, and the potential for its program in the coming

months. Each time the speech has asked agencies or individuals who desire to focus public attention on a specific problem in law enforcement to direct the Commission to that interest by appropriate reporting of their position or concern to Commission staff. In several instances, this approach has produced well formulated, helpful suggestions for Commission study.

— — — — —

During the course of the year, Commission staff, the chairman and vice chairman, and a few Commissioners attended out-of-state conferences concerned with planning for crime control. These were sessions which offered significant help to our Michigan effort. They included programs in Washington, D. C. sponsored by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, a "Juvenile Delinquency Conference" called by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and a Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

— — — — —

The Michigan Commission staff was instrumental in developing a meeting in Washington, D. C. on June 26-27, 1967 for staff of the several Governors' Planning Committees in Criminal Administration. This proved a mutually beneficial exchange of information, problems and perspective for the state commission staff, executive personnel of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, and representatives of the then terminating President's Commission. Detailed minutes of the conference were developed by the Michigan Commission's staff and circulated not only to those in attendance, but also to the entire membership of the Michigan Commission, with the hope that in so doing new dimensions for Commission operation might be perceived by our membership.

— — — — —

Commission chairman, John B. Martin, appeared for the Commission before Judicary Subcommittees of both the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, chaired by Senator John L. McClellen and Congressman Emanuel Celler. Mr. Martin expressed the Michigan Commission's judgment about general intent and certain proposed content of the then "Safe Streets Act" (now the "Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967").

The specific Michigan Commission recommendation on requiring state Governor review and comment to local government applications for federal funds was inserted to the "Safe Streets" proposal as it was reported by the Judiciary Committee to the floor under "H.R. 5037."

At these same committee hearings, as well as before Senator Long's special Judiciary Subcommittee, Mr. Martin testified on the Commission's conclusion that there is urgent need for a statute which authorizes judicial grant of wiretap and electronic surveillance warrants under carefully circumscribed rules in order to control organized crime and its related corruption of public officials.

— — — — —

Appointment of Ad Hoc Committee re Michigan's "One-Man Grand Jury"

In spite of the unique powers to investigate crime which are vested in Michigan's circuit judges upon the special application of prosecuting attorneys, recent "one-man grand jury" experiences show that their intensive one-year inquiry cannot adequately break the secret, entrenched machinery of organized crime and the interlocked web of corrupt public officers.

Even though the written record of one grand juror may now be passed to his successor, the required changeover in staff and judge causes a massive loss of: (1) unrecorded intelligence, (2) educated hunches and, (3) rapport with informers. Further, the changeover requires considerable time for the new judge and his

staff to learn that organized crime does actually exist, to sense its impact, to understand its terminology and method, and to develop an expertise in making the choices which produce real evidence.

The Ad Hoc Committee, appointed for the limited purpose of analyzing the problems and suggesting solutions, is two members of each standing committee, the Commision chairman and vice chairman, and three other Commissioners of special competence.

Several alternates are being presented toward improving the people's capability for policing organized crime and official corruption. The "one man" judicial investigation statute could be perfected in light of both recent caselaw and the recognized inaccessibility of syndicate chieftains to short investigative effort. Or a plan could develop for the creation of a specialized police unit appropriately located in the government structure with permanent staff, continuous protected life, and authorization (1) to obtain the subpoenaed presence of witnesses and (2) to compel testimony under grant of immunity from prosecution.

In very recent weeks, through interviews with knowledgable persons, staff has and will continue to gather impressions of the problems and solutions in this area, and organize this material for committee consideration. It is hoped that with very few committee meetings, a set of recommendations will be ready for the Commission's review and adoption at its December 1967 meeting.

CLIMATE IN MICHIGAN FOR CRIME CONTROL PLANNING AS THE SECOND YEAR OF COMMISSION EFFORT BEGINS

This report could cite a long list of unhappy events in the last eleven months which should have evoked a deep public concern for the amount of crime and the people's capability to control it. Indicators of such statewide concern

include mail to the Governor, "letters to the editor" in newspapers, establishment of state legislative special committees to investigate crime, and birth of local community crime control groups. Hopefully, there is heightened interest in and expectation for state level planning in Michigan against crime and for law and order.

This should be true, even without reference to the several climate-setting facts set forth below. The following list, certainly not all-inclusive nor ordered by importance, ought to provide even more impetus in the coming year to planning effort that is rational, coordinated and comprehensive:

--Not the least factor that improves the climate for crime control planning has been the publication of The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

This cover report and its supplementive series of "Task Force Reports" have provided valuable authority for local leaders who have for many years spoken to the issues of improving law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice, but without having the supporting evidence of widely respected origin. Indeed, the quality of The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, and the response to it have been such to make it necessary that local "crime commissions" resist the tendency to treat the President's Commission reports as "having done all the thinking necessary."

--Staff at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University's School of Police Administration provided the research and analysis for substantial elements of several President's Commission "Task Force Reports." Consequently, we have available to state planning effort, "experts" in several facets of law enforcement whose perspective is both

local and nationwide.

In addition, researchers at the several colleges and universities, and in public or private agencies and foundations have, at earlier times, demonstrated their capacities for meaningful study. The Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration should call upon them to assist in its work. The Commission should prompt local government units to utilize these people independently as well.

Detroit's police department and its Recorder's Court were studied by the President's Commission. The responses of these Detroit institutions to the Task Force commentary are part of the climate for change there and elsewhere in the state.

--Crime statistics have received frequent display. They tell that our traditions of freedom from personal attack and protection of private property are being violated at an alarming rate. While these statistics speak a serious increase in crime, they need to be seen in the context of: (1) improvements in the methods of compiling crime statistics during very recent years, (2) greatly increased citizen reporting of crimes to the police, especially by minority group citizens, so that the wraps are coming off much "unreported crime" and, (3) the tremendous surge in our youth age population which tends itself to a greater crime rate.

--The actions of the two "one-man grand juries," both just concluded, show that extensive inquiry into organized crime and corruption of public officers cannot occur within one year, nor can indictments which issue during that period do more than scratch the outer layers of these conspiracies. The public's interest in creating an efficient pursuit of

evidence against crimes of this origin can lead to designs to improve policing. The actual removal of organized crime from our communities involves even larger issues.

—Governor Romney has called a special session of the legislature for October to act on lower court reorganization. This is a most noteworthy opportunity to build into our total system of justice, at the level where most citizens receive their only direct experience with courts, an efficient, effective administration of the judicial process. In this respect, a well designed court reorganization can have dimensions for the public betterment that will be profound.

—The Governor's agenda for the legislature's special session calls for the statutory transfer of several staffs presently engaged in state resources planning into a central planning agency to be located in the Executive Office, and to be named the "Office of Planning Coordination." Within such an executive unit, a staff of planners would assist the several state departments describe, define and translate their information into designs for administrative and legislative action that integrate the resources of the individual departments to the general state objectives. Comprehensive planning which aims to enhance law enforcement and the administration of justice may conceivably be made part of this planning effort.

—The law set out by the United States Supreme Court on May 15, 1967, In The Matter of Gault[5] was declared by many Michigan juvenile judges to restate the operating practices of this state's juvenile courts for at

[5] 387 U.S. 1

least the last twenty years. Their state association said the same[6]. With further consideration, however, many judges, court personnel and related social agency staff recognize that the Gault decision has implications for the role and practices of the juvenile court far beyond the specific expressions of Justice Fortas.

As a result, the marshalling of professional interest has begun anew to examine: the legitimacy of the "parens patriae" concept; the need to isolate issues of adjudication from matters of disposition; the establishment of "juvenile court rules;" separation of management of administrative services for delinquent children from those for neglected children; and, of great importance, means to assure a large corps of trained, competent court workers to provide the needed services to children and parents. —— Public recognition of the recent, significant increase in the proportion of children to the total population may dramatize the need for effective court services, and for crime prevention programs even more.

--Michigan's citizenry is well aware that the public treasury has been overstrained to meet program requests of school administrators. As of August 31, 1967, forty Michigan school districts did not have their teachers under contract and were facing refusals by teacher associations to commence the school year on schedule. An imaginative approach that relates crime prevention planning to educational programming might hold the key to long-run human and financial savings. The establishment of a continuous rapport between the traditional "crime fighters" and educators should be attempted.

--Real interest in the activities of the Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration by police command officers across the

[6]"Resolution," June 24, 1967, adopted unanimously at the annual meeting of Michigan Probate and Juvenile Judges' Association.

entire state has been generated by the introductory announcements and actual receipt of the 1967 Michigan Law Enforcement Inventory of Local Law Enforcement. It is reasonable to expect that police commanders, having completed the questionnaire, will look forward to the publication of results.

The introductory inquiry, mailed to 2,074 local officials, brought a 93% response. The "1967 Inventory" has been sent to 763 police commands; and the research team has committed time to assure an even greater percentage of response.—The descriptive analysis which is to follow should be invaluable both to all public officials who have responsibility for planning police activity, and to citizens who wish to understand problems of the allocation of police resources.

--The July riot in Detroit's inner city is mentioned at this juncture because it has compelled massive local concern about a wide array of interlaced urban social problems. Crime is one such problem; or more accurately, perhaps, it should be viewed as a symptom.

The facts of this Detroit riot defy many traditional notions about "race riots." If the community perceives that it has not understood the forces of life in the ghetto and grapples to gain that understanding, so it may recognize the same need to scrap pat explanations for crime, especially that crime which occurs in ghetto life.

CONCLUDING COMMENT FOR NEXT COMMISSION EFFORT

One year of Commission activity is about to end. It has been the intention of every effort to hold as the central frame of reference the total process of crime control, which has meant bridging the gaps that exist between the different

functions. As the Commission continues in this vein, forward momentum will increase with the several units' successful experience in contributing to the process as a whole. Clearly, agencies in the crime control spectrum can be expected to do the best job possible only when their functions are exercised in an atmosphere of cooperation and understanding which is mutually shared. Such rapport about purpose and in action is difficult to achieve. The Commission will work to stimulate any discourse which has that end as its objective.

Broadly speaking, the development of our present institutions of crime control is the story of individual changes in substantive and procedural aspects of law enforcement and justice. Far more often than not, these changes have occurred in isolation rather than as a part of a comprehensive approach which developed from inter-agency planning. There needs to be a firm belief that improvements across the law enforcement spectrum will strengthen the individual institutions and simultaneously will build the integrity of the whole system, just as fine fitting of the spokes assures the balance of the wheel.

From the accumulation of Commission experiences to this time, we recognize there is need to maximize the individual contributions of Commission membership by adequate staff assistance. (It appears that most committee meeting content must be developed from staff-prepared materials.) The expansion of staff is necessary because greater technical assistance should be available for committee meetings and existing resources throughout the state should be made more readily available to the committees and their utilization tailored to the operating conditions of the respective committees.

The function of Commission membership at meetings will continue to be the engagement in careful scrutinizing and testing of ideas posed by themselves or by staff, and then the development of consensus which will be expressed by an

adopted position. There is no present plan that the final product is to be only a written report, which might go on a book shelf for perpetual storage. Rather the Commissioners and the resource people who become part of this effort are themselves workers for change as they reach out into their communities. Not all action occurs through legislation; indeed, most happens in other ways. The Commission should stimulate and depend upon others for the implementation of its planning effort.

To go forward in planning, the Commission should now do whatever is necessary to develop inventories of present and projected state and local resources in all facets of crime control. The participation of those agencies who have functional responsibilities should be committed to this purpose. It is the staff's responsibility to engage the appropriate persons and to offer continuous assistance in the process.

As soon as descriptive data becomes available, the Commission should immediately mobilize analyses by its members and others of the problems and objectives in existing programs. With the long-range broad goals of law enforcement and administration of justice clearly in mind, the unmet needs of the particular agencies should be determined. As many of the needs of the several elements of the spectrum should be identified as soon as possible and simultaneously; though not all problems are equally susceptible to simultaneous analysis. Once armed with this knowledge, a system of priorities should be established.

The Commission and the several agencies should apply themselves to specific problems with adequate follow through. Constructive stimulation of others must be a conscious part of the process. It would appear wise to select at the outset, several problems that would submit to solution readily. Success builds upon success.

———— 0 ————

Governor Romney's Address to the Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency, and Criminal Administration

September 15, 1966

I am glad to be here today to talk with you on the occasion of this first meeting of Michigan's new Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Administration of Criminal Justice. I use the full title of what may become known simply as the "Crime Commission" in order to indicate the broad scope of its responsibility. It is that responsibility or "mission" that I want to discuss with you today.

During the past year we have made progress in our attack on crime and juvenile delinquency but we are not moving fast enough. The rate of crime is steadily increasing both nationally and in the State of Michigan. Crime in 1966 is running 6% ahead of 1965. Forcible rape is up 14%; grand larceny up 11%; aggravated assault up 9% and murder, robbery and burglary up 4%. Organized crime exists in Michigan as in every other major population center in the country. I have a vital concern that we leave no stone unturned to stamp out rackets in gambling, drugs, prostitution and extortion wherever and whenever we find them. We must, therefore, greatly expand our efforts (1) to prevent crime wherever possible, (2) to apprehend promptly where crime is committed, (3) to dispose expeditiously of cases brought before our courts with due regard both for the rights of the accused and the rights of the public, and (4) finally, after conviction we must so deal with the offender as to insure, if possible, that he will not repeat his offense.

In the past year I am glad to report that in cooperation with the prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan, the Michigan Sheriffs Association, the Michigan Chiefs of Police Association, the Michigan State Police and the Division of Crime and Delinquency of the Human Resources Council which was

the predecessor of this Crime Commission, the legislature has passed and I have approved new laws which:

(1) Revise our search warrant procedures to accord with Federal practice;

(2) Provide for the development of a state-wide computer system for police information purposes;

(3) Create a statutory crime of conspiracy with penalties which should be of material help in combatting organized crime;

(4) Provide necessary penalties for fleeing from and for assaults upon police officers; and

(5) Provide a procedure for handling youthful offenders in the manner best designed to promote rehabilitation and stop the drift toward habitual crime.

This is progress but it is only a beginning. We need to take a far closer and more comprehensive look at our crime and delinquency picture than we have ever done before to determine whether we are using the best known methods of prevention, apprehension, trial and correctional treatment. That is the reason why I have appointed you as members of this commission. In doing so I have sought to place on the Commission only men and women who through their work or general interest have a commitment to do something effective about this most serious problem and who have indicated a willingness to devote time and energy to its solution. All of you are busy persons. I assume that your acceptance of this appointment is at a sacrifice of time and strength which could be used in other ways. I am grateful to you but I believe we have a common aim which makes this effort worth undertaking.

I expect that you will engage in more than routine thinking. I want you to apply your imagination to the best array of facts we can gather. The basic facts on the impact of crime in Michigan are essential and I will give you every possible assistance to get them.

In the area of police and public safety, I want you to examine the means for recruiting and upgrading state and local police forces through better pay, better training, the use of cadet and in-service training, and other means contemplated by the Law Enforcement Officers Training Act of 1965. I would like to have you consider the need for providing the Attorney General and Prosecuting Attorneys with subpoena power under judicial order and for providing for grants of immunity for necessary witnesses also under judicial order. Possibilities for more extensive use of scientific equipment and for improved internal law enforcement organization should have your attention. Other matters to which you may wish to give priority include the possible need for a Center for Law Enforcement Research and Planning, and methods by which we can enlist greater citizen aid in apprehending criminal offenders. The field of police-community relations ought to be the subject of your study and recommendation. In general, I would hope that we would have your thinking on the steps most needed to make an effective police force capable of full cooperation with the Federal authorities, the Attorney General and the Prosecutor's office in each county.

In reviewing your preliminary plans of organization, it appears to me that it may be well to place in a separate category and under a separate committee the field of organized crime. In this connection I would welcome

your views on the need for legislation dealing with the crime of wire-tapping under adequate judicial control. In many crimes but particularly in organized crime the use of telephonic communication is essential and without proper authority to intercept such communications police agencies are helpless to combat such activity.

I would like to see a thorough analysis made of our whole system of criminal justice, its strengths and its weaknesses. Such study ought to examine the various alternatives for improving the efficiency of our courts to the end that criminal matters may be brought to conclusion by prompt and fair trial before needed evidence and testimony has disappeared. Ways and means of providing more willing and competent jurors should be looked into and the use of improved court techniques of fact finding. The whole field of sentencing, bearing directly as it does on treatment and rehabilitation, is worth careful scrutiny. I would welcome your views on the question of whether we should provide compensation for the victims of violent crime and, if so, on what basis. We ought also to know your thinking on the matter of a "Good Samaritan" law to provide compensation to persons injured while trying to prevent crime or, if killed in the attempt, to their survivors. Juvenile court procedure and practice needs study to determine whether the present system, or some modification of that system, by use of a family court or otherwise, will produce the best possible results in court handling of juvenile delinquents.

Where there has been a determination of guilt, we have the problem of handling the offender in such a way as to reduce, so far as possible, the chance of his repeating his acts. Essentially, the problem here is to differentiate between types of offenders and crimes - to be selective in

treatment. The dangerous offender, prone to commit crimes of violence, sexual and otherwise, and the deliberate practitioner of organized crime whose studied contempt for the law is clear, require imprisonment on a different and more permanent basis than the nonviolent or occasional offender who may be reformed and rehabilitated. The alcoholic and mentally defective are special problems requiring special treatment. The whole field of probation and parole, where this is done under adequate supervision by trained and skilled personnel and after careful case study, has proved its effectiveness in many situations. I would welcome your examination of our correction, probation and parole system and your advice as to whether we are doing all that we ought to be doing to make our actions after conviction of maximum value in safeguarding society, and, where possible, rehabilitating the offender.

I should add that citizen action in all these areas has to my mind most significant possibilities. I would urge your consideration of the protective services of the Oakland County Probate Court and the use now made of citizens in the Probation Department of the Royal Oak Municipal Court. Steps which might lead to the extension of such service deserve your close study.

This Commission of which you are a part can have maximum impact on the lives of our citizens. I am determined that each of them shall be able to walk our streets without fear and to go about their duties in peace. I ask your help to this end and commend you to your work.

Appendix Item B

C
O
P
Y

STATE OF MICHIGAN

Executive Office * Lansing

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 1966-7

Establishment of Michigan Commission on
Crime, Delinquency, and Criminal Administration

WHEREAS, the incidence of major crime has shown a marked increase throughout the country; and

WHEREAS, much of the major crime is committed by offenders under the age of 21; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to strengthen and make more effective the work of the law enforcement agencies, and

WHEREAS, it appears that improvements can also be made in the administration of justice and the treatment of those convicted of violating the law to the end that they may be rehabilitated and may not repeat their offenses;

THEREFORE, I, GEORGE ROMNEY, Governor of the State of Michigan, pursuant to the authority of Act 195 of the Public Acts of 1951, order the establishment of a Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration to be located in the Executive Office of the Governor.

The Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration shall have the following functions:

1. To bring together those persons most familiar with problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including the disposition and treatment of persons convicted of crime, for the purpose of studying and encouraging the adoption of methods by which law enforcement can be made more effective and justice administered more efficiently and fairly.

2. To stimulate, promote, and organize citizen participation in the improvement and extension of law enforcement, the work of the courts, and the correction and rehabilitation processes.

3. To recommend improvements which need to be made in the recruitment and training of law enforcement officers and other law enforcement personnel.

4. To recommend methods by which cooperation between local, state and federal law enforcement officials may be furthered.

5. To identify noteworthy practices which have been developed in the State in the fields of police, court and correctional management.

6. To isolate pressing problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice in the State which have so far resisted solution.

7. To inventory the needs in financial, procedural and personal terms which may appear to be beyond the capacity of the State to satisfy.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

Executive Office * Lansing

8. To help in evaluation of proposals for improvement in crime prevention, detection, conviction and treatment which may be submitted for review by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

9. To assist in planning coordinated programs in the State in areas of the police, the courts and corrections.

10. To encourage public understanding of the responsibilities and problems of law officers and law enforcement agancies and the development of greater public support for their efforts.

11. To aid in publicizing and promoting those practices in the treatment of criminal offenders which will do most to prevent a return to criminal activity.

12. To recommend such improvements in bail requirements, court procedures, sentencing practices and treatment after conviction as will foster a sense of social justice and fairness in the application of the law.

The Michigan Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Criminal Administration shall consist of such professional and lay persons appointed by the Governor as may have a vital concern with Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

The Governor will appoint the chairman and a vice-chairman from the membership of the Commission.

Such committees and sub-committees of the Commission, special or standing, may be appointed by the Chairman as may be necessary to meet the responsibilities of the Commission herein provided.

The Commission shall operate with such staff as is made available from the office of the Governor under appropriations made to that office for this purpose and such additional funds as may be made available on a matching grant basis from the Federal government.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Michigan this 14th day of July in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Six.

(SEAL)

s/ George Romney

GOVERNOR

BY THE GOVERNOR:

s/ James M. Hare

SECRETARY OF STATE

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

STATE OF MICHIGAN
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
STATE HUMAN RESOURCES COUNCIL
MICHIGAN COMMISSION ON CRIME, DELINQUENCY, AND CRIMINAL ADMINISTRATION

PROPOSED STRUCTURE AND PLAN OF OPERATIONS

Membership

The Special Commission will comprise approximately forty-five (45) persons drawn from professional backgrounds in the courts, law, law enforcement, corrections and distinguished citizens in business, industry, labor, agriculture, education, and religion.

Structure

The Special Commission will establish four basic committees corresponding to the focus in the National Crime Commission, i.e., the impact of crime on society; improving the police function; raising the quality of courts; and the corrections, probation and parole field. Such other task forces as may be needed will be appointed from time to time. The committees will be composed of members of the Special Commission and will utilize consultants to expand the reach of its knowledge, experience, and competence. The Special Commission will be related to the State Human Resources Council and the Office of the Governor and will receive further assistance from these bodies and their staffs.

Function

1. To bring together those persons most familiar with problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including the disposition and treatment of persons convicted of crime, for the purpose of studying and encouraging the adoption of methods by which law enforcement can be made more effective and justice administered more efficiently and fairly.

2. To recommend improvements which need to be made in the recruitment and training of law enforcement officers and other law enforcement personnel.

3. To recommend methods by which cooperation between local, state and federal law enforcement officials may be furthered.

4. To identify noteworthy practices which have been developed in the State in the fields of police, court and correctional management.

5. To isolate pressing problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice in the State which have so far resisted solution.

6. To inventory the needs in financial, procedural or personal terms which may appear to be beyond the capacity of the State to satisfy.

7. To help in evaluation of proposals for improvement in crime prevention, detection, conviction and treatment which may be submitted for review by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

8. To assist in planning coordinated programs in the State in areas of the police, the courts and corrections.

9. To encourage public understanding of the responsibilities and problems of law officers and law enforcement agencies and the development of greater public support for their efforts.

10. To aid in publicizing and promoting those practices in the treatment of criminal offenders which will do most to prevent a return to criminal activity.

11. To encourage respect for and assistance to law enforcement authorities by members of the public.

12. To recommend such improvements in bail requirements, court procedures, sentencing practices and treatment after conviction as will foster a sense of social justice and fairness in the application of the law.

Program Areas

A. Impact of Crime on Michigan Society

1. Amount and nature of crime in Michigan.
2. Detailed portrait of offenders, victims, offenses, and the circumstances of crime in selected areas of State.
3. Determining degree and scale of unreported crimes.
4. Further development of comprehensive system of collecting and recording crime statistics.
5. Estimating cost of crime to Michigan.
6. Evaluating state of knowledge about causes of crime.
   a. Insights of psychiatry, psychology and medicine.
   b. Variations in different sectors of the population.
   c. Factors stimulating crime careers.
   d. Characteristics of criminal victims and relation to offender.
   e. Behavior of citizen witnesses to crimes.

B. Police and Public Safety
   1. What is the proper role of the policeman today and 20 years ahead?
      a. Should police restrict role to fighting crime?
      b. How much discretion should police have?
      c. The policeman's relation to the general public.

   2. Personnel Issues
      a. Present methods of recruiting, selecting, and training men officers.
      b. Methods to improve quality of police forces.
         1) Pre-recruit training
         2) Cadet schools and colleges of police services
         3) In-service training
         4) New criteria for selection of officers

      c. Present levels of salaries and unpaid personnel
         1) Roles of federal, state and local governments in financing training, salaries, and other expenses

   3. Police organization and management
      a. Use of available studies to develop redesigned organizational structures for police departments.
      b. Relationship of state and local police forces in coordination and program development.
      c. Single law enforcement office combining functions of both police and district attorney.
      d. Improved police field procedures.
      e. Central services: communications, record keeping, crime laboratories, and detention facilities.
      f. Police-community relations.
         1) Present situation
         2) Possible techniques and programs to reduce conflict between police and public
      g. Special projects to reduce opportunities for committing crime.
      h. Long range research needs.

C. Administration of Criminal Justice

   1. Analyze existing system of criminal justice in courts, prosecutor's office, and defense bar.
   2. Operation of lower criminal courts.
      a. Disposal of cases without trial process.
      b. Alternative methods of treating or rehabilitating offenders.
   3. Methods of control and review of police and prosecutional conduct.
   4. Improving efficiency of courts.
      a. Timetables for handling and disposition of particular kinds of criminal cases.
      b. Endorsed use of computor and business machine techniques in scheduling and managing the court's business.
      c. Reform of the organization and administration of courts and judicial selections and tenure.
      d. Training and qualifications of prosecutors and defense counsel.
      e. Improving fact-finding ability of courts.
   5. Sentencing.
   6. Juvenile courts.

7. Bail and detention.
8. Mental incompetency
9. Methods of improving fact-finding ability of courts.

D. Corrections

1. Development of specialized methods of treating different types of offenders.
   a. Female offender as less serious threat to the public - need for shorter incarcerations.
   b. Separate treatment for the youthful offender.
   c. Corrections phase for misdemeanants.
   d. Diagnosis, treating and controlling violent offender.
   e. Treatment of alcoholic, mentally defective, and dangerous mentally ill offenders.
   f. Rehabilitation of offenders brought up in urban slums.
   g. Impact of intermingling of non-delinquent and highly delinquent youth in same correction facilities.

2. Rehabilitative programs.
   a. School-correctional institution relations.
   b. Preparations for discharge of prison inmates with inmate and community to which he returns.
   c. Utilization of volunteers and private welfare agencies.
   d. Legal and other rights of offenders.

END