

CRIME IN VIRGINIA

**REPORT OF THE
VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION
To
THE GOVERNOR
and
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



140 28

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1970

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

STANLEY C. WALKER, *Chairman*
WILLIAM H. HODGES, *Vice-Chairman*
GEORGE S. ALDHIZER, II
W. C. (DAN) DANIEL
JAMES W. DAVIS
WILLIAM N. PAXTON, JR.
A. L. PHILPOTT
JOE RICHMAN
ERWIN S. SOLOMON

STAFF

G. M. LAPSLEY
WILDMAN S. KINCHELOE, JR.
FRANK R. DUNHAM
MARY SPAIN
JOHN A. BANKS, JR.
SALLY WARTHEN
DAVID T. WALKER
KATHERINE GOOLSBY

CRIME IN VIRGINIA

REPORT OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

Richmond, Virginia
January 13, 1970

To:

HONORABLE MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., *Governor of Virginia*

and

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

The 1966 Session of the General Assembly of Virginia in House Joint Resolution No. 113 created a Commission "to be known as the Virginia State Crime Commission" "—to endeavor to ascertain the causes of crime and recommend ways to reduce and prevent it; explore and recommend methods of possible rehabilitation of convicted criminals, and study other related matters, including apprehension, trial and punishment of criminal offenders." This Commission, as directed, reported to the 1968 Session of the General Assembly and in this report stated "because of the magnitude of the task assigned to (this Commission) and the limitations of time and funds which have confronted it, we feel that we have been able to accomplish only a beginning of the investigation which should be made of crime, crime prevention and detection and prosecution of offenders in Virginia. We feel that further study is necessary both to delve into ramifications of the subject which this Commission was not able to consider and to assess the effects of recommendations which we are making and of ameliorative programs which are now underway and which are proposed."

The 1968 General Assembly of Virginia concurred in this recommendation and by House Joint Resolution No. 48 continued the Virginia State Crime Commission in the following language:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 48

To continue the Virginia State Crime Commission.

Whereas, the General Assembly of Virginia, at its 1966 Regular Session, established the Virginia State Crime Commission, which Commission has submitted a report to the Governor and the General Assembly, in which report it stated that because of the magnitude of task assigned to it and the limitations of time and funds available to it, it was able to accomplish only a beginning of the investigation which needs to be made; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia, the Senate concurring, That the Virginia State Crime Commission established by House Joint Resolution No. 113 of the 1966 Regular Session, be continued.

The membership of the Commission shall consist of the same persons, provided, that if any member is unwilling or unable to serve, or if for any other reason a vacancy occurs, his successor shall be appointed in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

The Commission shall continue its study on all areas of public safety and protection, the causes of crime and ways to reduce and prevent it, the apprehension, trial and punishment of criminal offenders and the rehabilitation of convicted criminals.

The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their necessary expenses for which, and for such secre-

tarial and other assistance as the Commission may require, there is hereby appropriated from the contingent fund of the General Assembly the sum of ten thousand dollars.

The Commission shall conclude its study and make its report to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia not later than November one, nineteen hundred sixty-nine. All agencies of the State shall assist the Commission in its study upon request.

All former members of the Commission except Guy O. Farley, Jr. continued to serve and Honorable A. L. Philpott, Basset, member of the House of Delegates was appointed by the Speaker to replace Mr. Farley.

During its study, public hearings were held jointly with the State Law Enforcement Planning Council in Roanoke, Fairfax and Norfolk. Also, the Commission held its own public hearing in Richmond and several executive meetings. At such executive meetings conferences were held with Otis L. Brown, Director, Department of Welfare and Institutions, and members of his staff, Colonel Harold W. Burgess, Superintendent of State Police and members of his staff, Dr. Goeffrey T. Mann, Chief Medical Examiner, State Department of Health and members of his staff, Richard N. Harris, Director, Law Enforcement Administration, Gordon W. Mills, Director, Division of Automated Data Processing, Robert H. Ragland, Director, Division of Criminal Records Exchange, Honorable Andrew Miller, Attorney General-elect of Virginia, and with other State and local officials. In addition, several members of the Commission were taken on a complete tour of the State penitentiary and of road camps in various parts of Virginia. Also, a letter was written to every Bar Association, sheriff, chief of police, Commonwealth's Attorney and civic organization sponsoring local crime studies requesting them to advise the Commission of problems of law enforcement which had occurred in their area which concern the whole State and for which they believed amendments of existing State laws might be justified. To this letter over one hundred replies were received and some seventy amendments to the State's criminal statutes were proposed.

The Division of Statutory Research and Drafting acted as secretary to the Commission, Frank R. Dunham representing it.

The principal results of the study of crime made by this Commission show that Virginia has the problem of increased crime. Bold, new and immediate action is needed to reverse this trend. The Commission finds that present law enforcement was established primarily for a rural society and has not been substantially revamped. Crime has geared itself for today's urban society, and therefore has made substantial gains.

The problems of criminal justice, police personnel, probation and parole, juvenile delinquents, financing and communications must be re-evaluated in the light of Virginia's change from an essentially simple rural community to a complex urban culture. Leadership in the field of law enforcement is needed. Today it is fragmented. The public could not care less what police agency prevents or solves a crime, as long as it is prevented or solved. Who on the State level is concerned with the overall crime problem? The answer is—no one State agency or department. The public is becoming frustrated, angry and bewildered at the apparent lack of ability of law enforcement officials to curb the spread of drugs, stem the flood of obscene literature and stop the increase of rape, murder and assaults.

In this light, we make the following specific recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State Chief Medical Examiner's Office should be made an independent State department, be adequately staffed and have organized within it a complete crime laboratory, utilizing all existing State laboratories, and adding any needed equipment and personnel, with mobile units as needed.

2. The State Central Criminal Records Exchange should be the sole State criminal record keeping agency except for the Division of Motor Vehicles which must of necessity maintain its own records, and should be transferred from the office of the Attorney General to the Department of State Police.

3. Emergency funds of any amount deemed necessary should be appropriated by the 1970 General Assembly of Virginia to combat illegal narcotic traffic and use in the State and a study should be undertaken to determine whether a separate department of narcotics should be established in the Attorney General's Office, the State Police or elsewhere to cope with the illegal use and sale of drugs.

Furthermore, a program of drug abuse instruction should be immediately undertaken by the State Department of Education in all primary and secondary schools in the State and should include the use of film strips, courses for children, institutes for teachers, and distribution of pamphlets and books on drugs. Ancillary to this, this Commission strongly endorses the application of Professors Jack R. Gallagher of the University of Virginia and Charles Schotta of Virginia Polytechnic Institute for a federal grant under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to initiate plans for the development of an innovative and functional juvenile delinquency diagnostic, evaluation and training facility in the State.

4. The proposed 1970-72 budget request for funds necessary to staff the Law Enforcement Officers Training Standards Commission is endorsed and the 1970 General Assembly of Virginia is urged to grant this request.

5. The budget request of the Department of Welfare and Institutions for maintenance and operation for the 1970-72 biennium of \$280,415,000 is endorsed and recommended particularly the requests for phasing out the present State penitentiary and the erection over a ten year period of six correctional institutions, the creation of the Bureau of Correctional Field Units and Penitentiary Industrial Department, and the operation of eight correctional institutions and the Half-Way House program.

6. The request of the Department of State Police for twenty-one additional investigators and fifty additional troopers is endorsed not only because such officers are generally needed, but also because they will provide extra personnel to assist in the detection of illegal drug and narcotic use in the State.

7. A commission should be appointed and be staffed to undertake a revision of the State's criminal laws during the 1970-72 biennium. Such study would consider a revision of Code Titles 18.1 and 19.1.

8. Eleven changes in the criminal statutes as recommended by several law enforcement officials in Virginia in response to this Commission's letter of inquiry.

9. This Commission should be continued as a legislative Commission to investigate organized crime, to maintain liaison with all law enforcement agencies both local and State and to receive all data and information suggested to improve the State's crime detection and crime fighting facilities.

A CRIME LABORATORY

In the report of the Crime Commission submitted to the 1968 General Assembly it was stated "We recommend the establishment of a Central Crime Laboratory by providing, under the direction of the Chief Medical Examiner, a highly trained police scientist who could work in collaboration with the Department of State Police to improve the quality of scientific investigation available to all law enforcement officers." The need to establish such a facility still exists and is more pressing today than it was two years ago. The Chief Medical Examiner's Office is supplying what assistance it can, but the facilities available to it are inadequate and it does not have the time and personnel to fully function as a Central Crime Laboratory.

The Code of Virginia requires the Chief Medical Examiner's Office to perform post-mortem examinations of dead persons whose deaths are of a questionable nature and the cause of which should be determined. One such type of death in the criminal field is homicide. In addition, this office is directed to perform such pathological, bacteriological and toxicological investigations as might be necessary or proper, to provide the State Police with all assistance, cooperation and facilities as could be afforded by the laboratories and technical staff of this office, and at the discretion of the Chief Medical Examiner to furnish this same service to other law enforcement agencies. A further statutory duty of this office is to make blood alcohol tests under the State's drunk driving law.

When this office was created and until recently, it was able to function efficiently for all police agencies. But with the great increase in crime and particularly because of onset of illegal drug and marijuana use, this office has become unable to provide all the services necessary to proper and good law enforcement. Furthermore, the laboratories of the FBI, the federal Bureau of Narcotics and the U. S. Department of Agriculture until recently were able to provide such testing as the Chief Medical Examiner's Office could not perform. Presently, these facilities are overworked and cannot provide the assistance to local police agencies they once could. If crime continues to grow nationally, their services will become less and less available to State and local police.

As a result, a separate crime laboratory must be established in Virginia, capable of making any and all tests necessary to assist police in solving quickly crimes of all kinds. The problem is where such a laboratory should be set up. Should the Medical Examiner's Office be expanded to perform this function? Should a new Department of Police Science be created in the Department of State Police? or in the Attorney General's Office? or as a separate State agency? Also, how much will such a facility cost and how should it be staffed? These and many other questions must be carefully studied and definite plans must be made.

As a result, this Commission recommends that such a facility be established and an immediate study be made of the matters or questions outlined above and a full report and recommendations be made to the 1972 General Assembly. As a temporary measure, the appropriation of \$57,683 requested by the Chief Medical Examiner's Office for additional laboratory and office equipment to provide some additional criminal analyses is strongly supported. However, it is to be noted that these funds will provide only basic services and are not intended to provide a completely equipped and staffed crime laboratory, which unquestionably is needed.

CRIMINAL RECORDS

Referring to the report of the Crime Commission to the 1968 General Assembly it was stated "We recommend that the Central Criminal Records Exchange which was set up under the authority of the Attorney General's Office, be transferred to the Virginia State Police. Absolutely no criticism is intended of the current Director of the Exchange or the manner of its operation. However, we feel that the Exchange could function more efficiently as an integral part of the State Police Agency, and that, as it develops to the point where use of computerized data processing is feasible, control of such equipment by a police agency will be required, if certain national criminal records are to be available."

This recommendation we strongly make again with the addenda that the State Police establish such an agency as a separate function of its department and that this become the sole criminal record keeping agency of the State, except for the Division of Motor Vehicles, which we also hope eventually can be made a part of it.

Presently in the State, several agencies in addition to the Central Criminal Records Exchange are keeping criminal records of various kinds. The State Police keep records of arrests by their officers, a list of all wanted persons by all State

agencies, a method of operation file of all known criminals, a list of stolen motor vehicles, and others. The Alcoholic Beverage Control Board keeps records of violations of the ABC laws. The Department of Game and Inland Fisheries keeps other records of violations of hunting and fishing laws. The penitentiary keeps a record of its inmates. From this, it can be seen there is great duplication and expense involved in keeping all these records.

Thus, it is our thought that a complete file on all persons who violate the law should be in one facility, readily available twenty-four hours a day each day of the year to all law enforcement officials. Such a facility is available at the State Police headquarters, as it has a teletype system available to all sheriffs and city police departments at a cost to them of thirty-five dollars a month. Presently, this system is incapable of handling every local police department in the State but a study is being made of storing all information in a computer and preliminary investigations and studies are being made by Gordon W. Mills, Director, Division of Automated Data Processing and the Law Enforcement Planning Council, on the feasibility of establishing a statewide law enforcement computerized teletype system. Such a system will be of great assistance in law enforcement and crime detection. This will remove the necessity of diversified criminal record keeping.

In conversations with Colonel Burgess, it has been agreed by him that all of the present personnel of the Central Criminal Records Exchange can be utilized by him and that with the expansion of the State Police physical facilities in Richmond, sufficient space will be available to house the Central Criminal Records Exchange.

NARCOTICS AND DRUGS

The illegal use of narcotics by citizens of this nation and State has increased at an alarmingly high rate. All sorts of substances causing varied reactions of so-called "highness" unfortunately are being used in the greatest quantity by youths. Illegal trafficking in narcotics and other substances is on the increase in the State. Judges, parents, school teachers, doctors, ministers, as well as the police, are greatly concerned with this problem. The U. S. Bureau of Narcotics is urging states to establish special agencies to cope with the problem. To further complicate the matter, there is no known biological test of the blood, intestines, urine or sputum, to show the presence of marijuana or LSD unless a sufficient amount is inhaled to cause death.

In our study, it has become apparent that effective measures must be taken immediately by all agencies of the State to end illegal drug traffic and use. Therefore, we recommend that:

1. The State Police, the Attorney General and the Department of Health immediately devise a course of instruction in drug abuse and make it available to every local law enforcement officer in the State. The course should be given in various sections of the State at times and places easily accessible to all police officers. On the other hand, the heads of all local law enforcement agencies must take advantage of this instruction by attending themselves and sending members of their departments. This must be begun immediately.

2. The State Department of Education is urged to establish a compulsory program of education concerning drug use in all primary and secondary schools in the State. This program should include institutes for teachers, and courses for children and parents employing film strips, pamphlets and books to give a complete picture of what drugs, barbituates, narcotics and similar effect producing substances are, their habit-forming tendencies, methods of detecting their use and the permanent and temporary harm their use can cause to a human being.

3. The application of Professors Jack R. Gallagher of the University of Virginia and Charles Schotta of Virginia Polytechnic Institute for a federal grant under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 in order to initiate plans for the development of an innovative and functional juvenile delinquency diagnostic, evaluation and training facility in the State is

endorsed by this Commission. The purpose of this proposal is to develop a number of trained personnel to deal with juvenile delinquents and youths in danger of becoming delinquent. The objectives of this facility are:

(1) The provision of an interdisciplinary setting for training in an academic and practical way those professionals who will serve juvenile delinquents and youth in danger of becoming delinquent.

(2) The provision of inter- and intradisciplinary training programs in the diagnosis, evaluation, management, the adjudication and legal aspects of juvenile delinquency for professional personnel, including juvenile court judges, juvenile probation officers, juvenile police officers, social workers, psychiatrists and other medical personnel, psychologists, teachers, recreation workers, vocational rehabilitation counselors, Commonwealth's Attorneys, hospital chaplains, and dieticians, etc., who are employees of State agencies and local communities throughout the State.

(3) The provision of inter- and intradisciplinary training in the diagnosis, evaluation, management, education, and legal aspects of juvenile delinquency for university personnel, including trainees in law, psychology, sociology, social work, rehabilitation counseling, education, nutrition, psychiatry, pastoral counseling, and other pertinent academic disciplines, from universities and colleges throughout the State.

(4) To test, in a practical setting, the validity and efficiency of various techniques and patterns of rehabilitation, diagnosis, education, management, and training for juveniles.

(5) Research, often longitudinal, involving individual disciplines and combinations of disciplines.

(6) The provision of training programs which merge skills of several disciplines to train interdisciplinary specialists in juvenile delinquency which are not now available.

(7) For demonstration and teaching purposes, the provision of the highest quality services possible to a limited number of juvenile delinquents and youths in danger of becoming delinquent and their families with particular emphasis upon complex cases.

Throughout both the provision of training and the provision of services, the comprehensive systems approach to treatment of juvenile delinquents and pre-delinquents will be undertaken. It must be clearly recognized that the training program and the activities of the center must consider all elements of the system into which the potential delinquent will enter. Thus, the effect of a change in the structure of laws facing juvenile delinquents, changes in court procedures, and changes in correction and rehabilitation facilities upon each other and on such things as the recidivism rate must be considered.

Central to the concept of an interdisciplinary treatment-training center for juvenile delinquency, which may produce new knowledge applicable to changes in laws and court procedures and treatment procedures for juveniles, is the architectural concept. This concept must be expressed as a reflection of this program and its objectives not only as an academic solution, but one consistent with the demands of these needs, their function and special relationships as well as bringing about an environmental character sympathetic to the problem.

This program if funded will be a great help in combatting juvenile delinquency and this Commission gives it wholehearted endorsement.

4. The Attorney General-elect Andrew Miller has suggested the creation of a special Narcotics Bureau in the Office of the Attorney General. We agree such a specialized division is necessary but whether this division should be established in this office, in the Department of State Police or as a separate State agency is questionable.

In this connection it is to be noted that the State Police has several officers who have already received narcotics training. Many have attended schools sponsored by the U. S. Bureau of Narcotics, Northern Virginia Community College, Virginia Commonwealth University, and a course sponsored by the New Jersey Chiefs of Police Association. All State Police personnel have received a minimum of eight hours instruction in narcotics. All investigators in this department have received a minimum of thirty-five hours of training. Many have additional instruction totalling, with that already indicated, some eighty-eight hours. Also, the State Police already have the communication system to apprehend the illegal transportation of narcotics in this State.

From this it might well be that the State already has adequate facilities for narcotic enforcement and all that needs be done is utilize more effectively this personnel. Thus, we recommend an immediate study of the need and feasibility of creating a separate department in the State Police or in the Office of the Attorney General, or separate from all other State agencies. This study should be completed as soon as possible and a report made to the next session of the General Assembly which will be held in 1971, if the new Constitution is adopted.

5. The penalty for possession of marijuana should be reduced. There is another commission studying the pharmacy and drug laws, and other related laws, relative to the manufacture, distribution and sale of drugs and poisons in this State. This commission is to report to the 1970 General Assembly but at this time the report is being prepared, and has not been made public. Therefore, in order not to overlap the function of this commission, no recommendations for changing these laws will be made, but we reserve the right when the report of the Pharmacy and Drug Law Commission is made public to agree with if possible or dissent from this report in whole or in part and to propose additional legislation if we deem it advisable.

One suggestion made to this Commission which we believe deserves serious consideration is to remove "cannabis" or as it is more popularly known "marijuana" from the provisions of Article 11 of Chapter 15 of Title 54 of the Code of Virginia, which is the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act, create a new category of hallucinogenic or psychotogenic drugs and apply the penalty provisions of present Code § 54-446.11 to their use. These penalties are that any person who uses such defined drugs will be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than one thousand dollars or shall be imprisoned in jail not exceeding twelve months, or both so fined and imprisoned, at the discretion of the court or the jury trying the case.

These drugs have no medical use because they cannot be prescribed by any person licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State and cannot be legally manufactured, sold, dispensed, prescribed or possessed without investigative permit from the Federal Drug Administration.

As we have said, we are not proposing any specific legislation on this matter until we have had an opportunity to read the report of the Pharmacy and Drug Laws Commission.

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TRAINING STANDARDS COMMISSION

The 1968 General Assembly of Virginia enacted a statute creating the Law Enforcement Officers Training Standards Commission primarily to establish minimum standards required for the training of all local police officers and a schedule of when such training should be acquired. Though the statute was enacted, no appropriation was made to fund it and make it operative. A budget request for this Commission in the amount of \$147,821 has been made for the biennium 1970-72 and we recommend its approval.

It is also our hope that the minimum standards can be promulgated quickly by this Commission in order that all police officers in the State can have the necessary training to function efficiently and capably. An untrained or improperly

trained police officer is a detriment to himself and to the community which he serves. Police techniques are definitely changing and only through education can an officer keep up to date and competent to carry out his duty of fighting crime.

It is also our desire that a course be developed short in time and involvement which each person to be employed as a policeman will be required to pass before he performs a single function as a policeman. This course should be conducted by the State Police and contain all the basic information a policeman should know. Because of necessity, many policemen are hired, go to work and are trained when time permits. We believe the training should be first for all future policemen.

Also, we would like to mention the State Law Enforcement Administration, which has been engaged in a planning and information gathering process to establish the problems, needs and resources of law enforcement in the Commonwealth since it was established. The term "law enforcement" as used by the Law Enforcement Administration means all activities pertaining to crime prevention and reduction and enforcement of the criminal law, and encompasses the entire system of criminal justice—education, prevention, police, prosecution, courts and corrections, probation and parole, etc. It includes both juveniles and adults. The Federal grant for this planning phase of the program was \$405,100, and was a 90%-10% grant. During this period the State met its matching financial obligation of 10% by the "in-kind" contribution of personnel and services of existing State agencies. It was necessary to use this approach as there was no appropriation for the operation of the Law Enforcement Administration and the Law Enforcement Planning Council.

On June 10, 1969, a Comprehensive Law Enforcement Action Plan for 1969 was submitted by the Law Enforcement Administration to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is the agency which administers Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. The report was entitled *Commonwealth of Virginia Comprehensive Law Enforcement Action Plan for Fiscal 1969*. On June 25, 1969, this plan was approved, and the Commonwealth of Virginia was awarded a grant of \$557,090 to commence the action programs described in the plan.

The State Law Enforcement Planning Council, supervising and acting in conjunction with its administrative arm, the State Law Enforcement Administration, is continually developing comprehensive statewide plans for the improvement of law enforcement throughout the State. It will design, develop, correlate, implement, and administer programs and projects for the State and units of local government. It is attempting to involve every locality in these programs and projects. Ninety-six percent of all localities in Virginia are already participating.

The Law Enforcement Planning Council and the Law Enforcement Administration will collaborate and cooperate with legislative bodies and commissions, other administrative departments, agencies and institutions, and private organizations and agencies with common purposes and goals.

The program of the Law Enforcement Administration is new, not only in Virginia but throughout the nation. It is based on the following assumptions: (1) There is an increase in crime in the nation that is a threat to the economy and security of this country and that this increase and threat is present in the Commonwealth of Virginia; (2) To bring this increase and threat under control, all elements of the criminal justice system, at all levels of government, must be coordinated, intensified, and made more effective; (3) Crime is essentially a problem of the localities and must be dealt with through the use of State and local resources.

To finance this program during the 1970-72 biennium the Law Enforcement Administration has submitted a requested appropriation, which we also wish to support.

THE PENITENTIARY AND YOUTH DETENTION FACILITIES

The end of crime is always the most difficult and heartbreaking and is the confinement of those convicted. Confinement has a two-fold purpose, namely punishment and rehabilitation. The latter is in the minds of some people far more important because a person convicted of a crime must be made to realize the wrong he committed and be returned to society law-abiding and self-supporting.

Virginia has only one penitentiary, which this Commission visited. The present location in Richmond was selected in 1795 and since that time has been the site of a built-on walled enclosure which has served as the State's only penitentiary. Its present population is between one thousand and twelve hundred males, and two buildings containing three hundred sixty-six and four hundred ninety cells, respectively. There are many problems with the present facility, some of which are the following:

1. Its physical location is too near a growing State university and on one of the principal motor vehicle approaches to the capital city of Virginia.
2. The cell units, industrial complex and receiving unit are archaic.
3. There are no available facilities to separate prisoners by age or type of offense and new inmates are of necessity intermingled with the hard core veteran inmates.
4. The classification section where all examining, testing and interviewing is conducted contains only nine hundred sixty square feet of space, whereas eighty-four hundred square feet is the recommended minimum for such a facility.
5. The staff of the penitentiary must use some cells as offices. No separate space is available for counselling with new prisoners and counselling with inmates generally is conducted in make-shift facilities.
6. Educational and vocational training facilities are greatly insufficient and
7. The industrial training program functions under adverse conditions because of improper material flow and equipment layout.
8. The three different and distinct levels of the penitentiary complex and the multi-tiered cell buildings (five levels) create serious security problems.

These are only a few of the problems and really only the principal problems that were observed during our inspection. It is beyond question that this State needs a new penitentiary facility and we earnestly endorse the request of the Department of Welfare and Institutions to abandon this present facility and re-locate it over an eight year period according to the following schedule:

- 1970-72 Construction of a new 500 capacity Reception and Medical Center
- 1972-74 The construction of a new Medium Custody Institution
- 1974-76 The construction of another new Medium Custody Institution
- 1976-78 The construction of a new Maximum Custody Institution

Such a program will aid rehabilitation of prisoners and enable new programs of all types to be instituted. Our present penitentiary has outlived its usefulness and must be replaced. It cannot continue to function effectively as it now is.

This program concerns adult offenders. More important are youthful offenders. Thus, this Commission endorses the program titled "Services in the Seventies to Virginia's Delinquent Children and their Families." This is a program by which this State will commit itself to a ten year program to treat and *prevent* juvenile delinquency and other patterns of maladaptive behavior in children. It is obvious that the cost of confining juveniles in State institutions will continue to

increase, that unchecked delinquency will cause more and more youths to become involved in serious crimes or felonies and that, as a result, the commitment rate to penal institutions will continue to mount. Morality and good conscience unquestionably order and direct the commitment of all the State's resources to salvage a wayward child no matter what the cost.

Some of the principal characteristics of the proposed program are:

Prevention of delinquency through early detection and treatment of the troubled child.

A coordinated program of treatment in which the family is to be involved in the rehabilitative process.

An expansion of local treatment services and facilities that the earlier and milder forms of delinquent behavior and family maladjustment may be dealt with at the community level.

Development of regional State-operated treatment centers near the larger population centers to permit treatment of the less aggressive State-committed child as geographically close to his community and home environment as his family situation will permit. The goal would be to involve the family in therapy sessions and in the rehabilitative process.

Reevaluation of the existing training school programs and phasing in a lengthened and more intensive treatment program designed for the youngster who has failed to respond to local treatment efforts.

Establishment of effective coordinating bodies at central, regional and local levels in order that existing and specialized services may receive maximum utilization and become integrated with new services as these develop.

The Division of Youth Services provides a coordinated program of diagnosis and treatment for delinquent children committed to the State Board of Welfare and Institutions. It also provides through the field staff of the Bureau of Juvenile Probation and Detention direct and consultative services to juvenile and domestic relations courts and to local departments of public welfare in the areas of detention and court services.

Because an essential element in the successful pursuit of this ten year projection is better utilization of all existing services, there is a need for the creation of several coordinating and troubleshooting bodies, to treat and prevent delinquency. One of these should be a State Council on Human Needs and Resources responsible to the Governor, to be composed of knowledgeable citizens, representative of such fields as medicine, business, education, social work and psychology. The members, insofar as possible, should be drawn from the various geographical sections of the State. To augment the State Council there would be need for each region to have a Regional Council on Human Needs. The heads of the State Departments of Education, Health, Vocational Rehabilitation, Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, Welfare and Institutions and the Division of Planning and Community Affairs would serve as ex officio members.

The Council would have these primary functions:

1. To coordinate the work of public agencies and solicit the support and cooperation of private agencies in the maximum utilization of all State and community services relating to the promotion of a healthy environment for man.

2. To lay down broad guidelines and policies to govern the development of plans and activities of public agencies in areas of shared responsibility.

3. To serve as a source of guidance and referral for specialized information or assistance to private organizations.

4. To guide State departmental directors toward more efficient and compatible objectives and, thereby, to substantially improve the cost-effectiveness

ratio of services in the fields of health, education and social services for governmental and cooperating private organizations.

5. To serve as a top echelon communications link between the public and private sectors and, thus, to bring about a more systematic approach to improving all aspects of life in Virginia.

Eventually, through the machinery of the proposed district level Councils on Human Needs and Resources, more interest will be engendered in communities promoting neighborhood family centers as a first-line prevention tool.

In carrying out an integrated approach in the treatment and prevention of delinquency a reorganization of the institutional programs and personnel deployment patterns is necessary. The proposed revision in the institutional program and the anticipated evolvement of these programs are based on expected changes in the type of juvenile who will be committed to central care in the future and the type who will require a structured training school program.

It is anticipated that as improved community based services become available, only the more intractable youngster will be committed into central care. And for those youngsters committed to central care every effort should be made to treat as many of these children as possible near their home community in order that the family may be involved in the treatment process.

As a result, three basic changes in the present State-operated juvenile institutions are proposed:

1. Establishment of four regional training schools with a bed capacity of sixty each to house and treat the mild delinquent. Programs in these regional training schools would be developed for short periods of four to six months treatment. In essence, they would become a part of the community complex where children and their families could be treated.

2. Gearing the central training schools to prolonged and intensive treatment for the more persistent disorders which fail to yield to community programs. The period of treatment is expected to be extended from the current seven to nine months to an average period of eighteen months.

3. Revising the current training school program by making the cottage life program the focal point of treatment at all institutions. The chief characteristics of this program would be: small group living in cottages housing no more than fifteen to twenty youngsters; a cottage counselor who would assume the dual role now performed by houseparents and by caseworkers and who would possess a multidisciplinary background and training as well as the personal attributes necessary to work with delinquents; use of cottage aides, working in shifts, to assist the cottage counselor; a treatment committee to gear the training school resources to the needs of the child, to assure that every single activity in which the child is engaged contributes to the attainment of treatment goals, and to insure that there is coordination and consistency at the training school and between school and home.

All educational, recreational and vocational services will become an integral phase of the total treatment design, both for the total population and for individual children. The academic school, while continuing to offer remedial and vocationally related courses, would broaden its services in anticipation of having children in the training school for longer periods of time.

All academic programs would offer a greatly expanded course in human development. This course would be designed to promote in such children more useful attitudes toward themselves, other people, and especially the families they will one day establish. Similarly, the school will remain responsive in terms of providing youngsters with information and guidance about special problems, such as the current rise in drug abuse.

Virtually all delinquent children are, to some degree, also disturbed. Therefore, the program must offer a full array of treatment approaches. On the other hand, not all of Virginia's disturbed children are also delinquent, and other treatment programs must be provided for them. Similarly, those children whose delinquency is secondary to serious retardation or to severe and chronic mental illness should be served in treatment programs developed in the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals.

Expansion of Clinical Services to include specific responsibility for developing a statewide program in the prevention of juvenile delinquency and related emotional problems is necessary. The emphasis should be to use existing resources more creatively rather than to set a full array of new duplicative services aimed specifically at prevention. Even when Youth Services are needed, the policy would be to try to provide these through the existing appropriate agencies whenever possible.

Direct services, diagnostic and treatment, will be offered at three key points in the cycle of services.

At the community level, the Division would provide supplementary and consultative clinical services. Whenever possible, both diagnostic and treatment services available through local mental hygiene clinics and comprehensive mental health centers should be utilized.

Clinical teams should be assigned to each of the four regional training schools where they would function largely as consultant and resource personnel to the training school staff as well as the regional supervisors or directors of community counseling services. The clinical team would consist of psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric social workers, and speech therapists in sufficient numbers to support the planning and execution of treatment programs by regional training school and court service personnel. Similarly, clinical teams would be assigned to the centralized training schools. They would consult the training school staff, diagnose and treat a limited number of patients.

A third phase of direct clinical services would be located at the Reception and Diagnostic Center. It is anticipated that some limited diagnostic service would still be needed in this facility even though it is expected that improved community services would result in a steady increase in the number of children who would have had thorough psychological work-ups to adjudication and commitment.

It is also recommended that a Central Infirmary Building be constructed at the Reception and Diagnostic Center. It would have three sections:

1. One section would care for general medical cases requiring more intensive care than can be provided at the training schools' infirmaries and yet not needing hospitalization at the Medical College of Virginia.
2. A second section would provide temporary psychiatric hospitalization for the acutely disturbed, temporarily psychotic, or actively suicidal youngster who needs intensive treatment and protection. The facility would be a small unit for approximately twenty-five youngsters.
3. A third section would provide office space for the various supervisory personnel needed by Preventive and Clinical Services and for the practicing clinicians based at the Reception and Diagnostic Center.

As briefly outlined, the Department of Welfare and Institutions proposes an aggressive, comprehensive program of prevention and control which should begin the ending of that steady and intolerable increase in juvenile delinquency and family disorder that last year brought more than 20,000 cases into Virginia's courts. Virginia must build a circle of service, and of concern, large enough and powerful enough to hold these children safe and secure within a caring society. If society and its government cannot make of itself a circle large enough to include all its

members and to meet their primary physical and social needs, it will not and does not deserve to continue in existence.

This Commission strongly endorses this described program.

ADDITIONAL STATE POLICE

Adequate police are an absolute essential of good law enforcement. Not only does an adequate number help morale and provide adequate rest for officers so that they can perform their duties more efficiently, it also enables officers to be available for additional training in the various fields of law enforcement.

The State Police requested the 1968 General Assembly to authorize the employment of and make appropriations for the salary of thirty-one additional investigators and ninety additional officers. Only ten investigators and forty troopers were authorized. Colonel Burgess asks that the balance of men requested in 1968 be authorized by the 1970 Session, namely twenty-one investigators and fifty troopers. This budget request we heartily endorse.

During the first six months of 1969 there was on a national basis a 17% increase in the number of robberies and major thefts and a 15% increase in the number of forcible rapes. It is essential that local police departments which in some instances are understaffed, be provided sufficient State Police investigators to assist them in solving crimes. Also, with traffic on interstate highways becoming heavier and heavier and trafficking in narcotics increasing, the number of troopers on patrol must be increased.

REVISION OF THE CRIMINAL STATUTES OF THE STATE, SPECIFICALLY TITLES 18.1 AND 19.1 OF THE CODE OF VIRGINIA

In 1960, the Virginia Code Commission revised these two Titles, the first of which defines acts constituting crimes and the second sets forth criminal procedures of the State. No effort was made to include all other sections of the Code defining crimes and fixing penalties for the commission of such. A recent Aspen computer search of the entire Code revealed there are two volumes of citations some two and a half inches thick containing citations outside Title 18.1 that have criminal provisions. It is obvious that all such sections should be collected in one title so that all criminal statutes can be easily available. Furthermore, recent rulings of the U. S. Supreme Court has made procedural and substantive changes necessary in the field of criminal law. In addition, it has been brought to this Commission's attention that there are many archaic and antiquated crimes and punishments contained therein. Examples are: the larceny of a dog, a house, a pony, a mule, a cow, a steer or a bull has the same minimum and maximum sentence as an attempt to poison a human being. (See §§ 18.1-64 and 18.1-102.) The unauthorized use of an animal, aircraft, vehicle or a boat has the same minimum and maximum sentence as voluntary manslaughter. (See §§ 18.1-24 and 18.1-164.) In Title 18.1 there are 232 different minimum and maximum sentence levels. These are only examples and many more such discrepancies occur.

Therefore, we propose that a commission composed of twelve lawyers be appointed to revise the criminal statutes of the State. The commission should be composed of six members of the General Assembly (four from the House and two from the Senate), three judges (two of courts of record, one of a court not of record), one Commonwealth's Attorney, one lawyer specializing in criminal law and one member of the State Attorney General's Office. In addition, this commission should be authorized to employ an executive director, and as much other legal and secretarial assistance as may be necessary including the appointment of advisory committees.

The Law Enforcement Planning Council, and the Attorney General concur that this study should be conducted. Further, 60% of the cost of this revision can be financed with Federal funds under the U. S. Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets

Act. The remaining 40% must be provided by the State. Thus, we recommend the appropriation of a sum sufficient to finance this study, not to exceed thirty thousand dollars. We recommend this Commission complete its study by 1972, but if this be not possible, Title 18.1 should be completed by 1972 and as much of Title 19.1 as possible.

AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN STATUTES

In response to letters sent to all law enforcement officers, agencies and certain civic organizations interested in law enforcement, the commission as stated received over one hundred replies and some seventy proposed statutory amendments. Of these seventy, the Commission favors the enactment of some eleven. However, to avoid duplication, bills to effect these amendments are not attached to this report because various members of the General Assembly may have been approached concerning these and requested to introduce bills for this purpose. The legislative members of this Commission will stay informed during the 1970 Session of the General Assembly and if, for any reason, such bills are not introduced by other members, the Chairman of this Commission will introduce them.

1. Permit interception of certain communications by wire tapping modelled after § 2516 (2) of the Federal Crime Control Act.
2. Compensate jurors in criminal cases at the same rate as jurors in civil cases, namely eight dollars per day.
3. Repeal Code § 16.1-173 requiring the appointment of a guardian ad litem in juvenile proceedings.
4. Amend Code § 19.1-84 to change the list of items for which a search warrant may be issued.
5. Amend Code § 19.1-85 to permit a search warrant to be issued to search a person.
6. Add a new section requiring any officer who executes a search warrant to make a list of the articles seized under such warrant and file it in the court which will hear any criminal case in which the property seized may be involved.
7. The enactment of a statute requiring a defendant in a criminal case to file at a specified time before trial notice that one of the defenses to be used will be an alibi and a list of the names and addresses of the witnesses who will be called to testify in corroboration thereof.
8. The enactment of a "Stop and Frisk" statute.
9. The enactment of a statute providing compulsory psychiatric examination and treatment of persons convicted of any so-called "sex" crime.
10. The enactment of a statute increasing the penalty for a crime committed with a firearm, except homicide or armed robbery.
11. The enactment of a statute to require all persons remaining in jail more than twenty-four hours, either serving a sentence or awaiting trial, to undergo medical examination.

ORGANIZED CRIME

As President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice stated in its report titled *The Challenge of Crime*, "Organized crime is a society that seeks to operate outside the control of the American people and their governments". . . . What organized crime wants is money and power. What makes it different from law-abiding organizations and individuals with those same objectives is that the ethical and moral standards the criminals adhere to,

the laws and regulations they obey, the procedures they use, are private and secret ones that they devise themselves, change when they see fit, and administer summarily and invisibly. Organized crime affects the lives of millions of Americans, but because it desperately preserves its invisibility many, perhaps most, Americans are not aware how they are affected, or even that they are affected at all.”

Again this report speaking of the sections of the country where organized crime operates stated:

“Organized criminal groups are known to operate in all sections of the Nation. In response to a Commission survey of 71 cities, the police departments in 80 percent of the cities with over 1 million residents, in 20 percent of the cities with a population between one-half million and a million, in 20 percent of the cities with between 250,000 and 500,000 population, and in over 50 percent of the cities between 100,000 and 250,000, indicated that organized criminal groups exist in their cities. In some instances Federal agency intelligence indicated the presence of organized crime where local reports denied it. Of the nine cities not responding to the Commission survey, six are known to Federal agencies to have extensive organized crime problems. Where the existence of organized crime was acknowledged, all police departments indicated that the criminal group would continue even though a top leader died or was incarcerated.

Organized crime in small cities is more difficult to assess. Law enforcement personnel are aware of many instances in which local racket figures controlled crime in a smaller city and received aid from and paid tribute to organized criminal groups located in a nearby large city. In one Eastern town, for example, the local racket figure combined with outside organized criminal groups to establish horse and numbers gambling grossing \$1.3 million annually, an organized dice game drawing customers from four states and having an employee payroll of \$350,000 annually, and still capable of producing \$4 million worth of alcohol each year. The town’s population was less than 100,000. Organized crime cannot be seen as merely a big-city problem.

Citizens of Virginia believe we are relatively free from the activities of organized crime, but are we? This Commission heard several uncorroborated reports of various activities that appear to be those operated by organized crime, but definite proof was lacking. Yet, we know there are gambling operations going on in the State, such as football pools, numbers writing, horse race betting, and loan sharking. Are the persons engaged in these activities really only local people or do they have backing outside the State from a so-called “core group” of organized crime? Assuming their operations may be purely local today, what is there to prevent the organization from moving in to provide the financial assistance to help these local people get rich. Another suspicious area is the increase in illegal narcotic traffic and use. Drugs are entering the State illegally and being distributed and used particularly by young citizens who have no knowledge or suspicion about organized crime. These operations have every earmark of being maintained and operated by a syndicate of organized crime.

Virginia must be constantly vigilant about organized crime. It could well invade our State before we know it, just as illegal drug use has.

Thus, after careful thought, reflection and conversations with many law enforcement officials, this Commission believes Virginia should have a legislative based Commission empowered to constantly investigate the activities of organized crime. In order to function effectively, such a Commission should have the power to issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses. Since the Crime Commission has been working in the crime field for the past two bienniums, and is familiar with police officials of the State and with the many facets of law enforcement, we propose that this Commission be enlarged by the adding of two members from the General Assembly, be given the power to subpoena witnesses, and be authorized to function in this capacity. This Commission as presently constituted is representative of the General Assembly and of the public. The Attorney

General elect has met with the Commission and agreed to supply it with all necessary legal assistance in conducting hearings and gathering information. By enlarging the membership by two members from the House of Delegates, the Commission will be predominantly legislative in membership and through its function in this new capacity, can keep the General Assembly abreast of all developments in criminal law violation and enforcement. Thus, effective legislation can be intelligently and quickly recommended and explained to the General Assembly.

CONCLUSION

Crime is an ever-growing blight. Its growth must be stopped. In this report, we have attempted to recommend measures which we hope will stunt if not stop its growth.

We express our appreciation to the many State and local law enforcement officers who cooperated so completely with this Commission in furnishing it statistical data and suggestions. In addition, the public support we have received from individuals and groups was most encouraging. Finally, we thank the news media for their splendid cooperation and coverage.

Legislation to carry out the recommendations in this report is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley C. Walker, *Chairman*
William H. Hodges, *Vice-Chairman*
George S. Aldhizer, II
*W. C. (Dan) Daniel
James W. Davis
William N. Paxton, Jr.
A. L. Philpott
Joe Richman
Erwin S. Solomon

* Elected to U. S. House of Representatives and did not participate in any of the Commission's hearings nor in this report.

A BILL To amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered 19.1-19.1:1, and to repeal § 19.1-19.1 of the Code of Virginia, the new and repealed sections relating to the Central Criminal Records Exchange.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia be amended by adding a section numbered 19.1-19.1:1, as follows:

§ 19.1-19.1:1. (a) On and after July one, nineteen hundred seventy, the Division within the Office of the Attorney General of Virginia known as the Central Criminal Records Exchange, heretofore created and existing, is hereby transferred to and shall hereafter operate as a separate division within the Department of State Police under the supervision of the Superintendent thereof, but shall retain its present name. All the powers and duties heretofore vested in and imposed upon said Division in the Attorney General's Office are hereby transferred to and vested in and imposed upon the Department of State Police. In addition, this Division shall be the sole criminal record keeping agency of the State, except for the Division of Motor Vehicles.

(b) The Superintendent of State Police is hereby authorized to employ such personnel, establish such offices and acquire such equipment as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and is also authorized to enter into agreements with other State agencies for services to be performed for it by employees of such other agencies.

(c) All right, title and interest in and to any real estate, or any tangible personal property, vested in the Central Criminal Records Exchange as a division of the Office of the Attorney General of Virginia at the time this section becomes effective are transferred to the Department of State Police. All unexpended funds appropriated for the operation of such Division in the Office of the Attorney General shall be transferred to the Department of State Police for its operation therein.

2. That § 19.1-19.1 of the Code of Virginia is repealed.

A BILL To create a Commission to study and prepare a report on revisions to the criminal statutes of Virginia, and to appropriate funds therefor.

Whereas, the last twenty years have brought forth many judicial changes in the interpretation of the criminal laws of this nation; and

Whereas, the federal government is providing financial assistance to the states to effect criminal law reform; and

Whereas, Virginia's penal and criminal procedure statutes have not been comprehensively revised in the light of present day judicial opinions; and

Whereas, many sections of Virginia's Code defining crimes are scattered throughout the Code and are not collected in an easily accessible Title, now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. § 1. There is hereby created a Commission to study and prepare a complete revision of all statutes of the State relating to crime and criminal procedure, which Commission shall be composed of four members of the House of Delegates to be appointed by the Speaker, two members of the Senate to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, two judges of courts of record in the State and one judge of a court not of record to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, one Commonwealth's Attorney and one member of the Virginia State Bar whose principal field of practice is criminal law, both to be appointed by the President of the Virginia State Bar, and the Attorney General of Virginia.

§ 2. The Commission shall make a thorough study of all sections of the Code of Virginia defining both felonies and misdemeanors and of the Code sections relating to criminal procedure as well as case law interpreting these sections, and make recommendations for the revision and recodification of all statutes of the State relating to crime, including the repeal of unnecessary or undesirable Code sections and all other changes in the penalty structure as the Commission may feel will better serve the ends of justice. The Commission shall complete its study and make its report to the Governor and General Assembly of Virginia not later than November one, nineteen hundred seventy-one.

§ 3. The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for their necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. The Commission may employ a director and such legal, secretarial, clerical and other assistance as may be necessary to complete its study. All agencies of the State and of the political subdivisions thereof shall cooperate with and assist the Commission in this study.

§ 4. The Commission may accept and expend gifts, grants and donations from any and all sources or persons for the purpose of carrying out its study; including such appropriations as may be made to it by law.

§ 5. For the purpose of this study, there is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the State treasury a sum sufficient, not to exceed thirty thousand dollars.

A BILL To continue the Virginia State Crime Commission.

Whereas, the General Assembly of Virginia in 1968 in House Joint Resolution No. 48 continued the Virginia State Crime Commission; and

Whereas, in its report to the 1970 General Assembly this Commission stated that two studies should be undertaken, to wit, the creation of a special Division in some existing State agency, or as a separate State agency, to deal with drug abuse and illegal narcotic traffic and the feasibility of establishing a State Central Crime Laboratory; and

Whereas, in its report, the necessity for maintaining constant surveillance on the activities of organized crime in Virginia was pointed out and it was further recommended that some legislative based commission should be maintained to investigate any area in which organized crime was alleged, or suspected, to be operating, now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. § 1. That the Virginia State Crime Commission established by House Joint Resolution No. 113 of the 1966 Regular Session of the General Assembly and continued by House Joint Resolution No. 48 of the 1968 General Assembly, is hereby continued further.

§ 2. The membership of the Commission shall consist of the present members, with two additional members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Delegates from the membership thereof. If any member is unwilling or unable to serve, or if for any other reason a vacancy occurs, his successor shall be appointed in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

§ 3. The Commission shall continue its study into the causes of crime and the ways and means to reduce and prevent it and shall specifically study and report on the following:

(a) The need of creating a separate State department or of establishing within an existing State department a Bureau of Drug Abuse and Narcotics. The report and recommendations concerning this shall be made to the 1972 Session of the General Assembly or to an earlier special session if such report can be made.

(b) The need for the establishment of a Central Crime Laboratory in Virginia and how such a laboratory should be equipped and function, the cost thereof, and whether such laboratory should be placed in an existing State department or established as a separate department.

(c) The activities of organized crime in the State. For this purpose, the Commission is authorized to issue subpoenas for attendance of witnesses before the Commission with the same effect as if they were issued in an action in any court of record in this State. The Commission may administer oaths to witnesses testifying before it in any matter relating to organized crime. Disobedience of such subpoenas and false testimony given under oath before the Commission shall be subject to the same penalty as if such disobedience or false testimony under oath occurred or was given in an action in a court of record.

Further, the Commission is authorized to conduct hearings under any conditions it may deem advisable where it has reason to believe that an individual's or the public safety may be involved, or the public interest or welfare may be threatened.

The Attorney General of Virginia is requested to give any and all necessary legal counsel and assistance to the Commission.

Any information gathered by this Commission may be made available by it to any law enforcement agency or officer of the State at any time and in any manner it may deem advisable.

§ 4. The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their necessary expenses for which, and for such secretarial and other assistance as the Commission may require, there is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the State treasury the sum of twenty thousand dollars.

§ 5. Unless directed otherwise, the Commission shall conclude its study and make its report to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia not later than November one, nineteen hundred seventy-one. All agencies of the State shall assist the Commission in its study upon request.

