

Archival Notice

This is an archive page that is no longer being updated. It may contain outdated information and links may no longer function as originally intended.

REPORT
ON THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
COMMITTEE OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS
OF
CHIEFS OF POLICE
EXECUTIVE TRAINING SESSION

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

CONDUCTED AT

FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

JULY 23, 24, AND 25, 1974

READING ROOM

25181

D47

LOAW

REPORT
ON THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
COMMITTEE OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS
OF
CHIEFS OF POLICE

EXECUTIVE TRAINING SESSION

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

CONDUCTED AT

FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

JULY 23, 24, AND 25, 1974

This Police Executive Training Session was made possible, through Grant Number 74 TA-99-0011, from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The authors of this report are the membership of the IACP Committee of State Associations of Chiefs of Police, and any recommendations, conclusions or opinions expressed herein are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

BACKGROUND

The International Association of Chiefs of Police Committee of State Associations of Chiefs of Police attained full standing committee status in 1973.

Committee membership consists of the current President of each state association of chiefs of police.

The purpose and goals of the Committee, as outlined in its official Bylaws, are as follows:

"This Committee shall serve as a coordinating body between the several and separate State Associations of Chiefs of Police and the membership of the Association not holding membership in such separate State Associations. It shall be the responsibility of the Committee, through its appointed officers, to disseminate the views and needs of the membership of the several State Associations to balance the Association membership in such matters as: suppression of crime; police equipment; highway safety management; communications systems; training; and other such matters as may become apparent and necessary from time to time. "

Once having attained full standing committee status, the committee leadership proceeded to explore ways and means by which benefits, through the committee, could accrue not only to the membership of the committee, but to the entire membership of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, numbering well over 10,000.

Several alternatives were explored, but the one area receiving the lion's share of support from the committee leadership and the committee membership was a suggestion to explore the feasibility of implementing police standards and goals contained in the publication Police, produced by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

In response to this priority, IACP staff prepared and submitted a proposal to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, requesting the necessary

funds to conduct a police executive training session on the subject at Fargo, North Dakota.

The proposal was subsequently approved, and a three-day executive training session was scheduled for July 23, 24, and 25, 1974.

ATTENDEES

In addition to the Committee Officers, comprised of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Second Vice-Chairman and Secretary (IACP Staff), attendees included the Advisory Subcommittee (all past Committee Chairmen), one Sergeant-at-Arms, and forty-eight (48) State Association Presidents or their designated alternates. Several guest speakers were also in attendance.

LIST OF ATTENDEES

OFFICERS

Chairman:

Chief Edwin R. Anderson
Fargo, North Dakota

First Vice-Chairman:

Chief Robert G. Woods
Moraine City, Ohio

Second Vice-Chairman:

Chief Bruce E. Parsons
Cocoa Beach, Florida

Secretary and IACP Liaison:

Frank D. Roberson
Management Consultant
Highway Safety Division
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Advisory Subcommittee:

Chief Ramon M. Nardini
Vandalia, Ohio

Chief Roy Kelch
Logan, Ohio

Chief Ray Mass
Shrewsbury, New Jersey

Sergeant-at-Arms:

Chief Willie Bauer
Beaumont, Texas

Guests and Speakers:

President Francis B. Looney
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Deputy Commissioner
New York City Police Department

Mr. Quinn Tamm
Executive Director
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Chief Edward M. Davis
Los Angeles Police Department

Mr. Irving Slott
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Robert Macfarlane
Research Division
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Mr. Sam Laudenslager
American Bar Association
Washington, D. C.

Guests and Speakers (continued)

Mr. Preston Horstman
Executive Director
National Association of State Director
of Law Enforcement Training
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Dr. Charles Smith
Director
Project STAR
Marina Del Ray, California

Delegates:

Alabama

Chief J. H. Gant
Jasper, Alabama

Alaska

Chief Gary K. Eilers
Palmer, Alaska

Arizona

Chief Ronald Borane
Douglas, Arizona

Arkansas

Chief James Hanley
Jonesboro, Arkansas

California

Chief Jay D. Stroh
Inglewood, California

Colorado

Chief Marion Hobson
Littleton, Colorado

Delegates (Continued)

Connecticut

Chief Joseph Pascarella
East Haven, Connecticut

Delaware

Chief William Brierley
Newark, Delaware

Florida

Chief William Barnes
West Palm Beach, Florida

Georgia

Chief John Crunkleton
Gwinett County Police Department
Lawrenceville, Georgia

Hawaii

Inspector George Iranon
Hawaii County Police Department
Hilo, Hawaii

Idaho

Chief John R. Church
Boise, Idaho

Illinois

Chief Wilbur E. Reichert
Oak Park, Illinois

Indiana

Chief Jack R. Clements
Crawfordsville, Indiana

Delegates (continued)

Iowa

Chief Wendell E. Nichols
Des Moines, Iowa

Kansas

Chief G. A. Yonally
Roeland Park Police Department
Shawnee Mission, Kansas

Kentucky

Deputy Chief John W. Hiten
Lexington, Kentucky

Louisiana

Chief Charles P. Bourque
Gonzales, Louisiana

Maine

Chief Sherman C. Bonney, Jr.
Kennebunkport, Maine

Maryland

Delegate Not Able to Attend

Massachusetts

Chief Joseph R. Connell
Westford, Massachusetts

Michigan

Chief Robert Anderson
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Delegates (continued)

Southeastern Michigan

Chief Maurice D. Foltz
Sterling Heights, Michigan

Minnesota

Chief Daryl Plath
Hastings, Minnesota

Mississippi

Chief Toby Wood
Belzoni, Mississippi

Missouri

Chief Bradford E. Epperson
Rock Hill, Missouri

Montana

Chief Ken Losett
Miles City, Montana

Nebraska

Chief Lawrence B. Fagot
Lexington, Nebraska

New Hampshire

Chief Kent Williams
Milford, New Hampshire

Nevada

Chief James L. Parker
Reno, Nevada

Delegates (continued)

New Jersey

Chief Walter C. Witt
Wall Township, New Jersey

New Mexico

Chief Felix Lujan
Santa Fe, New Mexico

New York

Chief Walter F. Ruckgaber
Lake Success Police Department
Great Neck, New York

North Carolina

Delegate Unable to Attend

North Dakota

Chief Gerald D. Barnhart
Dickinson, North Dakota

Ohio

Chief Peter K. Gramkow
Marietta, Ohio

Oklahoma

Mr. O.K. Bivins
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Oregon

Chief Donald L. Newell
Beaverton, Oregon

Delegates (continued)

Pennsylvania

Chief S. Clarence Johnston (Retired)
Cheltenham Township Police Department
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Rhode Island

Chief Thomas J. O'Connor
Cumberland, Rhode Island

South Carolina

Chief Floyd P. Foss
Fort Mill, South Carolina

South Dakota

Chief James Simms
Yankton, South Dakota

Tennessee

Chief Harry Hammontree
Alcoa, Tennessee

Texas

Chief W.H. McGee
Texarkana, Texas

Utah

Chief Wayne D. Shepherd
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Vermont

Chief George J. Ellwood
Shelburne, Vermont

Delegates (continued)

Virginia

Chief A. E. Rhodenizer
Lexington, Virginia

Washington

Chief James R. Land
Lacey, Washington

West Virginia

Chief Thomas C. Durrett
Beckley, West Virginia

Wisconsin

Chief Frank J. Riemer
Germantown, Wisconsin

Wyoming

Chief Richard W. Hays
Jackson, Wyoming

Special Guests:

Canada

Chief Michael W. Solomon
Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada

Chief David A. McNamee
Brandon, Manitoba, Canada

- 11 -

MID-YEAR MEETING

AND

EXECUTIVE TRAINING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

OF THE

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.

AT THE

BILTMORE MOTOR HOTEL

FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

JULY 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1974

GENERAL INFORMATION

This Mid-Year Committee Meeting and Executive Training Session has become possible through provisions of a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc. (IACP), and the IACP Committee of State Associations of Chiefs of Police are grateful to LEAA for recognizing the need for this training session and for providing the means to conduct it.

The central theme of this executive training session is to study the feasibility of implementing goals and standards contained within the covers of the publication, POLICE, recently released by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

An examination of the agenda will reveal that we have assembled nationally-recognized experts to talk to you on the subject at hand. You will also note that smaller group sessions and group presentations are to be conducted. We feel certain that, by Thursday afternoon, you will all have agreed on at least two things: first, that this will have been one of the more informative sessions you have ever attended; and second, that it has been a "working session" in every sense of the word.

COMMITTEE OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

OFFICERS:

Committee Chairman (and your Host)
Edwin R. Anderson
Chief of Police
Fargo, North Dakota

First Vice Chairman
Robert G. Woods
Chief of Police
Moraine City, Ohio

Second Vice Chairman
Bruce E. Parsons
Chief of Police
Cocoa Beach, Florida

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS:

Francis B. Looney
President
International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

Quinn Tamm
Executive Director
International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

IACP STAFF:

Committee Secretary and Staff Liaison
Frank D. Roberson
Management Consultant
Highway Safety Division
International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

AGENDA

MID-YEAR EXECUTIVE TRAINING SESSION
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE
COMMITTEE OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF CHIEFS OF POLICE
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA
JULY 22, 23, 24 and 25, 1974

Monday, July 22, 1974

5:00 p. m. - 7:00 p. m.

Registration of Attendees
Issuance of Training Session Materials
Get-Acquainted Hour

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

8:00 a. m.

Opening Comments:
Chairman Edwin R. Anderson
Introduction of Distinguished Guests

8:45 a. m.

Coffee Break

9:00 a. m.

Keynote Address:
"An Overview of Police Standards"
Chief Edward M. Davis
Los Angeles Police Department

(Chief Davis served as Chairman
of the Task Force on Police of the
National Advisory Commission on
Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

10:00 a. m.

Address:

"Police Standards and NASDLET"
Mr. Preston Horstman

(Mr. Horstman serves as Executive Director of the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training - NASDLET)

11:00 a. m.

Address:

"Police Standards and Project STAR"
Dr. Charles Smith

(Dr. Smith serves as Director of Project STAR)

12:00 Noon

Lunch

1:00 p. m.

Address:

"A Comparison of the National Advisory Commission Standards and the American Bar Association Standards"

Mr. Robert Macfarlane
Mr. Sam Laudenslager

(Mr. Macfarlane is a Research Associate with the Legal Research Section of the IACP Research Division)

(Mr. Laudenslager is Associate ABA Project Director for implementation of standards relating to the urban police function)

Tuesday, July 23, 1974

2:00 p. m.

Questions and Answers:

Panel Members

Chief Davis

Mr. Horstman

Dr. Smith

Mr. Macfarlane

Mr. Laudenslager

*Other Distinguished Guests

4:00 p. m.

Assignment of Group Projects

5:00 p. m.

Committee Business

Wednesday, July 24, 1974

8:00 a. m.

Group Workshops in Session

12:00 Noon

Lunch

1:00 p. m.

Group Report Number 1

2:00 p. m.

Group Report Number 2

3:00 p. m.

Group Report Number 3

5:00 p. m.

Committee Business

7:00 p. m.

Banquet

Address by Mr. Quinn Tamm,
Executive Director, International
Association of Chiefs of Police

Thursday, July 25, 1974

8:00 a. m.

Group Report Number 4

9:00 a. m.

Group Report Number 5

10:00 a. m.

Coffee Break

*We sincerely hope that, in spite of their busy schedules, President Francis B. Looney, Executive Director Quinn Tamm, and LEAA Deputy Administrator Charles R. Work will be able to sit on the panel.

Thursday, July 25, 1974 (Continued)

10:20 a. m.	Committee Business
12:00 Noon	Lunch
1:00 p. m.	Committee Business
2:30 p. m.	Closing Comments
3:00 p. m.	Adjournment

PROCEEDINGS

The Executive Training Session was called to order the morning of July 23, 1974, at 8:00 AM by Chairman Edwin R. Anderson, Chief of Police of Fargo, North Dakota.

Chairman Anderson made official note that, in addition to the presence of Committee Officers, Past Committee Chairman and distinguished guests, delegates were in attendance from 48 of our 50 states.

Brief welcoming addresses were presented by the following distinguished guests.

Mr. Allen Olson
Attorney General
State of North Dakota

Mr. Richard Hentges
Mayor
City of Fargo, North Dakota

Mr. Roy C. Pedersen
Police Commissioner
City of Fargo, North Dakota

A telegram was read from the Honorable Mark Andrews, Congressman for the State of North Dakota.

"Welcome to North Dakota. I was pleased to have an opportunity to be involved in making this meeting possible, and I look forward to working with you and my own Chief Anderson in helping to make the law enforcement program responsive to the needs of all our cities. You represent the first line of defense against the growth of crime in our country, and you deserve the whole hearted support of the Congress of the United States. "

signed
Mark Andrews
Congressman
State of North Dakota.

Chairman Anderson then introduced Mr. Irving Slott, of the United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Mr. Slott's remarks are included herein.

MR. IRVING SLOTT

Honored guests, friends, it is always a pleasure to talk to police chiefs. In several years of working in a variety of areas of criminal justice, working with prosecutors, judges, and with police, and with other parts of the criminal justice system, I have found that the ones who have the best grasp of what the problems are, what their needs are, and who have positive programs to do something about it, are the chiefs of police.

In the beginning years of LEAA, much more funds went to police than to any other part of criminal justice. This was because, when the first state, regional and city planning units sat down with criminal justice leaders in the community, the only ones who knew what they needed were the police. Perhaps it was also because police needs had been ignored to some degree in many communities previously, and they therefore needed more. I'm sure that each one of you could still make a list right now of what you could do with additional funds. Well, that simply was not true of the other areas of criminal justice, and I think we all appreciate the need for improvement with prosecution, courts, and corrections.

I will be answering questions later, and I'll be happy to meet with you at any time to discuss questions you may have about LEAA. But first, I would like to mention two of the new programs at LEAA that we consider important, and which I hope you will also consider important. First, there is the program to encourage the development of standards and goals, in every state. I speak of the development of standards and goals rather than the installation of standards and goals, because we're asking you to select the standards that you believe are best for your needs. In fact, because Congress has mandated it, required it of us, we're requiring that each state, as a part of its annual plan, show us that it intends to develop standards and goals for criminal justice. However, LEAA is not telling you what standards to select. We shall assist the states in their development to the extent that they want assistance, and we're offering the states all types of material that we believe might be useful to consider. For instance, the excellent report of the Police Task Force of the National Advisory Commission on Standards and Goals, which was headed up by Chief Ed Davis, is an excellent example of the type

of material we're providing for your consideration. However, much of the job is yours, and since you gentlemen are the leaders of the police in each of your states, I would hope that you are taking a major role today in that development.

The second new thrust in the LEAA program is what we call the citizens' initiative program. Please understand that we recognize that the best thing to do, the best thing that can be done for the citizen, is to reduce crime, and to reduce the fear of crime. However, there's much more that can and should be done. Corrections programs are concerned with rehabilitation of the offender. We've heard this for a long time. It has been and continues to be terribly important. But up to now, very few have spoken of rehabilitating the victim. One of the reasons that people do not want to be witnesses, and you know it quite well, I'm sure, is the treatment they get at the courthouse. The witness is not usually treated as a citizen going out of his way to perform an important duty, but as a person providing a service to the court at its convenience. Juries are comprised of retired persons and housewives to a great extent today. Jurors, however, are not handled in a much better manner than witnesses.

I realize that in some communities these statements are not applicable, but I would suggest, in general, over the country, the last person to be considered by our criminal justice system is too often the citizen who is involved. It has been a truism throughout the years, that without the support of citizenry there is no law and order. We are now trying to take this to heart, and turn it into positive and active support. We believe citizens should be actively supporting their local police with positive programs of community crime prevention, and cooperation with the police, rather than simply with bumper stickers. When a crime occurs, the first thought should be for the victim. You can help us with this program. And certainly I know a number of police departments have excellent programs in community crime prevention, and there are many more being developed. But more can be done. Much more can also be done of course, by the prosecutors, the courts and even by corrections. These latter agencies of criminal justice have lost contact and their natural relationship with the community and the police. And, therefore, LEAA considers it necessary in this area to concentrate on encouraging them to improve their relationships. While these are just a few of my thoughts, I'm looking forward to meeting you and answering your questions on our many other programs throughout the day. Thank you.

Chairman Anderson then introduced the keynote speaker, Chief Edward M. Davis of Los Angeles, California.

ED DAVIS, CHIEF OF POLICE, LOS ANGELES

Thank you, Ed, fellow chiefs and distinguished guests. It's a pleasure to be here with you. I just can't help but think how important this conference is, so that the kind of life you enjoy here can be preserved and so it can also be restored in many other places in America, and people could then think about the important things in life. They could think about one another, and doing something for one another, and making a living instead of defending themselves. So I want to commend you, Chief Anderson for your driving force, and the force of your committee officers in getting this together.

I know this committee has been talking about this kind of a meeting for a long time, and I'm glad to see this come into existence. I think this group should be a major force because, after all, you represent all the chiefs and all the departments in your particular state. Francis Looney may be here with us, but asked me to express his best wishes to you. He may get in toward the end of the meeting, I understand. And, greetings from the officers of the IACP. I first got into this standards business about four and a half years ago when the American Bar Association asked me if I would serve on a committee to review some police standards that they had drafted. So, I went to them, and I said that my experience with lawyers has been that it's better to stay away from you. You think you know everything, and if you've got some drafted, they're probably no good. It would probably be a waste of time for me to talk to you about it. So they came back and said they did have an open mind, and you could tell us what you think is wrong. They sent me a copy of their standards, and I met with them at Palm Beach, Florida, in the offseason.

We had a couple of police types who had sat through the development of their standard and hadn't protested them, and these standards from the ABA were a set of positive restrictions and constraints on the police. What they would have done if they had persisted, would be to, in effect, cause you to make standards, and then have the courts continually supervise you in the imposition of their interpretation of your standards upon you.

You can imagine what I said about that. I said, O.K., I came here as an individual chief, I am on the Executive Committee of the IACP, I will go

to them, and suggest to them that we set up a committee and that we officially interact with you. Instead of individual chiefs reviewing the standards, I think we should do it Association to Association, and we did. And I chaired a committee of IACP that worked with ABA and came back with standards that were turned around, and which are positive charters for the police, instead of a group of negative restraints.

So, the orange colored book you have that compares the ABA standards with the Police Task Force Standards indicates that the ABA standards are in a great deal of harmony with the Police Task Force Standards. In fact, while I was Chairman of the Police Task Force, I attempted to weave into the National Advisory Commission Standards everything that we have in the ABA Standards, so you will find that they are not in conflict at all. And that one contains the other. If anything, the NAC standards contain everything that ABA has. The National Advisory Commission organized under LEAA because the President was sick and tired of having appointed runaway commissions with what he thought were good people who came out with absurd findings. Such as the Task Force on Drugs, that came out and said, "Let's everybody smoke pot;" or the one on pornography. He wanted to be in a position to disavow anything that came out of this group.

The commission did four major jobs, which were assigned to Task Forces. One was Police, which we are going to talk about; another was Corrections; another was Crime Prevention; and the last was Courts. And two out of four of them were good. The Courts Task Force Report was done under Professor Van Meter of the University of Virginia, and it was an outstanding job. The courts task force group was a hard-working practical group of prosecutors, attorneys-general, judges and other lawyers, and I would highly commend to you an attempt to implement in your state the Courts Task Force Report.

Let's take a look now at the Police Task Force Report, and the areas of subject matter that we covered. The Police Role, as you know; who we are, what are we supposed to do in society; philosophically, where do we stand in relationship to the public. And the American police have never really understood, at least they haven't demonstrated by their actions that they understood what Sir Robert Peel tried to say in England in 1829; that the police are merely citizens in blue suits with brass buttons on them. That he's there to do the job of every citizen, and every citizen shouldn't give up his job and responsibility of seeing that there's a lawful community.

The police are there just to help them. We've gotten away from that, and we've separated ourselves from the public in America, and it's extremely important that the police realize that the only way that we can do a job is to do it in a partnership, with the citizens at large. So there have to be methods and programs, which will bring us close to the public. Our relationship to the press for example, has frequently been a hostile one. The press is our best method of letting the public know truly what we're doing. And our best method of attaining the support of the citizenry in doing our job is through the press.

Chapter Two, Implementing the Role of the Police. Chapter Three, Developing Community Resources. Then we get into Chapter Four, Criminal Justice Relations. We cannot be an island unto ourselves. America has historically tried to solve the crime problem in its major cities by hiring vast numbers of policemen. This is not the answer. Most jurisdictions which have hired vast armies of policemen have not made safe communities. I happen to operate a department with about 2.3 policemen per thousand people. One major city in the country goes up to six policemen per thousand. Most of them go up to about four policemen per thousand. Most of you operate at one or one-and-a-half policemen per thousand population and, probably, the best level of policemen is in the ones with the lower ratio of police per population. Because you can't do it with policemen. It has to be police and the public working together. But more than that, it has to be communities that have learned that the criminal justice system has to work as a system, and with the best of police, whether its a large or small number, no citizen can be safe without judges who are concerned with the welfare of the citizenry, and without prosecutors who really feel they should go in and bring the proper charges, and not sell out justice in wholesale plea negotiations or plea bargaining. There has to be a realistic application of rehabilitation. We have to be for rehabilitation, but not in a silly way that has been practiced in most of America, where people who are dangerous to society are turned loose on the communities to prey again and again and again on society.

This is what has happened in the last ten years. We've had a revolution in the correctional system, and the correctional people are groping for answers. We can approach them from a distance, or we can sit down across the table with them and work out some of these problems. I've found that in my state, we were being plagued every weekend by 72-hour passes out of the prisons. These prisoners would go forth and rape and plunder and steal and burgle. We had to sit down and eventually convince our state correctional people that this program had to have a lot more constraints on it than it did. So our relationships with the justice system, in working with prosecutors

and courts and probation and parole is absolutely vital. This is why you can do a job without massive numbers of troops.

Then we get into planning and organizing a department. We talk about a new method of organization in Chapter Six called Team Policing. My department will be totally Team Police by the first of January in 1975. I'm going to talk a little bit later about team policing. There's nothing really fancy about it, it's just getting back to a sort of basic way of doing business in a small department. Many small departments never got away from team policing. Many big ones have organized themselves out of any possibility of coordination within their own organizations.

Then we have a chapter on Unusual Occurrences. All of you are going to have them at some time or another. Very few of us were ever ready for them. A Watts riot or a SLA, and the reason the SLA thing was handled well in my city is that we planned for such things many years ago. And we trained and we worked out and we used it on minor things, such as the guy barricaded in his house on a Saturday night with a gun who had run his wife out. And so when the SLA thing went down, it was really a routine LAPD operation. There just happened to be some notorious people involved.

Then we have Manpower Alternatives, the use of civilians and doing jobs heretofore done only by police. Many jobs are para-professional and are not up to the professional level of police. They should be done by people who don't cost as much, and maybe can do it better. Then we talk about outside professional assistance and support services, such as evidence technicians, property systems, and so forth. We get into the very important subject of recruitment and training. Which if you have not yet been looked at by your Fair Employment Practices Commission, you will be; if you haven't been looked at by LEAA, and if you are out of line, you will be . . . And so, you should take a positive attitude about this thing, of women in policing. Not an unrealistic posture. I have seven women who have gone through the whole thing and are doing a good job. But I don't think I'm ever going to have 7,000 of them. And I'm not going to slip my standards. These women, the new type, come in and they have to qualify in every way the men do, they have to train in every way the men do, they have to perform in the field the way the men do. And let me tell you, the pressure from the women and minority groups is not going to go away. But we should meet it in a way without hurting the public, without slipping realistic standards, we have to do these things.

Then we get into classification and pay. I think that it's really ridiculous the salary that we pay most police chief executives. I'm fairly well paid, but when I look at some other major city chiefs, it's really disgraceful, the kind of money that's paid. I fought and I got good pay for my men and for my brass on the way up, and I can demand top-level professional performance. And we get that out of them. But, I think we're way behind in what we should do in seeing that, if we're going to be a profession, we can't have ditchdigger salaries.

Then we get into education, and we get into training, very vital areas. The development and advancement and promotion of people in the organization, employee relations, and labor relations. If you don't have it yet, you're going to have it next year or the year after. I went through my first bargaining year, and I was helped a great deal by what I learned from fellows on the East Coast who had been through this process. We had better get with that, or it will get us.

Internal discipline. The development of a standard of conduct and professional level of work that we don't allow people to go below, and how you can bring them up through positive discipline, and use negative discipline where necessary.

Then we go into the health-care, physical fitness, retirement, employee services, professional equipment, transportation, and communications. Each one is an extremely important and complicated subject.

The commission had as a goal, to write a blueprint that would allow us to cut crime in America in half in ten years. Now is that realistic, to cut crime in America in half? Most police forces and most police chiefs I talk to say no, that's ridiculous, you can't cut crime in half. I say that you can cut crime in half. When you look back, crime doubled in the last ten years, and crime doubled in the ten years before that. Well, you think you know some of the reasons it doubled. You think it might have doubled because of the Mapp decision. You think it might have doubled because of the revolution of corrections, where they, instead of putting people in the state pen, they turn them loose on the streets. And you have other thoughts of why crime has increased, such as lenient judges in terms of general sentencing, or plea bargaining. Whenever those many, many reasons were; maybe, it was our deficiencies as police in doing

our job; maybe we never had the spirit to think we could admit it, or could hack it.

I have the feeling that a lot of chiefs and some of my predecessors' main objective was to survive as a chief of police. And that is not a worthy objective. If I do my job in such a fashion that I'm really worried about surviving, so I can continue to be the chief of police in Los Angeles, then I can't be worth a damn. And if I had to live my life that way, I couldn't stand the cop-outs I would have to make. So, I think we have to have an objective better than survival. I think our objective is clear, our responsibility is clear. It's to the public we serve, to bring them the lowest possible level of crime and the highest level of safety that we can deliver to them. And no one else can do it. You are the catalytic force in the criminal justice system. Until a cop makes an arrest, nothing else can happen. If no cop made an arrest, no district attorney could take the case into court, no judge would have anything to do, no correctional administrator would have anyone to rehabilitate. And, so you set the tone and the pace, you're the catalytic agent, and you have to take the position of leadership and what you put into this system, and you have to have a great deal of care about how it's handled through the system, and what happens when it gets out. So, I think it's very possible to cut crime.

I've been chief five years, and in 1972 in my city we had a three-percent decrease in crime with a national increase of one percent. Last year we had a seven percent decrease, against a national five percent increase. This year the national increase for the first three months is 15 percent, and we have a two percent increase. We're going to turn that around, by the end of the year. We're not doing it with a pencil, as has been done in some places. I'd have cut it in half a long time ago if I was going to do it with a pencil. But we're experiencing a real crime reduction. We have to look at the causes of crime. Again the standards go into this. We have to look at the degree of involvement of the public. Do we really want to gather with the community? Do our men? It really has to happen at the policeman's level, or the trooper's level. Are they out there actually soliciting the work of the community in getting the job done? The report gets into that. To show you I believe in these standards, I've had my department surveyed. And this is the report of LAPD's compliance with the National Advisory Commission Standards. There are 107 standards, and there are 1,114 points of recommendation. We are deficient on 72 of those 1,114 points. We intend to, and we are, implementing changes in

62 of those areas. In 10 of those 1,114 points of recommendations we disagree, and we are not going to do what you "Feds" are pushing. This wasn't a federal thing, because this Police Task Force was your own members. So I'm going to bring my department into full compliance with those very minor exceptions. It's not quite like the good book, but in spite of my being chairman, we had some other good people. We had Dale Carson, who's former head of the National Sheriff's Association, who's the Chief of Police in Jacksonville, Florida. We had Judge Bolin of Milwaukee, and Judge Arthur Alecone of Los Angeles. Art Alecone, a Superior Court Judge, has a very distinguished background. He was a prosecutor for us in our district attorney's office. He was clemency secretary for our governor. He was the head of the state parole board. Now he is a Superior Court Judge and, in addition to that, he is the author of many books that all policemen buy. So, Art sat there, and I call him Art because I was raised in the ghetto with him in the Mexican barrio, and I was just a poor white kid. Judge Alecone brought to this book a lot of sensitivities from a man very concerned with legal rights and constitutional rights. So, you'll find that his hand revolved throughout the book. He also is a guy who sat and looked in the face of these cons who were trying to get out and commit more robberies and so forth on the community. We had, from Cleveland, Ohio, at that time, General Benjamin Davis, Jr., retired out of the Air Force, who is now the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Ben is a hell of a man. We had Don Derring, who just a year ago finished his term as the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Don is a distinguished chief of long-standing from Winnetka, Illinois. And he's a true professional. He knows our business. We had Dave Kelly on our task force and Dave, at that time and up until a few weeks ago, was the head of the New Jersey State Police. An absolutely incorruptible, high-caliber professional law enforcement officer who was a tank commander under Patton. Dave is a man we can really be proud of, and he's one of the task force members. Another person you may have heard about by the name of Clarence Kelley. He's going to make a good Director of the FBI, and you already have felt the difference in the Bureau and it's relationship to you because of the fine work of Clarence Kelley. John Shryock served on our task force, and John served as President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, which gave him a lot of sensitivity. A fellow named Irv Allano from the American College of Pathologists, to get at some of the scientific things, particularly in homicide type investigations.

We had a private lawyer, David Hames. A young fellow devoted to constitutional law, he's worked for a Supreme Court Justice. He brought some important constitutional rights feelings to this whole task force report on police. We had a professor from John Jay College in New York. Charles Kingston, a representative of the National League of Cities, Donald Benson, and we brought in even an SPA director, he was the house liberal, Joe White from Columbus, Ohio. He brought in a very liberal perspective. Not that all SPA directors are, just most of them are that way. Well, that was your Task Force. Now, we required that for everything that went in here, there were two success stories for that particular recommendation, someplace in America. None of this is blue sky stuff. These practical hardheaded interdisciplinary people, like I mentioned to you, said that we're not going to recommend anything unless the staff can travel around the country and bring us proof that this worked in at least two places. Cause something might work in one place, because of leadership ability, the influence a man has over his men or his community, and that same thing, when you transplant it, might not work, might not even be a good idea. But if it works in two or more places, it probably is a good idea.

We had a top flight staff that did the legwork. And this Commission was no rubber stamp, and this Task Force was no rubber stamp Task Force. Guys like Clarence Kelley and Ben Davis and Dave Kelly and Art Alecone just aren't rubber stamp men. The workers on this; we had a man from the Michigan state police, we had a man from Kansas City, Clarence Kelley's shop; we had a chief of police of Arcada, California. You haven't even heard of Arcada, California, have you. We had a few of my people on it. So it's not an LAPD report. This is a national report. These are the success stories from the police of America. It's good stuff, it works. But it won't work just by taking every one of these 1,114 recommendations and say I'll take one of these and one of these and put them together, it isn't going to work that way. It must be put together with tender loving care. It has to be organized so that it fits, in your particular, uniquely different part of the world where you and the chiefs you represent work. And they must be energized by a leader who believes that he's going to accomplish something. I think that's the most important thing. That's the thing I find with some brass, that some of them are just there because they wanted more money, or they wanted more status. I just hate that, when somebody will take as important a job as police work and just be a damned economic whore and take it because of the money and status. No, he has to take it because he has a commitment to get the job done. And so none of it will mean anything unless you have that. You must have a road map, you must

have a strategy. So that you can say this is how we're going to take this, and we're going to make it work. Just like a coach. If he's going to win a game, and he knows what he's put together over a number of years, and he knows all his strategy, and he knows the strategy of the other side, and he conceives the strategy of the game when he puts it into effect. So none of these will mean anything unless you have that.

Let me tell you my strategy. A lot of it was inspired by seeing this work develop over a period of the years I was involved in the very preliminary stages. And this is what I have learned out of this. I wouldn't have been able to come up with this successful strategy if I didn't have the opportunity to serve with these distinguished men on this fine commission and to get the benefit of looking at police in America through our staff.

I have what I call my five frontiers that have been paying off for me. Number one, that the police and the people must work together. You can't get anything done in a backroom by yourself. If we depend on our intelligence, on our strength, on our professional knowledge, on our force, on our experience, that isn't worth a damn unless we can turn on a lot of people. There's one of us to a thousand people, or one of us to five hundred people. And we have to move the fulcrum on that teeter-totter to where we get enough people on our side, the side of law and order, if I may use that abused term, and when we sign enough people up to work with us, and we have programs that bring people in, then we can start winning. Let me tell you what my officers have done. We confine them to one district and we don't want them to go out of that district for a year or two. They're in that district, and we call it territorial imperative. First, they had to meet in school houses and tell people to come in, and they talked about burglaries or whatever it was. And that was pretty good. That was different. Well, they've done that. And this has changed those young policemen. But, more importantly, it's changed a lot of those citizens. They see that policemen as a human being. We switched from the schoolhouse meeting now, to meeting in people's homes. We tell them to invite the neighbors over, we have a neighborhood watch meeting, where we all talk about how to help one another. Last year those young policemen met with more than a third of a million people, in people's homes.

A third of a million; more than 10 percent of the population of our city. Believe me, those young, vibrant, enthusiastic young professionals that you have working for you, when they get an opportunity to go out and talk to people, they really make us look sick. I don't think I could have done the job they're doing in this respect, when I was a young policeman. I would have been scared to death. I don't think I could do it as well today as this young clean-cut fellow. He's your greatest P. R. man. He's the guy that can bring the people to you.

Our second frontier is getting people to reduce crime. And it's just absolutely gratifying to see people, when they're confronted with crime crisis, to say what can I do? And so we have a thing called neighborhood watch. Where they can help one another. It's a case of being your brother's keeper, voluntarily. We've even come up with a thing called Junior Neighborhood Watch, where you get little kids on bicycles in a high burglary frequency area, and we get Explorer Scouts who don't cost taxpayers anything to go out and have a meeting and get all these little kids in, and maybe we can get the businessmen to pay for a little lemonade or something and they talk about how to keep people from ripping off your neighborhood. Closing the garage door so they don't get your dad's lawnmower. Locking your bike, so they don't get your bike. And describing burglars. And they're having little kids call in and give us information and our radio car guys go out and capture a burglar. We have businessmen booster groups that have gotten together in each of our 17 precincts and they provide money for some of the athletic activities that the policemen get involved in. They provide coffee and cookies for meetings in homes and junior neighborhood watch meetings. We have female auxiliary groups, and it's just absolutely phenomenal. These outfits run themselves. They're auxiliary to us, they help us, they have no official status. Getting the people turned on is very vital.

Number three. Getting the police to work with the police. Sounds very funny doesn't it? But you know, if your department has any size to it, it may have been organized a long time ago, so that it couldn't work together. They set up a chief of detectives. He had all the detectives under him. They then set up a chief of patrol. Then they set up a chief of traffic, and he had all the guys with boots on. The detectives were upstairs and the coppers were downstairs, and out in the street, and never the twain shall meet. But by the use of team policing, we go back to what a small city would naturally have, where we take a hunk of that area and we say, O.K., you uniform policemen, you traffic guys, you

detectives, this is yours. And we take a Lieutenant and say you're not a detective lieutenant, or a patrol lieutenant, you're a lieutenant of police, you're in charge of this team. You've got your sergeant and you've got your men, and you go in there and do the kind of a job you have to do. A lot of funny things happen. Policemen who take lousy reports, once they are working intimately with the detective, (we call them investigators now), they stand in for him when he's gone to court or on vacation. They have to do some of his work. They realize you have to put something in the report that a detective can go to a prosecutor with. There's a tremendous improvement in the preliminary investigation capability of a policeman. Because he gets a chance to really know that investigator. He knows how he will help him, or foul him up in the way he does his work. And there's no other way you can do it, by any kind of training. By their working together, this police working with police has really paid off. We put one of these into Venice. It was our first test. We cut burglaries by 43 percent in one year. We put one in the middle of Watts. If anything can't work, it can't work in the middle of Watts, because there's nothing there. No social organization, no theaters, there's all kinds of unemployment, there's all kinds of crime. That thing in the middle of Watts has turned those people on. Crime in the middle of Watts, for a year and a month now, has been down 27 percent. It's cut near a third. It's the magic of team policing. No additional resources, no one had to pay us to do this, no Federal funds. We did have federal funds on the Venice thing. But all the rest of our team policing thing, you don't need money. Most good things in life, to run a police department, don't require any money from LEAA. It's good that money is there, seed money to get ideas moving, but you can implement most everything that's good in terms of reorganization, a better way of doing work, working with the criminal justice system without money. We take it because our councilmen want us to get our share, but LEAA money is about three percent of our budget.

Number four. The fourth frontier is getting the police and the brass working together. If you think back to when you were a copper, and you think about two different kinds of sergeants you had, there's always a sergeant who was sort of blowing the whistle on you. He was saying how come it took you so long to get here. Or he was always just picking on you, he was criticizing. He was sort of like a referee or an umpire. You did your best to avoid him. Then you can think about another kind

of sergeant who you ask if you go out of the city boundary to pick up a suspect. And he'd say, "Well, it's police work isn't it? Let's go". That kind of a guy sort of let you know, sort of turned you on, and he was a coach, instead of a referee or umpire. And a hell of a lot of sergeants and lieutenants and captains and the rest of the brass wind up thinking their job is being an umpire or referee. We need a little bit of umpiring and a little bit of refereeing from them, but I'd say it's about five percent. We need about 95 percent positive leadership. We need about 95 percent of their effort and really appreciating the quality of the people below them. And cultivating those men, and letting them roll and patting them on the back. We don't have this because of the quasi-military nature of police. Somehow or another, the stereotype of "Old Sarge", is just not conducive to leadership. And our policemen do a good job sometimes in spite of this rather than because of it. When all the things I've done successfully, I've taken the five frontiers, and I said how do we do them, police and people working together.

My fifth frontier is the police working with the rest of the criminal justice system. We recommend in here something that I have done, I have found very useful, and that is, once a month I sit down with the District Attorney, the presiding judge of the court, the city attorney, and the head of probation. We have about a dozen different criminal justice principals. It's a non-organization. It has no constitution or by-laws. I just happen to have been chairman of it for about two and a half years. We got a lot of wonderful things changed in terms of judicial policies, police policies, prosecutorial policies just by sitting down quietly behind closed doors and working together.

In closing, a few additional points, I'd like to go further on through the barbed wire fence, a few more points and I'm through. Some of the great problems I see we have to cope with to reduce our crime are getting the juvenile justice system working. Because of the Gault decision which put in a one-sided adversary system about 1968, all over this country your juvenile courts are screwed up. Instead of doing some good because of the nature of the law, you're probably doing more harm than good. America is producing the seeds of a crime wave five and ten years from now that will be unparalleled. It's because we have not put any two-sided adversary system in the juvenile court setup. We have to get our prosecutors involved. The ridiculous thing of having a probation officer or social work writing the charges in a murder case, which happens in most states is preposterous. But that was O.K. when we had the juvenile system before

the Gault decision, where the judge came in like a father and listened to the probation officer and talked to the kid and figured out what was good for little Johnny. That isn't what's happening now. Little Johnny's got his mouthpiece, and he is getting back out and doing it over and over and over again. He's becoming a vicious killer and a terrible burglar. Our eyes are sort of on the adult criminal. Let's get our eyes down, look down, I say. Look down at the juvenile justice system as an important challenge to you. Heroin is a hell of a challenge. It's coming in from Mexico in fantastic quantities. We closed it off from France and we closed it off from the middle east, but brother, you are getting it from down in Mexico. If your people aren't using it yet, they're going to be using it soon. Because it's cheap and plentiful and prolific.

These standards are like the Bible, like the good book. It isn't going to do any good if it's on the shelf. It must be read, it must be understood, and it must become a part of you. If we do all that, we'll have some potential of it leading us out of the land of Egypt. So I say, try it, I think you'll like it. If it works, it's only going to work because you understand it and you believe it and you push it.

Following Chief Davis' address, Second Vice-Chairman Bruce E. Parsons, Chief of Police of Cocoa Beach, Florida, introduced Mr. Jack Shreeves, a member of the Florida House of Representatives and Chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee. Mr. Shreeves delivered a short presentation.

At a later time, IACP President Francis B. Looney arrived to participate in the Executive Training Session. His address is included here.

FRANCIS LOONEY

Thank you very much, Ed. I noticed when I walked into the meeting today there were big smiles on the faces of Roy Kelch and Bucky Mass. And that brought me back to about six or seven years ago when I was first elected a Vice President of this Association. At the time, I was President

of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police. And Bucky gave me my first job. And that was to go before the Executive Board of IACP and urge that this Association of State Chiefs be formed. I have to admit that I was not successful at that time. We were sent back to do some refinement, we were told. But, I'm also happy that we had men like Bucky and others who went out and did the work. So, two years later they came back, and I had the privilege of offering a resolution that formed this great association. I believed in this association at that time, I believe in it more so today. Because I'm fully convinced that if we are to move law enforcement ahead in America today, it will be done through the instrumentality of the state associations for one simple reason, that there you are closer to the people.

I know that in our own state, and I refer to that solely because I happened to have a period of leadership in New York. When we wanted something done, which would advance law enforcement, whether it would be more representation on the state planning agency, whether it was to secure a no-knock bill, or a stop and frisk bill, or whether it was to offer a great force in preventing the legislature from watering down the powers of police in making arrests, we did it through the instrumentality of the state association. So we knew it had great promise, So I know that through the leadership of Ed today, in calling this meeting on standards, it's another giant step forward.

We're here at this conference to discuss standards. Standards whether they be the American Bar Association standards, or the national standards developed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. We know, as was pointed out earlier, that we need standards. But standards are what they indicate. They're merely guides. We cannot hope, for example, that one broad set of standards will be good for every police department in the nation. We know many hours of hard work went into the American Bar standards as well as to the national standards. But we know, too, that with the diversified types of police service that we have in America today that we cannot hope to address ourselves to all the needs. It is true that the Executive Committee of the IACP endorsed the American Bar standards. And many of you may ask why. Well, for a very simple reason. That they're broad standards, they're standards that can reach out in a very broad way and are not that restrictive. The man who developed the national standards, worked much harder and

they developed refined standards, they went in and tried to help policemen carry out their responsibilities in a better way.

We heard a reference today that these standards possibly come from Washington and Washington thinking. And that brings me back to the day in Washington when we discussed these standards. Peter Pitchess, the distinguished Sheriff of Los Angeles County was there at that time. He was addressing the large assemblage. And he said, "You know ladies and gentlemen, these standards appear to come out of Washington, but in truth they do not. You know, if I ever had a mental health problem, I would come to Washington, because it would never be noticed there".

So I can share some of the feelings when you men refer to Washington here today. But we know that these standards did not come from Washington, they came from very distinguished leaders in the law enforcement profession across America under the able leadership of Ed Davis. Ed insured that nothing would be placed in those standards that would inhibit generally the police operations throughout the nation. When we developed the American Bar Association's standards, they were worked on by a set of distinguished lawyers and judges in the legal profession across America. And it took them five years to develop standards for police. The police, incidentally, were one of 16 separate standards dealing with the total criminal justice system. And they sent those standards to the IACP for their endorsement. And immediately we responded through the IACP and said suppose we in the police field, were to develop standards for judges and for lawyers and for district attorneys, would you be willing to accept them. And they said we would be very reluctant to do that. We would question whether or not you are qualified to do that. So we in turn said to them we feel likewise. We feel lawyers are not in a position to develop standards for police. So we sat down with an American Bar Association committee. Ed Davis was also a member of that committee as was Donald Pomerleau, the police commissioner of Baltimore. And we worked out a set of standards that was acceptable because they are in a much broader field.

And as pointed out earlier, we believe that standards are necessary. We feel a little guilty that we with the great police professional organization that we have, probably the greatest in the world, today, did not develop our own standards to guide us all the way through. But when we

did not do that, we felt that we should go along and at least be part of the development of concrete standards that we could all live with. I will not address myself to any particular standards that are in the national effort for obvious reasons. That is why you men are here today, to deliberate that.

So, I will move along, and if you will permit me a few minutes I would like to talk to you as President of the IACP. During this last year that I had the privilege of serving as your President, we tried to address the great issues that are affecting police in America today. We did that through the instrumentality of the editorial in the Police Chief magazine each month. And in turn, we channeled that out to more than 700 newspapers across America. We know that these issues are vital to us if we are to be effective. We know that on one individual can do it, therefore, we called meetings of our executive board ten times during this past year to be sure that we did not overlook the compelling needs of the police of America.

We appeared before the Congress of the United States. We prevailed on the legislatures of many of the states of our nation to pass laws that will make the job of the policeman a little easier. We also had conversations with the executive branch of government including several meetings with the Attorney General of the United States. We had discussions with Mr. Simon when he headed the energy commission in Washington, and you know that as a result we were able to get for the police the required amount of fuel necessary for them to carry out their responsibilities.

I mentioned appearing before the Congress and prevailing on Congress to pass laws that would be helpful to us. Some of the areas briefly, that we addressed ourselves to, are, for example, the posting of bond when policemen are sued for actions committed during the course of their employment. It might be interesting for you to know that lawsuits against policemen have more than tripled since 1967. We feel that many times policemen are required to spend a great deal of money in legal defense and investigation to defend themselves against frivolous lawsuits. We received a good reception, we feel, from the courts of the nation and many of the states as well as from the Congress. Then, too, we pressed very hard for passage of a bill that would give to policemen's families \$50,000 in the event they should lose their lives in the performance of their duty. In the last ten years, more than 860 policemen lost their lives in the performance of duty, for the most part as a result of gunshot wounds. In addition to that, we have prevailed on a Congressman from

New York to introduce legislation that a national memorial be established in Washington, which will pay honor to the men and women in the police service throughout the nation who make the supreme sacrifice. Beyond that, we have asked the Congress to really "put their money where their mouths are" by passing legislation that will exempt all pensions of policemen from any Federal income tax. We feel that this will be extremely helpful to the police of America.

All of you know of the efforts on the part of IACP and your own organizations in working hard to bring back the death penalty in those states where it does not now exist. We know that about 18,000 people lose their lives each year in America. We know too that in 1967, the last year when anyone was executed for killing, there were only 9,000 homicides in America. I think those statistics pretty much speak for themselves. In the IACP we felt that new directions should be taken. Therefore, we established many new committees. The criminal justice system was mentioned here today, and I am sure that it was mentioned in your own deliberations. We established a committee to deal with that. You know, when you say we established you get the feeling that you're talking like a politician.

But we did establish committees for the purpose of having a committee, we established committees for the purpose of doing something about the problem. In the criminal justice system we recognize, as was pointed out here, that we must work together. But we also recognize that the deficiencies in the other components of the criminal justice system are really inhibiting the police from doing the job that they want to do and are equipped at doing. We know the many cases we investigate each that goes down the drain because of the ineptness of some unqualified judge. I have urged the Congress of the United States as well as the Judiciary of the United States, as well as the Judiciary and the legislature of many of the states of our nation to place policemen on screening boards so that they might have something to say about who was selected to sit as a judge in all of the courts, both of our Federal government and at the state level.

We hear, too, of the problems of police chiefs across America today. I established a vigorous committee to deal with that. It might be interesting for you to know that of the 30 commissioners and chiefs of police who have

the largest police departments in America, one-third lost their jobs since our last conference at San Antonio. We felt that this is wrong. We felt that the political implications in the loss of many of these jobs were far reaching, that something should be done about it. That committee presently has under consideration a grant from LEAA where we will receive nearly a half million dollars to study and to deal with the problem. Not only of security for the police chiefs and the commissioners, but also to better equip them to do the job that they have to do in 1974.

Another area that warrants great consideration on the part of our association is that of private security. You know, over these last five years we were able to get great benefits for policemen. And now that we have these benefits, some municipalities across our nation are looking for ways to circumvent it. Some are even going so far as to seek private security agencies to police an entire municipality. We feel that it needs control. We feel that when those controls are developed and those standards are written that we in the police profession will be the ones who will dictate what is needed because we think we have the most to lose. So we are working in that area at the present time.

Another area that we're working very hard on is the area of youth and juvenile justice. We hope to form a national institute at IACP headquarters to deal with youth crimes, and juvenile justice today. We know it's shocking in some of the major cities of America today where we have more than 100 criminal court judges and have only about three or four judges dealing with youth and with juveniles. And speaking with the Attorney General of the United States we urged him to call a conference directing national attention to what we believe is a national disgrace. The youth problems and the youth and juvenile delinquency in America today. We mentioned police casualties. I formed a committee also to deal with that, because we're not concerned alone with seeking the death penalty after the policemen are killed, but we're also concerned with finding ways and means of preventing the killing of policemen. And we want to bring together the best minds in America so that they can share this information and in turn spread it out across America to each and every department.

We hear much about women in police service. And again I have an active committee working in that area. Unfortunately the courts in America today have told us that we must give equal opportunity to women and that we must appoint them the same as men. And yet, we all know that none of us across America have had the opportunity of judging whether or not they can effectively do the job. So we hope that through this committee, and through the staff that we have engaged at IACP headquarters, we can share information with you, that we can gather information and hopefully we will be in a position within a year or two to go before the Congress and the legislature, and go before the courts in America give them proper guidance.

Another area that we're deeply concerned with is that of personnel relations. Those of you who have followed the press closely in recent weeks find a great disaster emanating from Baltimore, where the policemen went out on strike, and as a result much looting and damage took place in that city. We feel that much has to be done in this area. We feel that discussions must take place before men meet across the bargaining table. We feel that changes in law might be needed, and we hope that out of that committee, again consisting of all practical, practicing policemen, that we will get some of the answers.

We heard briefly, earlier, about privacy of records. And we know that in the Congress of the United States today the great effort that is being made to really seal all records of police to particularly be concerned about intelligence records, and we know too that as practicing policemen, to do an effective job as an investigator, we need that type of information. We're not in favor, for example, of giving out backgrounds and medical records on individuals. We are the first to say that stringent and strict controls are necessary and we have urged the Congress to pass those controls. But we are conscious of the fact that many of the recommendations made to the Senate and the Congress of the United States today, will inhibit you and me from doing the job that has to be done. We know that that cannot be permitted.

Another consideration that takes a great deal of our time, and that is the court decisions across America, dealing with quotas for appointment to police departments and for promotion. And also decisions which vitally

affect the standards that we traditionally have had in the police departments in every state of our nation. It was mentioned here, and I reaffirm that the police more than any other component of the criminal justice system has done more to develop standards, to educate, to train, to professionalize their people than any of the others. And yet, today, we find that we are the victims of many of the court decisions which are restricting us in standards and providing for quotas.

I hope that the decision that emanated from San Francisco and some three or four other cities will be reversed. But each and every one of us should not sit back and wait. We should be conscious of this at a local level, speak out on it indicate why we feel it should not take place, and I think that we can reverse the tide. We had much to be done in the IACP and I do not propose that we solved all of our problems or a great number during this past year that I have had the privilege of being President. But I think at least we have opened the door and that those fine men, like Rocky Pomerance, Ed Davis, and others that will follow me will continue, but most of all they will need your support.

You might say that what I'm going to say now, well he's saying this because it is the thing that should be said here. I say that that will not be so. And what I am going to say is this. You represent state associations of chiefs of police. You are much closer to the people than we are in IACP. I know from experience when a bad law is recommended at a state level if we alerted the chiefs of police of our state to that, and they in turn contacted their local legislators, that law, that recommended bill would not have a prayer of passage. So, I think if one thing you take back from this meeting today, and that will be this. That all of you are going to be conscious of what's happening in the law enforcement field today. Feel that you are a tower of strength in changing the law enforcement profession. And if you change it in your own state, it will indeed change throughout the nation.

In the IACP we are going to try to be more international. We have prided ourselves for more than 50 years at being the International Association of Chiefs of Police. But yet, if you look at the membership you will find that more than 95 percent comes from the United States of America. We think in this age of international kidnapping and terrorism that it should take on more an international aspect. I spent the last two or three weeks visiting the police in Italy and Germany and France and in England as well as with Interpol. And we're trying to develop more international flavor so that we can have an international exchange of ideas, particularly in the

area of management. We know that Interpol is very jealous of the great advances that they have made over the years, but I assured them, as I say to you, that we as a professional police association are concerned more with the management, more with the professionalization of law enforcement than we are with the actual criminal investigations with which they are concerned.

So we as the IACP feel very strongly that we'll take a greater leadership role, we will speak out on all issues, we will respond to any attacks made against policemen individually, or against our association. And I think we have developed within IACP and its board a group of courageous leaders who are willing to stand up and speak out when it has to be done. But most of all of you are the men who hold the key, and with you rest the success of police professionalization in America today, and I wish you every good luck in your deliberations here and those that will follow. Thank you very much.

MR. QUINN TAMM

I am pleased to be here today and to have the opportunity to see all of you again. We've been very busy, of course, preparing for our annual conference in September. It hardly seems like more than a month or two since we were in San Antonio, but in a matter of weeks, we'll be welcoming you to Washington.

Speaking of Washington, I always try to be hopeful, but I doubt that even you distinguished gentlemen will be able to straighten things out back there. You can try, but I don't think you'll have much success. In recent years, we have invited Mr. Nixon to speak at our conferences. We always ask him months in advance, and he always sends us a very gracious reply saying that he can't commit himself because he doesn't know where he'll be at conference time or what he'll be doing.

We got the same kind of reply this year, but one of our Division Directors remarked that this time, he really meant it!

In preparing for the conference, I've been reviewing some of the developments in law enforcement over the past year. In many ways, it has been another year of great visibility for the police. Law enforcement seems to be regaining some of the prestige it lost during the late 1960's.

Undoubtedly, this is due in part to the continuing popularity of police fiction in books, movies and on television. The number of shows depicting policemen as heroes continues to increase.

I haven't seen every one, but I did manage to catch a few episodes of "Kojak," which I understand was one of the year's top-rated programs.

It seems to me that the program serves a real purpose. It may not be a realistic depiction of police work, but at least it shows the viewer that there are other cities besides Los Angeles and San Francisco with a serious crime problem!

If the police are gaining favor with the general public, they are also scoring points in the areas of education and government. Colleges and Universities which, twenty years ago, had no use for law enforcement and criminal justice as academic programs, are expanding their course offerings in these areas. At the same time, their publishing houses are issuing a record number of books on policing. Police journals are receiving a flood of articles from professors of law enforcement, many of whom must "publish or perish" in an increasingly competitive academic discipline.

Then, there are the studies and surveys often funded by grants from large foundations. It sometimes seems that every police department in the country is being studied by its own group of researchers, probing everything from team policing to the relationship between an officer's height and weight and the likelihood of his being assaulted.

Every issue of the IACP's Journal of Police Science and Administration contains the results of several new in-depth studies of police departments.

Then, of course, there are state and regional criminal justice councils -- and the Federal Government, which, with the formation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, finally recognized criminal justice as a major national priority. All of this attention is very flattering, especially after such a long period of being virtually ignored. And, on the whole, it has been a good thing for law enforcement.

The number of institutions of higher learning offering law enforcement degree programs has increased tenfold in the past decade, and this has had the effect of raising the level of law enforcement courses and law enforcement graduates.

The college-educated police officer is becoming commonplace, and this is a development that I think we can only applaud. The fact that we now have the machinery for a meaningful exchange of ideas among police agencies -- magazines, books, journals and conferences -- is also an important development.

Trial and error may have been an acceptable procedure in less complicated times, but the technology has become so complex and the alternatives have become so varied that it has become vitally important that police administrators talk to each other about what they are doing, and why, and how it has worked.

Similarly, academic studies that focus on, say, the attitudes and beliefs of patrolmen, can assist police agencies in devising training programs and correcting deficiencies in ones that already exist.

Turning to the Federal Government, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is a major factor in the lives of most police administrators. Yet, if the LEAA did not exist, someone would have to invent it.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to aid law enforcement, and it is clear that the allocation of funds for a specific purpose is most efficiently handled by a single agency assigned that task. In

theory, at least, the LEAA serves a vital function in law enforcement.

It would, however, be a mistake for law enforcement merely to bask proudly in the glow of this unprecedented attention. There is no question that recent developments justify a healthy optimism about the criminal justice system, but there are problems that have been caused by the very extent of the new popularity of the police.

To put it simply, I'm convinced that the police are not participating enough in the institutions and activities which are designed to help them. I would like to suggest that professors of criminal justice and government administrators, even if they have the best intentions in the world, are frequently hampered by their lack of knowledge and experience of the practical problems of law enforcement. They frequently make errors of omission and commission, errors which only diminish the usefulness of their work.

What I am arguing is that there is a real necessity for the police to participate actively in the deliberations and decisions that affect them.

Let me begin with the academic field studies that may have a direct effect on both the theory and practice of policing would have far more credibility with more police input. Although it is often difficult to divert the necessary manpower, police administrators should make every effort to assist, and where necessary, guide those conducting field research. Unworkable theories die when confronted by the realities of law enforcement. This is the police administrator's best weapon against "experts" who oversee the criminal justice system from the security of their ivory towers.

Similarly, it is not enough that policemen are pursuing advanced degrees, and thereby qualifying for promotions and higher salaries. The education they receive must have some value to the police service. I am not suggesting that police officials attempt to control the academic programs at colleges and universities.

But I do contend that you have some responsibility to inform your selves about what is being taught in the schools your officers attend. If you see a way in which the curriculum can be improved, tell the department chairman.

Law enforcement is, for the most part, an intensely practical subject, even when it is confined to the university classroom. Educational administrators are no more anxious than police administrators to offer courses of little or no practical value. Police officers who attend courses also have a responsibility in this regard. They should not be so intimidated by the academic credentials of their instructor that they fail to challenge him when he presents views that are at obvious variance with the realities of policing as it is actually practiced.

The best education, after all, often consists of the confrontation between theory and practice, between the way things are supposed to work and the way they actually do work. Student feedback will produce a better class at the same time that it serves to keep the professor honest.

Another area in which police officers and administrators could become more active is in the writing of articles for police journals and magazines.

The Journal of Police Science and Administration, which the IACP publishes in conjunction with Northwestern University Law School, has been in existence for almost two years. It is recognized as one of the leading publications in its field, and is widely read by police administrators as well as educators in criminal justice. The vast majority of articles received and published by the Journal are written by professors, not by policemen.

I know the editors of the Journal and the Police Chief magazine would dearly love to publish articles by active, functioning police officers and administrators, but they are simply not being written. Yet these publications are ideal vehicles for both proposing and evaluating police techniques, and they should not become the exclusive province of academics. The most significant impact of all on law enforcement, however, is that produced by the policies of state and regional criminal justice planning agencies and the LEAA.

These agencies control the Federal funding purse strings and set the policies for police agencies, and it is here that the greatest dangers and the greatest challenges lie.

The fact is that through their power to withhold or divert funds, these agencies are exerting an enormous amount of control over the police departments under their jurisdiction. They are making requirements and ordering changes according to their own ideas of how law enforcement should be conducted. And yet for the most part these standards and requirements are being imposed on the police by bureaucrats who have neither the proper background nor adequate information to determine how police business should be conducted. Millions of dollars in Federal funds are going to law enforcement without the proper direction and without anyone taking the trouble to properly identify law enforcement's needs.

It may well be inevitable that with Federal funds come Federal controls. But there is no reason that Federal control should be exerted without any participation by those who will be directly affected. Law enforcement needs to constantly re-evaluate its directions and goals.

Our profession has never been slow to change when it has found better methods and equipment. We have made use of the latest technology and taken advantage of new developments in electronics and computer science. I have no doubt that this receptiveness to change will continue. But change should come from within law enforcement agencies. It should not be imposed from the outside. And change should come only when it has been proved that present methods are unsatisfactory. It should follow research conducted by police for police services. It should be accomplished in order to meet goals set by the police, not those established by unqualified outside agencies.

It is time, in short, that police agencies re-establish control of their own destinies. There is, after all, only a limited amount of public funds available to the police, and it would be the height of folly to waste these funds on studies that are useless or even harmful to the cause of law enforcement.

What can be done?

First of all, I believe Congress must pass legislation permitting the police to have a say in the distribution of LEAA funds. The police should be allowed to identify areas where research is needed and advise officials on proper recipients of Federal monies.

At the state level, police officials should communicate more with their representatives on law enforcement planning councils. There must be a continuing dialogue between those who decide where tax funds should be spent and those who will receive and use these funds.

Government has become increasingly powerful today, I believe, because Americans have permitted it. They have allowed politicians and bureaucrats to make for them decisions they should be making for themselves. Perhaps they have forgotten that things could be any other way. Despite lip-service to the concept of bringing the government closer to the people, centralized authority in Washington holds greater power than ever before.

The law enforcement community, for its part, must take a leadership role in attempting to reverse this trend. The police must remain close to the people they serve. They must have the flexibility to act according to local conditions, to meet local needs. They should not be prevented, by some arbitrary, externally-imposed rules of procedure, from taking a creative, constructive role in community life.

I am not suggesting that we all go our own ways, and abandon regional and national approaches to law enforcement problems. We share many of the same problems, and have many of the same needs. Individual police agencies cannot afford to fund their own research. Total autonomy would produce an expensive, wasteful duplication of efforts.

Clearly, there is a need for cooperation today, and there will always be such a need. But I am convinced we can achieve this cooperation without relinquishing control of our individual destinies.

We need research, but we need research that is directed toward our missions and objectives.

We need standards, but we need standards that are devised by qualified police professionals to help make law enforcement more effective.

Let this, then be our goal in the coming months and years: to continue to chart new directions in police service, to explore the creative possibilities of crime control and prevention in our society, but to do so with the realization that they must be our directions and our possibilities.

After all, it is we who, in the long run, must answer for them.

Thank you for your attention.

I hope to see all of you in Washington in September.

GROUP WORKSHOP SESSIONS

The committee membership was then divided into these pre-assigned group workshops, for the purpose of studying the feasibility of implementing certain of the recommended standard areas contained within the Report on Police.

Following is a listing of the workshop delegates and their assigned areas of study.

GROUP WORKSHOP

GROUP: A

GROUP LEADER: Chief Joseph R. Connell
Westford, Massachusetts

PARTICIPANTS: Massachusetts
Vermont
Connecticut
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
New York
New Jersey
Maine

ASSIGNED AREAS:

Chapter I
The Police Role

Standards 1. 1 through 1. 7

GROUP: B

GROUP LEADER: Chief A. E. Rhodenizer
Lexington, Virginia
(Report delivered by Chief William Barnes,
West Palm Beach, Florida)

PARTICIPANTS: Virginia
Kentucky
Mississippi
South Carolina
West Virginia
Delaware
Tennessee
Alabama
Florida
Georgia
Pennsylvania
Canadian Delegations

ASSIGNED AREAS:

Chapter IV
Criminal Justice Relations

Standards 4. 1 through 4. 5
Recommendations 4. 1 through 4. 3

GROUP: C

GROUP LEADER: Chief Felix Lujan
Santa Fe, New Mexico
(Report delivered by Chief Brad Epperson,
Rock Hill, Missouri)

PARTICIPANTS: New Mexico
Arkansas
Texas
Kansas
Oklahoma
Nebraska
Louisiana
Missouri
Iowa

ASSIGNED AREAS:

Chapter XIII
Recruitment and Selection

Standards 13.1 through 13.6
Recommendations 13.1, 13.2

GROUP: D

GROUP LEADER: Chief Daryl Plath
Hastings, Minnesota
(Report delivered by Chief Wayne Shepherd,
University of Utah)

PARTICIPANTS: Minnesota
Michigan
Wyoming
Wisconsin
Montana
Utah
Illinois

North Dakota
Colorado
Ohio
South Dakota
Indiana

ASSIGNED AREAS:

Chapter XVIII
Employee Relations

Standards 18.1 through 18.4

GROUP:

E

GROUP LEADER:

Chief James R. Land
Lacey, Washington

PARTICIPANTS:

California
Hawaii
Washington
Nevada
Arizona
Alaska
Oregon
Idaho

ASSIGNED AREAS:

Chapter XIX
Internal Discipline

Standards 19.1 through 19.6
Recommendation 19.1

INSTRUCTIONS

Your group has been assigned the above standard(s) to study and prepare recommendations on. Your Group Leader and fellow participants have been identified.

It is recommended that you meet Tuesday evening to get your workshop "off the ground." By this, it is suggested that you get to know your Group Leader and fellow participants, and become familiar with your assigned areas of responsibility.

Once you feel comfortable with your assignment, and are certain you know what your areas of responsibility are, your group should feel free to adjourn until 8:00 A.M. Wednesday morning.

It is important to keep in mind that your group report will constitute a major portion of a final report to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration from the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The Committee of State Associations of Chiefs of Police will be identified as the author of that report. The final report will, in all likelihood, receive nationwide distribution. We would appreciate, within reason, as complete a final written report from each group as possible.

Further, one or more members from your group will be designated by the Group Leader to present an oral report (check the times assigned on the agenda) to the entire session.

METHODOLOGY

For each standard area assigned to your group, please include in your report:

- A generalized view of the standard as seen by your group.
- Feasibility of implementing the standard.

NOTE: The consideration should not be restricted to whether the standard is "good or bad," but could it be implemented.

- Fiscal considerations.
 - Manpower
 - Equipment
- Considerations affecting department morale.
- Legal considerations.
- Political considerations.
- Considerations affecting relationships with:
 - other law enforcement agencies
 - the courts
 - prosecutors
 - corrections officials
 - social workers.
- Any discussion or observation you may wish to note on problems between NAC and NBA Standards.
- Problems between Standard and traditional requirements.

GROUP REPORT A

Chief Joseph Connell, Westford, Massachusetts

Our report is unanimous, with no dissent, and it is concise. It is the generalized view of Group A, which consists of all the New England states: Massachusetts, Vermont, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Maine, New York and New Jersey. We unanimously, unequivocally reject as untenable, the endorsement of the Report on Police of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, prior to a study by our respective state chiefs of police associations. We further

reject acceptance of this report as the criteria for obtaining Federal funds. Thank you.

Question from Chairman: I assume, if I understand it, you were assigned The Police Role in your deliberations, is that correct? And if I interpreted what you said, you unanimously reject the total report until further study. Is that it?

Chief Connell: We reject in total the report, but our assigned area was The Police Role. We reject it until further study by the respective chiefs of police associations.

Audience: Is there an opportunity for questions?

Chairman: I think there probably should be, absolutely. We'd better take questions and have Chief Connell return to the podium for questions and discussion.

Audience: Is there any qualifier on that recommendation? What do you base it on, lack of capability of going through the whole report, or the lack of being able to speak for your entire state, or what's the qualifier, because it's a pretty emphatic recommendation.

Chief Connell: One question. What was the first question he said?

Audience: The question is do you have any qualifiers on your recommendation, or what did you base your recommendation on?

Chief Connell: The entire group recognizes the value of the fact that there should be standards and goals in every organization. In some instances, and in perhaps most instances, the report that we were to make recommendations on had not been received, in some cases until we arrived here, in some cases a few days before we departed for this locale. As I mentioned in the report, that we reject the endorsement of the report prior to study by our respective state chiefs of police associations.

Audience: Chief, excuse me, did you consider the feasibility of implementation of any of these standard areas?

Chief Connell: No, we felt that again, unanimously, naturally implementation comes only after evaluation, analysis, and this should be the function of the respective state organizations.

Audience: Chief, I was under the impression when I came up here from Mississippi, and I imagine all of them liked me and wanted me to represent them, that is our respective state associations. I take issue with you on this subject. I think we are selected by our people to come up here and to look on this book that we've gone through, and make some judgement. Perhaps your state might be different from mine, but that's why I'm taking issue.

Chief Connell: Well, I might respond to that, chief. Merely to reiterate what has been said here many times during the conference that some of our organizations have not been apprised of various documents that come out of Washington, D.C. I think that, some of us are not too familiar with the composition of the committees that are charged with the responsibilities in their respective states to bring about changes in the law enforcement structure. In many cases, there's no background whatsoever of these individuals, many of these individuals. Many of these committees, and perhaps I speak only for my own state, but I don't think so, have a minority police representation. It would be certainly a dark day for all of us if we were to accept as inevitable, that on the invitation of our own IACP, and funded by LEAA, that we were going to endorse carte blanche standards which, in most cases, have not even been exposed to the membership. Certainly, I don't propose, I cannot and will not be so presumptuous as to think that I speak for every single chief of police in Massachusetts, nor am I so presumptuous as to think, or to believe that any one of us, nationally or internationally, who might even represent large municipalities, metropolitan areas, is bigger than the smaller chief of police in any one state organization. In any one of our state organizations I think we will all concur that the strength lies in the small town, cities, and towns chiefs of police, or police departments. And, certainly, I think that I can state without reservations that few chiefs of police in Massachusetts have had an opportunity to observe let alone digest the contents of this book. I think that when we do, it will perhaps induce us to look into the other volumes that deal with the criminal justice system, and we all know and concur that one time this was the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, now it's the Criminal Justice System, and we don't feel that although we recognize the need for standards and goals, we don't think

they should be mandated from Washington, D. C.

Chairman: For the record, before I recognize New Hampshire, I would like to read the methodology that we were instructed to perform as a result of our deliberations on the various assigned five areas that was given the various groups for their consideration. The methodology was for each standard area assigned to the group, to include in the report, a generalized view of the standard as seen by your group, assembled, the feasibility of implementing that particular standard, and with a note here, the consideration should not be restricted to whether the standard is good or bad, but could it be implemented, and fiscal considerations as to manpower and equipment requirements. Considerations affecting department morale, legal considerations, political considerations, considerations affecting relationships with other law enforcement agencies, the courts, prosecutors, correction officials, social workers, and any discussion or observation you may wish to note on problems between the NAC, which is the National Advisory Commission Report, that's the book in the National Bar Association standards as they related to the individual areas assigned. Any any problems that you see between the standard and the traditional requirements as we know them in policing. Now, New Hampshire you are recognized.

Audience: There were five groups involved in this, we have heard only from the first group at the moment. There is group one's area of the United States, if we take the other four groups, you might end up with that. How about the rest of the party? If we paid attention yesterday, we heard a gentleman up there, hold this book up and refer to it as a package. What we don't want to hear is a group one endorsement or approval, a group two approval, three four and five, to this or this. And this gets our package shoved down our throats next year. This is what we're trying to avoid. This is why we looked at all of these, and felt that we just could not follow that. Not forty pages out of 665.

Chairman: Any further discussion on Group One? Chief Barnes, Group Two report.

Chief Barnes, Florida: Through the democratic process, we elected a recorder and a reporter. Our recorder did a heck of a job. The report

is here. Our group met with due deliberation and, frankly, we didn't look at this as to whether we were endorsing the whole book or not. We took our particular section and went over it page by page, and we could find nothing that was not acceptable to law enforcement. To be against this, is like being against motherhood and everything else. Because, in our particular section what we had to look at was, frankly, what we, as professional police officers, believe in, what we've been yelling about for years, and there was absolutely nothing that was not palatable to us. We do question the implementation of it because we feel that while we really go along with these particular sections, we don't know just exactly how the other facets of the criminal justice system are going to go along with it. The first section for consideration was cooperation and coordination. How in the hell can you be against that? Every police should immediately act to insure understanding and cooperation between the agency and all other elements of the criminal justice system, and should immediately plan and implement appropriate coordination of its efforts with those other elements of the criminal justice system. And the first standard, every police agency should cooperate with other elements of the criminal justice system, in processing criminal cases from arrest, to trial within 60 days. We feel that the 60 days might be a little unrealistic, but states, many states throughout the United States have already got laws limiting the amount of time that a case can stay in the judicial process. So, consequently, it can only help us. Police officers throughout the country are constantly screaming about the undue amount of time that cases take to go through the judicial system. As much as two years, and things of this type. And that in that length of time we are losing witnesses that we're losing interested persons to prosecute the case. So, this can only help law enforcement, frankly. Because, as was said here yesterday, nothing starts, the wheel doesn't begin rolling until we start the wheel rolling. We institute the case through the courts, so consequently our part of it should be done at that time, and a speedy and a quick trial can only help us in the law enforcement field. We could see nothing wrong with endorsing that particular segment. Every police agency should consider where -- oh, and we didn't also feel that there were any fiscal considerations, manpower, or equipment, and other considerations that would affect us in law enforcement. No considerations affecting department morale, because it could only boost department morale. We did feel that our relationships in this with the courts and the prosecutors and so forth, that we felt that that was their wagon, that they had to load it and haul it, and if we loaded the wagon for them, that the implementation of it,

then it was up to them to handle it from there on. That every police agency should consider where appropriate, to seek the formation of a criminal justice coordinating council, with members representation of law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies within the local government. There can be nothing really wrong with that to get together, and if you, under the system that Los Angeles operates under, nothing official, no minutes, no rules and regulations and so forth, while they do say, in here, they should develop policy and institute planning and coordination, we feel that's just a guideline, and if a policy of this type would be implemented it could only help you to have an opportunity to trace across the table the various members of your criminal justice system. We felt that would be no budgetary problem, no morale problem, no fiscal problem, no problem between agencies, just a problem of getting the individuals together. Section Three, every police agency should support training programs that promote understanding and cooperation to the development of unified interdisciplinary training for all elements of the criminal justice system. We saw nothing wrong with that. That's something that we try to do anyway. Most agencies are doing this, we felt nothing out of line with that at all. These programs should provide for the instruction of police personnel in the functions of all criminal justice agencies in order to place the police role in its proper prospective.

And that's just as it should be. Should encourage where appropriate police participation in training given to members of other criminal justice agencies. Well, I think that if we stick our head in the sand and don't realize that there are other sections of the criminal justice system, that we're just kidding ourselves. I think that we in the law enforcement field have far outstripped the court systems, the correction systems and the prosecutors and all the rest of them. We are the only group within the criminal justice system that has on-going constant training programs to upgrade our police officers, and as a result of it we should not feel hesitant at all to participate in training programs of other criminal justice agencies. I think, frankly that they can use the expertise that has been developed in the law enforcement field. We feel that this would raise the morale of law enforcement personnel because of a number of factors. One of those being that it would give the individual self-satisfaction in knowing that he was doing a good job and to aid in the operation of another agency. We also were assigned Standard 4.2, police operational effectiveness within the criminal justice system. I want to say that one of our members, give credit where credit is due, from Beckley, West Virginia, he did his homework well. We've got quite a lengthy report to turn into you, typewritten, about 20 pages or so. Every police agency

should immediately insure the operational effectiveness in dealing with other elements of the criminal justice system. Well, what can you find wrong with that? Every police agency should develop procedures in cooperation with the local courts and prosecutors to allow on-duty officers to be on call when subpoenaed to testify in criminal matters.

Through the cooperation between law enforcement agencies and the prosecutors officers and through pre-trial conferences, it would not be necessary for a police officer to appear at the trial until notified by the prosecuting attorney's office. Therefore, the agency would receive maximum performance of the officer during his own duty time. We feel that through the development of liaison officers, who, through cooperative efforts of the courts and the prosecuting attorney's office, that these law enforcement agencies would be kept abreast of criminal cases, thus being able to prevent legal mistakes in major criminal cases. Through the development of a liaison officer in the juvenile court system, the courts could be made aware of the circumstances of the complaint, and with the cooperation of the court, refer various cases to the appropriate social agencies. Each agency should be aware of individuals that have been released from various penal institutions so that individual's conduct in the community could be monitored, and thus an accurate evaluation of the socio-economic -- you can talk like that up in West Virginia? -- pressures could be made by the agency responsible for such reports. If this type of information exchange was set up, the agency responsible could be advised that the individuals having problems performing under the pressures so that he could be referred to a social agency for counselling, thereby eliminating the problem before it becomes critical. The liaison officer would be responsible for the notification to other agencies of the arrest of fugitives to make the arrangements for the return of fugitives to the area where the outstanding warrants are on file. Also see that all information pertaining to wanted persons and fugitives are forwarded to NCIC as well as seeing that all statistical data is forwarded to the various state and federal agencies. Responsible to see that information requested from other law enforcement agencies is expeditiously processed. It is the responsibility of the liaison officer to keep all other agencies advised of any criminal activity by individuals believed to be from other locations. We had a little conversation about 2B, where it says every police agency should develop and maintain liaison with juvenile courts to divert in appropriate circumstances juveniles from the juvenile justice system and to preserve confidentiality of proceedings to the greatest extent possible. Our trouble developed in this particular section B, in whether

we were dealing with the court in the matter of the judge in diverting these cases, or whether we were dealing with a juvenile officer or a youth services officer to divert these things before they got to the court. We read this over a number of times, and we came to the conclusion that if we take this for what it says, that we are dealing with the juvenile court in the form of the juvenile judge, who would divert these cases, and we felt that it meant that the individual would get into the court system. If we are talking about a youth intake officer, or someone that would divert these cases prior to being handled in the court, then that would not be including develop and maintain liaison with probation and parole officers, in order to exchange information on the status and activities of released persons who are still under sentence. The only thing we can say about that is that it must be a two-way street. If it is a one-way street, it will not work, but if the corrections people are interested in making this work from us, than it could only be helpful to us. Other federal, state and local law enforcement agencies in order to arrange for the arrest and return fugitives and so forth. That we should cooperate with the establishment of task force efforts with other criminal justice agencies. We felt that this could only lead to the benefit of law enforcement. And it was brought out by some of our chiefs that they were in departments that were not large enough to release a man, for instance, to work with a task force. But it was our feeling that these are the departments that would benefit from the results of what the task force does.

I don't think that a small department would be expected to give manpower to a task force. We feel that it would be the task force that would help the small department. We didn't feel, frankly, that there was a great deal of trouble in implementing this, but fiscal considerations, of course, must be taken into consideration. It's not felt that the fiscal matter is a matter for the individual cities. We felt that a task force of this type would have to be financed by either the state or the federal level.

To give you an example, the one in Florida is financed cooperatively through the state and the federal government. Our state criminal investigation agency furnishes manpower; the prosecutor's office furnishes manpower; and the internal revenue furnishes manpower. So it's a consideration. We don't feel that it's a consideration that must be worried about at the local level. The only thing with the manpower and equipment, and if you were large enough to support it with manpower and equipment, I would think that you would be only to glad to, because it's going to give you back more than you put into it.

We felt that there would be no bearing on department morale in a case such as this, because it could only increase the morale in your department. Legal considerations are something that must be thought of as moving a man out of the area that he has his authority in, and it's something that must be taken care of at a higher level.

Political considerations, of course, must be considered.

Our next section was diversion. Every police agency, where permitted by law, should immediately divert from the criminal and juvenile justice systems, any individual who comes to the attention of the police, and for whom the purpose of the criminal or juvenile process would be inappropriate. Or in whose case, other resources would be more effective. All diversion dispositions should be made pursuant to the written agency policy that insures fairness and uniformity of treatment. Police chief executives may develop written policies and procedures which allow, in appropriate cases, for juveniles who come to the attention of the agency to be diverted from the juvenile justice process, and such policies and procedures should be prepared in cooperation with other elements of the juvenile justice system. These policies and procedures should allow for the processing of the mentally ill persons who come to the attention of the agency, and we should be prepared to cooperate with the mental health authorities. And also arrest for misdemeanor offenses to be diverted. Now, gentlemen, this is exactly what law enforcement has been doing for years. This is exactly what the well-trained man on the street has been doing. In his discretion he has a written warning ticket, or he gives a citation for an appearance in court, or an actual arrest of the person and taking him into custody and incarcerating him. Now, diverting individuals from the criminal justice system who don't need to be there; the mentally ill, the alcoholic, these are some of the cases that in some states you are being forced to do it.

In the state of Florida, there is no longer a crime of being drunk. The individual is turned over to an alcoholic rehabilitation center or some type of hospitalization. They're considered to be sick people, and there's no greater friend that the drunk has than law enforcement. We've been taking care of these people for years. There's no more sympathetic group of people to the drunk than the law enforcement officer has been over the years. After giving it some very serious thought, we feel that we should do this, that we should cooperate fully with this. Nothing is said about the mentally ill person. We all know that they have no business being in the criminal justice system unless they have violated a law, and if they have, if they're eligible to be in criminal justice system, there's no

problem as far as mental health is concerned.

But if it's an individual who is obviously mentally deranged, or needing help of some kind, then we should cooperate fully in getting these people out of the criminal justice system, and into the treatment facilities where they can be helped.

We don't think that there's any problem as far as manpower or equipment involved in this; we don't think there's a fiscal operation that has to be worried about. We do feel that there are certain legal considerations and political considerations that must be handled. Some of these facilities are made available outside your particular jurisdiction and you are placed in a position, as some police officers and chiefs say, of being a delivery service for these people. Well, these are some of the political considerations that must be taken into consideration. Some places have solved it by having a regular service that will pick these people up at your station.

Our next section was citation and release on recognizance. This is also another area that is already covered in many states. Every police agency should immediately place maximum effective use of state statutes permitting police agencies to issue written summonses and citations in lieu of physical arrest or pre-arraignment confinement. Every police agency should also cooperate in programs that permit arraigned defendants to be released on their own recognizance in lieu of money bail in appropriate cases. Now, gentlemen, once we get past our old police thinking that it's our duty to put these people in jail and punish them, and get back to thinking that this individual is really not guilty until he's found guilty, then this does not become too hard to swallow. If certain provisions are made wherein the individual does not live up to his end of the bargain, that additional charges are placed against him, then you're in no worse situation than you are right now with your traffic citations. Every police agency should take all available steps to assure that at the time arraigned, defendants are considered for pretrial release, and a previous criminal history or present conditional release status, if any, is documented and evaluated by the courts in determining whether defendants are released or confined pending trial. Every police agency should place special emphasis on the expeditiously serving of all outstanding warrants obtained by the agency, and particularly those issued due to the defendants failure to appear at court proceedings. Get this individual back into the court system at the earliest possible moment.

We don't feel that a manpower problem is involved in this. We feel that it is a feasibility of implementing, and it is really not a great problem as far as department morale is concerned. It's an individual situation that must be taken into consideration, that is, how does a police officer feel about citing an individual for a petty offense. We don't feel that -- we've had things face us in law enforcement that have shaken us to the ground a hell of a lot more than something like this will. We feel that our relationship with the court must be such that the court will take a very serious look at how they handle the individual that fails to abide by that particular court.

4.5 was our next section, which is the criminal case follow-up. The standard could work provided that the department had a liaison officer that could keep the prosecuting attorney's office abreast of criminal activity occurring in the area that it's felt to be the direct result of an individual that is coming up for trial. As well as advise the prosecuting attorney of all criminal histories with dispositions of all the cases of the individual being tried for various criminal charges. This is the one the standard that says that every police agency in cooperation with local courts and prosecuting agencies should provide for the administrative follow-up of selected criminal cases. Policies and procedures should be developed. It's one of your duties anyway. To identify criminal cases which because of extenuating circumstances of the defendant's criminal history require special attention of the prosecuting attorney. And to require police representatives to attend, personally, all open judicial proceedings relating to these cases and to maintain close personal liaison with the assigned prosecutors. Every police agency should review administratively all major criminal cases in which prosecuting agencies declined to prosecute or later caused to be dismissed. And that review should result in a referral of each such case to the concerned officers' commanding officer for administrative action to correct any police deficiencies which may have weakened the case. We don't feel that that's involving us in anything that we shouldn't be doing right now. If our men are taking cases to the prosecutor's office that are weak, that have not been prepared properly, then we are the first ones that should know about it. We don't feel that this is anything that we can't live with. It should result in a referral of each case to the prosecuting agency for that agency's action to correct any deficiencies for which it might have been responsible. We are firmly convinced that the prosecuting agencies should be held liable for what they do, and if they don't prosecute it fully and are fully aware of all aspects of the case, then it should be brought to their attention. You are going to have a problem there in your liaison, your relationship with the prosecutor's

office. As far as the standard saying that every police agency should encourage courts and prosecuting agencies routinely to evaluate investigations, case preparation, and the courtroom demeanor, and the testimony of police officers, and to inform the police agency of these evaluations. If you aren't doing it now, you should be doing it. Because if we run along here fat, dumb, and happy, and think that all of our men are doing the job over there the way that you did it when you were an investigator and a police officer, the better off we're all going to be. So, consequently, if we take this criticism or constructive criticism, for just exactly what it is to make the entire criminal justice system run smoother, then we'll all be better off for it.

We don't like, I know I don't and I don't think anyone else likes to be told that you're not going a good job. But damnit, if you're not doing a good job, let's know about it and let's do something about it. Because believe me, we do our share of the bitching when they don't do their job.

Every police agency formally should make information from its files available and it goes on. Well, we consider that if it isn't being done, it certainly should be done, and we don't see any problem with that, and we don't see any legal considerations, political considerations, fiscal consideration, or any other type of considerations involved in that at all. There were some recommendations involved, and that was on alcohol and drug abuse centers. You can't be against those.

It's recommended that every state enact legislation that provides authority for civil commitment and diversion of persons who because of alcoholism or drug addiction are in need of treatment, and who should be dealt with outside of the criminal justice system. Legislation should provide funding for the treatment centers, where such persons can receive both detoxification and follow-up care. It bears back on one of the preceding standards. We can only go along with this whole-heartedly because we of all people realize that alcoholism is a sickness; and drugs, we have not solved the drug problem by throwing the drug addict in jail. So consequently, some form of treatment that works, some form of treatment that guarantees that the individual will stay in these treatment centers, until he is "cured." We feel that we have to go along with that.

Now, we come to the telephonic search warrants. It's recommended that every state enact legislation that provides for the issuance for search warrants pursuant to telephone petitions and affidavits from police officers. We feel that that can only help law enforcement and manpower in getting his work done, and that there must be safeguards built into the system, there must be safeguards built into it as far as the recording that is taken by the judge so that the police officer can be protected, the judge can be protected, and in fact, I think our friend from Delaware said that they were required to keep them for ten years. Ten years they must keep these recordings, so we see nothing in this that can hurt law enforcement, it can only help us. It's doubtful that it will be enacted in a great number of places. Court-supervised electronic surveillance. The commission recommends that each state enact legislation prohibiting private electronic surveillances, and authorizing court supervised electronic surveillance by law enforcement officers consistent with the provisions of Title Three of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. No problem, we are of the opinion that things of this type should be controlled, that indiscriminate use of electronic equipment and surveillance equipment should be halted and should be done legally and through the court system and we see nothing wrong with that recommendation. We go along with it. We see no fiscal problems involved with it, we see no manpower problems involved with it, we see no liaison problems or anything else. Gentlemen, we do not find anything obnoxious, or repulsive or anything else in the section we dealt in. Maybe we were extremely fortunate, but the section we dealt with we felt were pretty much the feelings of professional law enforcement as it is, and we endorse the commissions and the task force's recommendations wholeheartedly. Were there any questions? New York.

Audience: I don't have any questions, but I do take exception to your remark "rejecting this like rejecting motherhood." We didn't reject the item, and I stand corrected by any of the committee. We didn't reject the items per se. But our objection was with the methodology with which this whole thing was dealt with. I know of a dozen police chiefs, myself included, in New York State that did not receive this topic. Number One. Number Two. You're considering, as my friend from New Hampshire said, there'd be a hundred or two hundred pages out of six hundred. We're concerned about what's in the other four or five hundred pages. In the items we were concerned with -- and this is a personal opinion, when I read it, I found it rife with semantics, ambiguity, and everything else. This is what I personally objected to. Plus the fact that I'm sure all of us that have children,

have seen the books, see Jane, see Jane run, well, that's what this impressed me as. Because if I didn't do the stuff that they're putting down here, and treating me like a child, then I wouldn't be a police chief, I wouldn't have a police department. These are what our objections were. Not that we were objecting to standards and goals per se, we know we need them, I guess everyone in the room have them, we were just objecting to the format and the way this was done. This was our main gripe.

Chief Barnes: If you have taken anything I've said as criticizing your group, you didn't listen to me very well. I said that being against, and we're only concerned with this portion that we were given to look into. I said that we felt that being against any particular standards that we were given to look into would be like being against motherhood and sex. Because we don't feel that they're obnoxious, these particular sections, we don't feel that they're out of line in any way, we don't feel that they're anything that we're not doing or should be doing at this time. We didn't look into any of the other sections of the book, and if we had been given other sections, we might be feeling differently about it. We also frankly never, probably because it never entered into our mind to look at the book as a whole. We checked the sections that we were given to check into. So consequently, I mean I'm a member of the group just such as you are, reporting on my particular section, and in no position to endorse the book as a whole, or to not endorse it as a whole. I know a hell of a lot of work went into it, and I'm glad I didn't have the job of doing it, because it's certainly not going to make everybody happy. That's for sure. Here's our report, typewritten one and notes. Any other questions?

Audience: Who was in your group?

Chief Barnes: A fine group of people. Chief A. Rhodenizer of Lexington, Virginia was our exalted group leader. He led us with firmness right down the line and didn't let us deviate. He let us take a break one time, and that was the extent of that. And then there was the honorable states of Virginia -- listen to these now, with longing hearts -- Virginia, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, West Virginia, Delaware, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, Maryland, Georgia, North Carolina, but North Carolina wasn't there, nor Maryland, and the state of Pennsylvania got in there somehow, and we never were able to understand unless he was a spy sent into our group.

Audience: Mr. Chairman, also we have to recognize the gentlemen from --

Chief Barnes: Right. We also had our brothers from the north, Canada, and believe me, they have problems, just like we do. Anybody that thinks that our brothers from Canada have got the total answer, they're wrong. Yes sir.

Audience: Your membership and their respective organizations, represented by your group, have they had benefit of --

Chief Barnes: Of seeing this book? All I can say to that is, I can answer for my own self. We received this book several weeks, a month ago, in the state of Florida. But maybe because we asked for it. But we received all of the volumes quite awhile ago, and we have had a chance to go through it. If you're group did not receive it, I would probably feel the same way that you did. But, as I say, we have had the benefit of having this book for quite awhile. Yes sir.

Audience: (inaudible)

Chief Barnes: That would be a problem. Because you would take extradition to get them back, wouldn't it, or kidnapping.

Audience: (inaudible)

Chief Barnes: Yes. With us we feel that it could only help us in the terms of manpower and so forth to be able to have a citation issued rather than.

Audience: But the only problem is, if the state legislature read this book (inaudible).

Chief Barnes: We can't hold them anytime. There's no statute.

Audience: Throughout this book, in various places, it says you should do this, you should do that. Washington would be, if the arrangements are going to be effective, change that should to shall.

Chief Barnes: I don't believe that they would. We didn't take this probably in that particular vein. We took our own particular sections that we were to look into, and if they were to change it, in those sections to should, I don't think that there would be a great deal of problems involved with this. In our sections we're talking about cooperation between agencies. We're talking about cooperation with the court system, setting up liaison with courts. We're talking about the taking the alcoholic out of the criminal justice system, taking the mentally deficient out of the criminal justice system. Like I say, we were probably very fortunate in the sections that were given to us, because we find nothing innocuous about it all.

Audience: (inaudible) Somewhere in this standard there should be some place to release the public of an obligation to a criminal once he has gotten into a case of recidivism, where he will repeat. I don't think the public will hold with a repeater, bond after bond after bond.

Chief Barnes: We feel that that's a job for your legislature.

Audience: (inaudible).

Chief Barnes: Another item from me will just take another minute. Take the alcoholic, the drunk. One of our members brought up the fact that Mr. Bigshot down at the bank is picked up time after time for drunk, and he gets out for ten dollars, and he's got the \$10 in his pocket. And poor old Joe Wino, he's picked up and he hasn't got a dime, so he gets the whole bale of hay. Under this new setup, we'll be able to take Mr. Bigshot from down at the Atlantic National Bank and run him through the alcoholic rehabilitation center and he does just like poor old Joe Wino, and he get the full bale of hay, too. We feel that will help us in the long run, also. Yes sir.

Audience: Do you have that law on your books now?

Chief Barnes: Yes.

Audience: It's not mandatory that they go, is that correct?

Chief Barnes: It's not mandatory that they stay.

Audience: They don't handle those. Cause I've been in two states with the same law, and it's a bunch of malarkey. Because a guy can go in there, and go right out the door when he doesn't like what you're doing.

Chief Barnes: But it doesn't say anything in the world against you putting him in jail if he's violated a law, other than being drunk.

Audience: Being drunk is violating the law.

Chief Barnes: Not anymore. That's right. Well, that's what I say. Just being drunk is no reason for going to jail anymore.

Audience: But you put your banker man in jail, or in that ...

Chief Barnes: We can deliver him there. What does he do when you put him through your system? Same thing. He's right out there, and it's cost him \$10.

Audience: (inaudible).

Chief Barnes: Well, I don't know how you do it in Nebraska, but I'd like to see you keep me in jail for a sleeper, I mean when I have somebody there to take me out. Thank you.

BRAD EPPERSON - GROUP THREE

I was appointed to take the notes in our workshop and to make this presentation. I'm not going to go into elaborate details as to everything that was said about every area because it didn't take us long to decide that police departments come in various sizes throughout the United States and that some of their needs are different. The needs of all departments are not the same. I was hoping that Commissioner Looney would be here. I would like to personally congratulate him on the remarks that he made. I think they were very appropos and very timely. I believe he has an interview outside at this time but, anyway, that's how I feel.

I would like to just read this report, and we'll try to answer any questions that you might have as to how we felt about the various areas. With direct reference to the assignment of group workshop C, specifically to evaluate Chapter Eight, of the publication Police of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. The delegates were from the states of New Mexico, Arkansas, Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Louisiana, Missouri and Iowa, and the following is a report of that workshop.

Sort of sounds like a police report, doesn't it? The area that we were concerned with was police recruiting. Standard 13.1 was general police recruiting. We felt that by no means should the responsibility and authority to recruit one's own police officers be relinquished to any other agency. This is the responsibility of law enforcement, part of the criteria of professionalism that we must select our ranks, police our own ranks and we should not relinquish this authority to any agency. And each department, depending on their particular needs, should set up their own criteria for recruitment. All hiring should be done by the police chief, or at the recommendation or direction of the chief of police. Also, no person should be accepted in police service unless he or she possesses a minimum of a G.E.D. certificate. Credit should be given for each higher level of education, whether it be a high school diploma, a law enforcement certificate, a bachelor of arts, or a master's degree. But, additional credit, financial credit, should be given to officers with these higher levels of education after at least one probationary year.

It was felt that regardless of whether a man has a degree or not, it is necessary for him to have at least one year, possibly two or more years of practical police experience before he is taken off his probationary status. We felt where it states that police agencies should provide application and testing procedures at decentralized locations, etc., that this should not read should, but it could read may, to present the testing procedures at different locations. Depending again on the size of the department.

It's already been said that various departments have various needs, various levels of needs, and throughout this document we find should is interjected and possibly could be "may", probably should be may. Again stating that this document is so lengthy, and would take so much digestion, that we read through it and took each item as it came up, and in places where we felt that it could be changed or should be changed, or we had a comment in reference to that item, we made note.

We felt that all other areas were acceptable. We felt that in recruiting, the financial reimbursement to officers should be discouraged. However, our individual officers and people in the police service should be encouraged to recruit fellow members into the profession. But to do it on just a body basis where you bring so many people in, and you receive financial reimbursement, we felt that was an unprofessional tactic.

We felt that people should be recruited from colleges and universities, but they should have at least, we felt that we should discuss minimal standards rather than what we would all like to see, and that is college people brought into the profession, and we decided that we would go with the idea of having a minimum of a G.E.D. so that the person could obtain college at a later time. So we are definitely in favor of college recruiting.

We addressed ourselves to minority recruiting, which is a very hot topic of these times. We have a general statement that we would like to make in reference to this. Minority recruitment should be encouraged, as should all recruitment practices. However, minimal standards, driver's license requirements, have at least a G.E.D. and physical fitness should never be disregarded. We should not lower the standards at all, to recruit minorities, but encourage minorities to bring themselves to a level where they could come into the profession. We don't want to lower the level of training or standards for law enforcement.

Next item was minimal, or correction state-mandated minimal training standards, which would be, of course, through legislative. We felt that this was acceptable as submitted, except that it should not exclude lie detector or PSE testing. We feel that this is a very important part of the testing. We feel that psychological evaluation, except for one gentlemen who questioned this some, but I think that I can speak for the group, that we feel that psychological evaluation is very necessary in the recruiting process.

The selection process by which people should be selected was the next item we addressed ourselves to. We felt that because of the time factor involved, we could not possibly give a recommendation or an attitude on this as we felt about the employment of women in our business. We probably spent more time discussing employment of females in law enforcement than any other area. There was much discussion, there was much differences of opinion, and different feelings about this. However, we did not come to a positive conclusion as to our feeling about this. We did feel, though, that whatever the person is hired for, and in whatever level of law enforcement, it should be job related. They should only be assigned to duties that would be conducive to their personalities, or, in this case, their sex.

Recommendation 13.1, job related ability and personality, inventory test, police attitudes is primarily what I just said. And we were generally in favor of this. Development and validation of selection scoring system. We were generally in favor of this. We felt that probably more, let's say a better cross-section of recruiting could be obtained if there were certain validation scores, for various areas that a person might have in his favor, and with a minimum standard or minimum score through this evaluation we felt that we might get a better cross-section of people in law enforcement. Still maintaining the high level and high standards that we would desire. In conclusion, it was felt by the members of the group that the police, meaning the document Police, is an excellent reference manual, but by no means should be enacted into law. It seemed like many people on our group and from conversations that I have heard, are very skeptical about legislation that might be at the Federal level and for whatever reason it might be, would be undesirable and at this period in time our group felt that this should not be enacted into law, because we feel that Federal legislation is limiting to what we could do in our various areas.

If anyone has any questions, I'll try to answer them to the best of my ability. We did feel that we were not in a position to respond for every police chief in our state. But we also decided that we were delegates from our states and we had some responsibility to make a commitment to this report for which we were assigned. So, if anyone has any questions, I'll try to answer them.

Audience: Could you elaborate a little bit on the minority recruiting aspect. I would like to hear what you discussed and what your views on minority recruitment were.

Mr. Epperson: We felt that this was definitely necessary. We felt that we should go after these people who are qualified in minorities. Whether they be black, or whether they be yellow people, we felt that we had a representation of that population within our respective areas, definitely these people should be well-represented. But as I say, well-represented, not just represented. And we would not relinquish qualify just to count bodies.

Audience: You're not talking about lowering standards, are you?

Mr. Epperson: No sir, not lowering standards in anyway.

Audience: I'm not against education, I think we need it, but I think you should incorporate a little more about training to tie with the educational need.

Mr. Epperson: This is, possibly I didn't go into great detail, we discussed the fact that a man coming out of a university or a college with a Bachelor's degree. And the idea was discussed that possibly, just because this man has a degree, he should start on the payroll at a higher level, according to pay scale. This should be after a period of time. But he must go through a probationary period, which is a very intensive training period as you well know. In law enforcement before he would get to this level. So we're definitely considering training as well as education. That's my opinion. Now does anyone have any ...yes sir, New Jersey.

Audience: Have you considered a man attending college while working (inaudible).

Mr. Epperson: Yes sir, we did. And that's why we decided on a minimal standard of a G.E.D. so that he would be able to.

Audience: (inaudible).

Mr. Epperson: We addressed ourselves to recruiting, sir. I would be happy to answer that if you'd like, but we did address ourselves, as far as from a personal standpoint, but we did address ourselves to recruiting. I feel, and I think every member of our committee feels that we should take this book home, many of us did not have an opportunity to go through it prior to this conference. I think we should really do some serious study of this. Before we come up with a recommendation that this should be passed into law. Yes sir.

Audience: As I said before, I would like to see a response by hands how many are in favor of the polygraph and the use of selective process, in recruiting.

Mr. Epperson: To elaborate on that just one moment, I think it would be appropos to see how the membership here feels about psychological evaluation. This is somewhat new in the recruiting process. I'd like to personally see a show of hands of people who are in favor of this.

Audience: May I say something just to qualify this. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the PSE, the psychological stress evaluator. We have one in our office. In Louisiana, we feel in our short experience of P.S.E., but that this machine is more beneficial than the old lie detector tests. It bears more into people, it's easier to take the test and as a result, there's more company, and certainly we don't want to put the lie detector out of business, but I don't think we should minimize the value of this P.S.E. For those of you that have access to it, I think will agree with me that it's just as important as the polygraph, and more comprehensive.

Mr. Epperson: I've seen it demonstrated only one time, and I have to concur it is a fine piece of machinery.

Audience: People keep mentioning Federal law, putting this thing into effect. As an individual, I don't think there will ever be one.

Mr. Epperson: Chief Barnes, I wish that I could agree with you, but I see a very socialistic trend in this country, and I'm very much opposed to it. I believe in state's rights, I believe in the rights of individual police departments, and I do not want to move in any direction that would enable the Federal government to control what I do in the state of Missouri, and in the city of Rock Hill, Missouri.

Audience: I certainly agree with you, but I feel that I've got to say that for this to be put into effect of law, you need 50 Senators and a hell of a lot of Representatives are going to have to pass it into law. I don't think that you and I are going to be around to see anyone pass this into law.

Mr. Epperson: Chief Barnes, I don't want my children around when it's passed into law, either, and I intend to do everything I can in my way to see that this does not happen. I think it's conducive of professionalism to set these channels, and set these standards ourselves, and not have them set for us by some other agency.

Audience: That's exactly what we're doing here.

Mr. Epperson: That's a personal opinion. I'm not acting in response to the committee.

Audience: That's why I was asking you, as an individual. If you just look at these things, that's not having someone else do it for us.

Mr. Epperson: New Hampshire.

Audience: Just like to point out two things that happened in New Hampshire in the past year. We're reckoning with our LEAA funds cut off, because they're not satisfied with our comprehensive plans. And in the second instance a representative came up from Boston, and told us that our crime commission is not representative, and our money is to be cut off. This is what we're concerned with. If they change those words should to shall, and then say you shall (inaudible). This is what we're concerned

with, we don't want this to happen. The place to stop it is here, not when they're going to do it.

Mr. Epperson: Absolutely. Oregon.

Audience: I probably said it to a lot of you already but, we were just talking about having to take criminal law. But it's state law, legislation pertaining to our standards and goals (inaudible).

Audience: Of course, you pays your money and you takes your chances with your own people in that business of law.

Oregon: Watching criminal justice planning. That's where you have to clean grants through. If you don't go along with it, you're not going to get any funds.

Audience: Of course I feel sort of silly saying I don't have any Federal money, when I am sitting here on Federal money that brought us here. But we don't take any Federal money. The people that I work for, and the community that I live in, they feel that if they can't support their police department, they don't need one. So you don't just ask for Federal money. Yet, here I sit at after LEAA brought me up here.

Mr. Epperson: There are probably some of us that are committed to Federal funds. In my particular community, we will not commit ourselves to Federal funding that is ongoing, if we can obtain a piece of equipment that is ours, after we obtain it, and it's not something that has to be ongoing, we will obtain it. But we decide what's done with it when we're finished with it, and there are no strings on us. If they want to take our car after it's worn out, they're welcome to it. I am just personally very paranoid about this, I see such a socialistic trend in our country. Chief Wood from Mississippi made a remark a while ago that I would like to reiterate. What are we getting into in this country? When the Supreme Court orders our President to turn over his tapes as he has. I am fearful for us. I think that we must take a very strong stand. I think that we should professionalize in every way that we can. Upgrade our training, upgrade our education and upgrade our cross-section of people who are

trained, educated, and in the profession of law enforcement, and stand strong against the socialistic trends that are not only in this country, but are in the world. Chief Wood.

Audience: I was listening to a gentlemen talking about the criminal justice planning commission. (inaudible) I'm quite concerned about this because I can see a form of a police review board to a certain extent to look into our inner workings of the police department, and have a bunch of civilians tell us what we need. (inaudible) I think we're getting into this and I think it's something that you should be highly concerned about. But if we set an accord to have x-number of civilians and we have a few police on this committee, then this is quite serious. I can see a trend for civilian review boards.

Mr. Epperson: I have those feelings very much myself. I don't know, since I have the floor I guess it's the speakers prerogative, and we're getting away from what I was called up here to do. But I would like to express a feeling that has been with me, it's been a motivating force to me in law enforcement, and I would like to pass it on to every one of you here. That our country so far has been ruled by professional people. The people with higher degrees, educational backgrounds, generally have ruled our country. Professional people. They have had to say a lot of what we do today. And I think that if we are ever to balance this imbalance that is now in existence, we must be professional. Part of the criteria of being professional is being educated. I would say to you to try to impress upon every police chief that you come in contact with to emphasize the importance of higher degrees of education in law enforcement. And I think that that is the only way we are going to show a force and really be heard as professional people. I don't like to get on a soapbox, but I wanted to take that opportunity to express this. I've expressed it in my own state and feel privileged to express that to members of the United States. Yes sir.

Audience: You've made several comments, or general comments have been made, relating to LEAA money. I would have to make this comment for all you gentlemen here today, and especially you, Brad, about the comments you just made about education. But, who has provided more money for law enforcement in the past few years than LEAA? Now, I will agree with all of you that the extremes that have been attacked have been generally bad. But where would law enforcement be today if all the problems we've had the last ten years if LEAA hadn't come to our aid, when we were struggling to keep our head above water. I'm not an

advocate of LEAA. I do say that we have accepted your money, and we have money that has educated our officers. Yet, then we turn around and downgrade LEAA. I think we're going to have to meet on an even level with them. And I will agree that we are going to have to keep our eyes on LEAA because it's Federally-funded, it is government, and the socialistic trend is here. But still, there's one point. Where would we be in law enforcement today, if LEAA hadn't stepped in when it did. I think that all of these programs, at least we are today, we're much better educated, and we're much sharper, and we're more professional and these are the things we must remember when we talk about LEAA. On one side they've given, on the other side they've taken away. But, let's all have an open mind to accept their mind and have better law enforcement year after year and these fine objectives say to all of you that I think without LEAA we would not be where we are today.

Mr. Epperson: Well, taken. I'd feel further we should possibly exercise the police prerogative and let's keep them straight. If there are no more questions, I would like to again express to Commissioner Looney the remarks I made prior to his coming into the room. That I certainly enjoyed your remarks, and I think that everyone here benefited by them. I feel personally privileged to hear them. Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you, Brad. Gentlemen, the reports and the discussions are very interesting and very informative and frankly, I am more convinced all the time that this is a very worthwhile conference. I do think, again, that I should make a couple of comments. First of all, one of the reasons of our being here is so that we can find out exactly what is going on. And you know yourself that it would be impossible to sit down and discuss a subject like this with 8,000 people. No way. We've got a representative from every state. Certainly there are things about LEAA that we do not like, and I also agree that there are things about LEAA that are pretty darn good for us. We've got to determine a balance there's no question about that. I think LEAA is just interested in that. I think that some of the problems that you are pointing out, though, have been created by our lack of effectiveness. By our fragmentation and by our lack of organization. If we'd have had this group as a regularly mid-year meeting group, to get together and discuss police problems, and understand, and get some unanimity of approach

I think this group could have been a very potent force in providing the guidelines for LEAA, rather than LEAA providing guidelines for us. But we are here, and this is our job, to review what we can of the standards and goals and submit a report. I also would like to make this comment. Some say how can they come up here and evaluate this report in the way we've allocated, and it's impossible, true. But this publication came out many months ago, and if you're like me, across my desk every morning comes a new publication, or maybe two, sometimes three. I wonder how many of you, actually, and let's be real honest, how many of you have taken the time to do your homework and read this volume from cover to cover, or go through it cover to cover. How many have really done it? Be honest now. You see what I mean? We haven't, we say we haven't got time to study, but I admit it, I haven't really studied it in it's entirety, too.

Audience: There's some things you don't consider here. Number one, as I said from the floor before, I, myself included, know at least seven chiefs of New York state who did not receive this volume. Number two, we have one man who sat on our committee today, whose two daughters in college did receive it. Now how could we evaluate it?

CHIEF WAYNE SHEPPARD - GROUP REPORT D

Our assignment was Chapter 18, on the Police Standards and Goals. Involved were Minnesota, Michigan, Wyoming, Wisconsin, Montana, Utah, Illinois, North Dakota, Colorado, Ohio, South Dakota, Indiana and Montreal. We put together a brief synopsis of Chapter 18, it involves 18.1 through 18.4. Standard 18.1 discusses the role of the police chief executive and his responsibility to develop policies and procedures that promote and maintain good employee relations. The chief executive is expected to recognize and respond to the problems of the community, more than any other local department head. The conduct of the police employees and their employee organization depends largely on the attitudes and the programs of the chief executive. If his reaction to these employee groups encourages employee cooperation, the chief executive can promote an atmosphere of effective employee relations. The chief executive may be able to alleviate potential problems by anticipating those problems and adjusting programs and procedures for organizations. As stated in the book, good management includes a concern for the employee's welfare, and each chief executive should speak out for the department, and the

employee. If he fails to do this, the employee will surely do it for himself. The old traditional military and police autocratic administration is an inadequate approach to a new employee's requirements and employee organization.

Each chief should create an atmosphere that encourages an employee to do a good job and create the desire within the employee that he feels he is contributing to the agency's success.

Each state should provide legislation that would balance the rights of the public as well as the employee of the police department. Management over the years has failed to meet the needs of the police employee, and on a state management, I don't mean just the police chief executive. The wages and benefits have lagged far behind any other professional organization in the United States. It has become a serious problem in selecting and finding qualified personnel. The majority of this (inaudible) lies with the chief executive as he failed to use good management practices and procedures. Because of this the employee has decided to speak out for himself. The larger departments across the United States, because of their numbers have been able to alleviate this. Many of our small departments have not.

Standard 18.2 considers employee organizations. Employee organizations should protect each employee's rights yet insure that the employees remain responsible to their oath of office. As related in the book, during the past several years, indications are that organized labor is not the road police organizations wish to travel. Most police organizations, such as the Fraternal Order of Police were employee organizations designed to meet the desires of police personnel who wish to hang together in police organizations. Unions or employee organizations have a profound effect on management in some cases. We will experience them. Profound effects in other areas.

Standard 18.3 discusses the collective negotiation process as it applies to police employees. In police agencies, the collective negotiations being representatives of management and employees together to develop and mutually agree on terms and conditions of the employment. Of course,

that's for a specified period of time. It involves compromise and balance of needs for both groups. The objective is to create and maintain a productive operation within the police agency and reduce the potential for the internal conflict. Because the process of negotiation is new, complicated and virtually unknown, in many police sectors, police managers are apprehensive about its long and short term effect upon their organization. Experience has shown, however, that management prerogatives are subject to the negotiation process only, if the police chief allows them to be. If good negotiations apply within a department, a harmonious relationship can prevail between a police agency and organization.

The standard 18.4 discusses work stoppage and other job action, used for bargaining purposes. The standard urges such actions to be prohibited as well as work stoppage or situations such as "blue flu." However, management should be cognizant that if they set up guidelines, they should be realistic and they should be enforceable. Anything less would create more of a problem than it would solve. This responsibility would ultimately rest with the chief executive and his ability to perceive the actions and reactions of the organization. We should try to sell our administration on the fact that it is easier to plan, organize and implement good policies and procedures protecting the rights and benefits of our public safety employees rather than pay the consequences in budget dollars in utilizing other majors to handle police situations such as work stoppage. It is generally felt that those standards in Chapter 18 are good standards with common sense and the implementation of these standards would work and benefit the employee and the organization. Our group also felt that the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals should be a guideline only for implementing and developing their own standards within the state. Any questions.

Audience: I have one comment concerning that I, as one member of that group, do object to Standard 18.3. In that the whole idea of that (inaudible). The idea is repugnant to me as such. I think if we accept this standard we're not moving toward professionalization, but we're moving in the other way.

Chief Sheppard: Any comment? Massachusetts?

Audience: Have you, or anyone in your committee, experienced unionism?

Chief Sheppard: Some of us has had a little bit of experience, but not a great quantity. I don't think, my interpretation of this wasn't so much the union as it was an organization itself, it might be PMA. Of course, you could say, yes, that's union, but I think we need to hear what is said by our people, if we don't they'll go around us and circumvent, and use other measures to get what they want. These provide good guidelines in which we can adhere to as well as the employees.

Audience: It seems to me that if management can hear or indicate the fact that there are those who say that the police agencies are no longer quasi-military organizations. I say they are. From recent experiences in Massachusetts, the Supreme Court made a decision rendered a few years ago, among the other victims was the state, said, "If you deny the chief of police the right to assign men to their respective duties, and to substitute therefore provisions of an agreement would be totally subversive to the discipline and efficiencies in an upper level deficiencies." A month and a half ago, in my case, a labor relations case, in a case in which I brought suit against the Board of Directors of the International Brotherhood of Police Officers and police agencies. The court did a 360 degree turn. And said these are negotiable. (inaudible) We're dealing with semantics whereas the realities of the job (inaudible). Mainly those of us on the east coast will find there's more to the labor relations problem than just sitting down with a group of employees and coming out with a very satisfactory arrangement. I think the problem, perhaps, in one of the major cities on the east coast today are indicative of the problems that rise.

Chief Sheppard: I noticed in this chapter it spelled quite specifically the fact that there are non-negotiable items, such as the right to hire, the right to fire, the right to place people at your own discretion. And I also feel that these are areas that we cannot negotiate. But there are many areas that we can negotiate with our people.

Audience: Here it says that one of these items was assignments. The only law in this country at this time is the Massachusetts law. It says that they are negotiable, assignments. They not only will tell you what

shift they want to work, they will tell you who they're going to work with, and what area to which you are going to assign them.

Chief Sheppard: Personally I think this law is some responsibility with us. If we allow it to be, it surely will. We might lose our jobs over it, but that's something that I wouldn't negotiate. I'd rather lose my job than lose the opportunity to run the department as I see fit.

Audience: (inaudible).

Chief Sheppard: Could I ask a question to Massachusetts. Does Massachusetts have a state law that gives an exclusive right to the police chief for the assignment and transfer of his personnel? Under general rules and guidelines of the safety director or city manager, or mayor.

Massachusetts: No. In most towns, a few municipalities, usually the larger ones, are covered by charter, where the chief of police may have exclusive authority. However, in the cities and towns, that comprise most chiefs of police.

Audience: May I ask a question for a show of hands on how many states have legislation that gives the exclusive right to the stationing or transfer of personnel to their police chiefs? How about state law?

Comments from the Audience: We have, Louisiana has a decision on that where the chief of police is the sole supervisor of all police personnel. The city council has the power to hire and fire employees, but once they're hired, no one can instruct that officer what to do, except the chief of police and it remains so until he's fired. This is a Supreme Court decision in Louisiana.

Audience: I would like to ask a question, I don't know who can answer it. In your report you use the word policy and procedures, either together

or interchangeably. Is there any area they refer to the police chief for formulated policy. I'd like to know exactly what do you mean by policy. In my own instance, in my department, I have a 132 page document that I call rules of procedure to tell the men what to do with everything from air pollution to arresting a murderer. We also have rules of conduct. These are policy that are promulgated by my municipal body, what we can do and can't do as far as our conduct is concerned, as far as our terms of employment are concerned. When they refer to policy here, what do you mean. Procedures or what your municipality says you can or can't chew gum in the car, you can't go into a gin mill with your uniform on, stuff like that. As far as I'm concerned forget the crew, because I don't know which one you're referring to. Because in my case, by law, I cannot formulate policy. That is the prerogative of the municipal body. I can only formulate procedure.

Chief Sheppard: My terminology of policy and procedures would be pretty well one and the same.

Audience: Is this what they mean in the book. This is what I'm trying to find out.

Chief Sheppard: I'm not Webster. Yessir.

Audience: Call it something else. Policy has always been, I was always advised that policy is the law. Long range laws to work with the policies. Also, the talk that rule, procedures, conduct is more or less the same. These things change but only after much consideration and research. The policy has always been the broad aspects. (inaudible) One of the things that came up out of all their problems, they say that they have not had a single thing as far as any kind of rules, regulations, or procedures to follow, any kind of guidelines, I think, personally they ought to have something to be fighting over. To more or less show them the way, they wouldn't have had nearly the problems. I think that's what we're talking about. Having something, not all of it, may be a little of it, but having some guidelines when we do get into this trouble (inaudible).

Audience: I think we should add something in here, for the simple reason, once we get under union negotiations, and they come in and negotiate certain items, now there are some rules, not in all states, where the chief of police

can be held personally liable for the actions he makes. If they come in on a negotiation and they put something in a policy he doesn't agree with and passed, so we couldn't be held civilly liable (inaudible).

Mr. Anderson: Thank you, Chief Sheppard. We will now have the report of Group Five. Chief James Land of Lacey, Washington.

CHIEF JAMES LAND - GROUP REPORT E

I think I'll be able to keep this fairly brief. I'm here representing Alaska, Idaho, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, Hawaii, California, and of course, the state of Washington. You will kind of have to bear with me a little bit. I don't know if it was predesigned by our chairman, or what, but our committee met in the host room. Everything went fine. Fact is, we covered our subject matter very well.

I asked for volunteers to get up here and explain what all we'd accomplished. I didn't get any. I'm not a very good chairman in that respect, I suppose. I would like to, while I'm up here speaking to all of you, to turn to Chairman Ed and I think express some of the feelings as far as our committee is concerned and I'm sure perhaps everybody here is. I think this is tremendous, Ed. The people that are meeting here, and I think it's tremendous the hospitality you extended to the people attending. You've done a tremendous job, and I wish to congratulate you on behalf of myself, members of my respective committee, and I'm sure everybody here.

If I might, our subject was internal discipline. If I might further refer you to page 474, if you have your manual, on 19.1, which is the foundation for internal discipline. One of the questions that came up for discussion was double jeopardy. Of course we spoke both of disciplining somebody, the criminal aspects versus the civil aspects that we as department heads utilize. We felt that this is something that perhaps should be considered by the individual agency, rather than some blanket concern throughout the nation. Recognizing that each of us have our own individual problems, and so forth. Let's not, we weren't going against anything, we just asked that whenever this thing came up for consideration to consider that aspect of it.

We may or may not, as far as the law is concerned, we do not have double jeopardy as most lawyers consider it. One of the things, one of the people we did have on board through part of ours, was, of course, Chief Ed Davis, we had some input even into some of our considerations. I'd like to refer you again to 19.2 on page 477. What I'm primarily doing is going through here and perhaps making a few comments, but also we felt that perhaps there should be some changes considered. This dealt with complaint reception procedures. It was the feeling of the committee that all complaints, which include second party and anonymous parties complaints should be investigated and validated, if possible. If possible, public disclosure of the officer or officer's names should not be released to the general public. We felt this would be in the best interest of the officer and the agency and perhaps the public in itself. In other words, the complaint should be on a person to person basis. I'm sure most of you will probably agree to that suggestion. Outside of that, we endorsed 19.2.

Now if we might, I'd like to skip over to 19.3, which is on page 480. We had some considerable discussion on the specialized units for complaint investigation, that should employ a strict rotation policy limiting assignments to 18 months. Chief Ed Davis would extend that to 24 months. We felt that specialized units for complaint investigation should employ a suggested rather than strict policy of limiting assignments to 18 months. We were looking not only at the large departments, but we were also looking at 4, 5, 6, 7, up to 10 or 12 man department. Again I feel that most of you would agree with us.

On 19.4, the investigative procedures, we recommend no changes. We recommend adoption of 19.4.

19.5 which is on page 487, the adjudication of complaints. We added a new section in the black, bold print, the seven things that they cover. We added an eight one. And perhaps you could quarrel with some of the language here, but in essence what we said, in all the disciplinary cases, the department's findings and disciplinary action should be developed to the point where it stands judicial review. I think most of you will agree this will be in keeping with some of the recent court decisions we've had throughout the nation. It seems that every time one of us chiefs take it upon ourselves to fire somebody that appeals to the Superior Court, and if we don't have findings of facts that withstand the judicial review, we are crossly reversed, and the more of this type of thing that happens, the more we're shot out of the saddle of respect. So we feel very strongly that whatever develops in the area of findings that it should be substantiated enough to stand this judicial review.

In 19.6, positive prevention of police misconduct, we recommend no changes. At this particular point, I would like to point out also that the points that I'm covering here are where we were unanimous within my respective committee.

We have no minority report. This was general concurrence throughout.

On our last subject was recommendation of 19.1, study in police corruption. I would like to refer you to that. I'm sure that this is going to be up for consideration, either by this body, or another body for LEAA funding to actually look into this type of study. It's on page 495. What we, in essence, propose is this: It is recommended that a national police support organization such as the Committee of State Association of Chiefs of Police, in other words talking about our own people here, be commissioned by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to study the conditions that have led to reduction or elimination of corruption in police agency that have been successful in dealing with particular problem. If you have the book in front of you, we struck the last line. We feel that if it is necessary, if this particular group was to apply for funding, and make up a task force of our choosing, to look into some of the ways and means of getting rid of police corruption. We didn't feel that a body, here, anyway, would have any adverse feelings about even looking into some of the departments who, or perhaps alleged to have, some corruption going on in them. We're looking at, not only from our standpoint as law enforcement people, but from the public's standpoint. Mr. Chairman, I will submit to you the typewritten suggestions that we have. I for one would say that if you have any questions, I would probably be able to answer them, and I'm sure that members of my committee also could.

Audience: I think your committee did a great job. A great job.

Chief Land: As a member of the same committee that you were attached, I agree with you on that. Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you very much, Chief. Gentlemen, you've now received or now have been provided with the reports from the five groups. Now, come here, I encounter a sort of in my mind at least, a procedural dilemma. Actually these reports are not, this is not law. These standards and goals are not law. They are guidelines that can be used and our action on them really has, it doesn't make it mandatory, in that it does not impose them on any community in the country. But what we're here for is simply to look at them. From our standpoint as a chief of police, examine them sort of under the microscope, and see if there are any flaws, and if we see them, so state in the

report. What I simply think now the motion in order is simply to receive these reports, include them in our report to the LEAA from this conference. I don't think we should ask for a vote, and anyone who is a parliamentarian can correct me. I don't think we should ask for a vote of the membership because then we might vote against one group, or add to a group, and frankly we did not sit in that discussion, we did not have the benefit of their discussion, we devoted their time to their own topics. So I don't think we should start picking each other's apart. But just simply accept each of these committee's reports as they are submitted, and include in our report as submitted. May be I'm wrong, parliamentarily.

Audience: I would so move with the stipulation that the exceptions and comments on the reports be noted also.

Mr. Anderson: Correct. Motion made and seconded, that that procedure be adopted. Any further discussion. All in favor of the motion, say aye. Opposed? Carried. Gentlemen, we have accomplished something here today.

END

7. 11/25/1944