

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
PUBLIC HEARING ON S.B. #247

March 3, 1971

Chairman Monroe called the hearing to order at 9:00 a.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Monroe
Senator Close
Senator Dodge
Senator Foley
Senator Swobe
Senator Wilson
Senator Young

Others Present: Gene Coughlin - Head Counselor, State Prison
Carl Hocker - Warden, State Prison
Ed Pogne - Deputy Warden, State Prison
Marylee Bone - League of Women Voter's
Lester Halstead - Clark County Juv. Court
A. A. Campos - Parole & Probation
Marlene Wendell - District Attorney's Secretary, C.C.
George Wendell - Carson City Sheriff's Office
Phil Hannafin - Nevada Gaming Commission, formerly
with Parole & Probation Dept.
Press

S.B. #247 - Changes sentencing and parole procedures and penalties
for certain felonies.

Senator Wilson: This bill was designed to solve a couple of problems. The bill has not been cleared with all the departments concerned. I'm going to make a motion at this time that the bill be held in committee but I think we ought to take some steps to get the problem defined. We've got one particularly with respect to repeating offenders. We need a legislative committee or task force of some kind to give us some answers. The bill in the present form will not be adequate for that reason.

Phil Hannafin: There have been a number of problems that have become obvious in the several years since we have gone to the determinate sentencing provisions.

We have found that numerous individuals are receiving sentences in the district courts of four years, or three years, and when sentences are being served, by the provision of good time credits, they are being released prior to the time the parole board would ordinarily feel they should be released. They are being released by reason of expiration of the sentence or being released prior to the expiration of the sentence because the parole board feels they should have some small amount of time on parole in order to help them get relocated in the community. In that regard, the members of the parole board have reflected on more than one occasion their dissatisfaction with this plan, because people are forced out of the prison prior to the time the parole board feels they should be released.

7-1000

Secondly, we have found through the use of determinate sentencing, there is a wide disparity of sentencing taking place throughout the state. This results in numerous persons in the prison comparing their sentences and finding that for the same offense, another prisoner might have gotten a much lesser sentence. It causes a great deal of problems within the prison setting.

Thirdly, we have received from the Attorney General for the past few years several opinions that have, I believe, drastically altered the administration of justice in the state. That statement is not critical, it's just a statement of fact. For example, we have had a law on the books for many years which was not administered and it said essentially that persons who had three or more prior convictions could not be paroled. When the Attorney General was asked for an opinion as to the meaning of this language, it came out that we had to go back administratively and seek out all of these prior convictions, get exemplified copies of all the documents, prove that the person had been represented by council, and if all this was satisfactory, then he could no longer be eligible for parole. Now in some cases, this was difficult to do. It seems to be an injustice for we have people who back in the 20's and 30's committed a series of crimes, and then for 10 or 15 years seemed to get ahold of themselves. Then finally again fell for some even minor offense, come to the prison, and can not be paroled.

Another opinion related to a person who is serving consecutive sentences. It was the practice for a person serving consecutive sentences, after he had shown some degree of improvement at the prison that he would be paroled from that first sentence, to begin serving the second sentence. An Attorney General's opinion indicated that this practice was improper and that he must now serve to completion the first sentence and then serve the minimum amount of time on the second sentence to gain eligibility for parole. One of the effects of these opinions has been to plug up the outflow from the prison and you are seeing an increase in the prison population as a partial result of that.

I think there is a real problem. Determinate sentencing was an answer that did not do what it was intended to do. It does not appear to me to be an adequate remedy for the evils that we have and there is a definite need for a very full and thorough study for sentencing procedures. I would suggest that you heavily consider appointing a group of real experts to a task force.

Senator Wilson: Aside from the problem with the inconsistencies in determinate sentencing, we obviously have a problem with the repeating offender. To what extent do we have the problem of not having sufficient discipline over the person who goes to prison, gets out and gets back into trouble again.

Phil Hannafin: If released on expiration of sentencing and gets back into trouble, you have the habitual criminal provisions of the law, which are very seldom invoked. You must keep in mind these provisions are brought by the District Attorney. These kinds of repeating offenders are not being viewed as such when they appear in court. The question is now, should there be a mechanism when the person arrives at the prison for taking his prior repeated behavior into account. My own feeling is there should be.

Senator Wilson: Do you know offhand what the incident of parole violation is?

1-207
Phil Hannafin: In a two year study we did, we found we were successful with 64% of them. This meant 36% were failing on parole. A majority of those failings were on the realm of technical violations rather than new crimes being committed. That's not as rosy as that sounds because technical violations were invoked against these people wherever possible in order to prevent them from committing more serious crimes.

Senator Wilson: What percentage of the crimes committed have been committed by the repeating offender.

Phil Hannafin: From my observations it is a rarity when a person is sentenced to the state prison and has not been previously convicted of some offense. The number of first offenders coming in is small.

Senator Dodge: From what you've seen, would you say we might have to go back to the indeterminate minimum maximum sentence and let the parole and probation people make a determination within that range.

Phil Hannafin: I don't want to make too many wild speculations because I do think it would be most proper to follow Senator Wilson's suggestion that this be studied very thoroughly. I tend, on a personal basis, to lean more towards the indeterminate sentencing provisions. But just the pure indeterminate provisions that we had several years ago are not totally adequate either, there has to be some modifications.

Senator Wilson: Do you think we ought to consider; either by task force study, or committee study, or otherwise, some kind of a scheme where after a guys served his hard time and has not been paroled because he isn't qualified, that he ought to remain under some kind of supervision for some length of time as though he were on parole. Give him some measure of supervision at least to help him adjust and at least give society a greater degree of protection.

Phil Hannafin: There may be some constitutional problems there, but you can probably resolve them by imposing a term which would allow that. I have no objection to running these persons on a parole basis. I don't think parole is in the sense social work which has been viewed over the years. I think it more precisely is a system of preventing the reoccurrence of crime on the part of those persons previously convicted. If this provision in keeping these people on parole will assist in that endeavor through supervision; through surveillance; through counseling, which really takes the form of trying to coordinate community based programs; if in that way we can keep this man out of prison some time in the future, and reduce the incidence of crime by these offenders, I think its worth the money spent. Because parole by and large is a real bargain if you take a per capita cost figure.

Senator Close: Are you aware when this provision was considered last time it was to be a step going more toward the federal system where the judge gives a sentence and somebody else gives the actual sentence according to his prison record. Do you suggest we go into something like that at this time; are we ready for that type of a program?

Phil Hannafin: I personally lean toward systems of that nature. I think all to often the judge in rendering sentence is very ill equipped to understand the person before him. He sees him for a very small amount of time and doesn't converse

1-228

with him to any great degree. He's hearing representation from counsel on one hand that says he's a nice guy and on the other hand from the prosecuting attorney that he's a real dog. I don't know how the judge can make an accurate determination under those conditions. I think it would be far better if there is a system where the man is sent to a perception and diagnostic center prior to sentencing, and then returned to the court with a complete work-up study only for a sentencing hearing. This gives the court a far better understanding of the human being.

Senator Close: We felt during our study that the responsibility for sentencing would be with the parole and probation department. It was their responsibility to make adequate studies and reports to the judge and give him something to go on. We never meant the judge to be the deciding factor to a sentence. The judge was supposed to rely on what the parole and probation recommended in their reports. Have they supplied the reports and in them made a recommendation for the sentence?

Phil Hannafin: The department has more than fulfilled the obligation placed upon them for providing a pre-sentence report to the judge which gives good information. I didn't come here to criticize the judiciary, but I would have to reflect to you that on many occasion they do not read the report, and on other occasions they will read only the last page which is the recommendation. I have had judges call us and say "where is the report on this guy" the day for sentencing and we had delivered it to him the previous week. You can provide the report to him, but if he doesn't read it, or he doesn't understand it, it hasn't really done much.

The answer to the last portion of your question, yes, there is a definite term of imprisonment being recommended.

I would say that in 70% of the cases, the recommended sentence that we provide is reduced by the court at the time of sentencing and we're not all that harsh. The department on many occasions feels it's being back-dooed. If the Probation Department recommends that the person be sentenced to 10 years, he's eligible for parole in 1/4 of that time. Somewhere there's a deal made and he's not sentenced to 10 years, he's sentenced to 4 years because 10 years would be too onerous. He is able to expire that sentence in 2 1/2 years, which is the same time in which he would be able to gain parole eligibility. This is the evil of the present system.

Senator Close: What can we do during this session, if anything, to help meet the problem you suggest, and not wait for a two year study. We are talking about immediacy because if there is a serious problem in the disparity of identical crimes, we want to reduce that disparity.

Phil Hannafin: One of the things I know is done in several other places, is to have a review committee on sentencing to try to keep them in balance. But I would say rather than try to do something this session this whole problem should be described to you so that you can see how we feel about it, the evils of it and then accordingly set the wheels in motion to come up with far more thorough information than we are prepared to give you today.

Senator Close: It doesn't really shock me to find disparity in sentencing, because for the same crime there are disparities within that person. But it would bother me if two first offenders commit the very same type of crime and received varied sentences.

Phil Hannafin: I think the gentlemen from the prison and from the parole and probation department can describe numerous occurrences of that very nature.

Senator Young: Are there any states known to be particularly successful in this field?

Phil Hannafin: California has had the reputation of being the most progressive and enlightened state in the nation in both juvenile and adult offenders. Frankly, it has been my observation from those institutions I have visited down there, that we leave them in the dust. We have a far better system than California has.

George Wendell, Carson City Sheriff's Office, read a statement he prepared which is attached to minutes as Attachment I.

Senator Wilson: It is really the intent behind 247 to retain some kind of supervision and discipline over the person who wouldn't normally qualify for parole after his release from serving his full term. Is it your judgement as a law officer that we need a scheme of that kind?

George Wendell: Yes sir. In my opinion, if they are released I would like to see the supervision be mandatory. If we have more under the control of parole and probation we can keep a closer eye on them. We know that rehabilitation is a fantastic thing but I think there are facts to show that most of the people that go in the institution and come out are not rehabilitated.

Senator Wilson: Do you think the crime rate by the repeating offender would decrease if these guys were under supervision?

George Wendell: Yes.

Mr. A. A. Campos, Parole and Probation: Mr. Wilson's thoughts on this are my thoughts as well. I think it was maybe an overreaction to an unpleasant situation.

I think when we talk about determinate and indeterminate sentences, we really have to have some degree of emotion involved. Our indeterminate sentencing that we had previously had a lot of good points, but had a lot of weaknesses. The reason it was ineffective was because it was not properly administered.

It's hard to get into prison and hard to get out. You run about 65% probation grants on felonies, which means you are only sending 35% to prison of your convicted felons but when a felon gets in prison there is a 35% grant on the parole board. This is because the parole board are community minded people who are protective of their authority and do not abuse that authority. In response to Senator Close's question about pre-sentence reports and meanings they do and don't have in sentencing, our department is given 30 days to prepare the pre-sentence report. Ordinarily this probably averages out to 25 days. When you figure that you have a certain amount of time for dictation, typing, and review by supervisors; what you really have is probably about 2 weeks for verification of background information. You don't really have time to send to previous places of incarceration and so on and get the response from agencies that have dealt with this man in the past. On the other hand, once a man gets to prison, during the first 90 days he is there, his case is fully evaluated and a case summary is prepared. With the 90 day preparation period, they can do one whale

of a report. They verify everything the person says. So, the resources about the man that the judge has fall far short of what the parole authorities have when they review the case. 1-250

The problem with determinate sentencing is two fold: One, maximum sentences are not adequate. A 10 years sentence for burglary, when you include good time credit, the maximum amount of time he would spend in prison is 6 years. There are cases where a man will expire his sentence who is just as dangerous as he was when he came in. Secondly, the courts in sentencing the man have further reduced the maximum time you can hold them in prison. A sentence on any offense of up to and including 6 years in prison will mean that a man is eligible for parole in roughly about one year. He goes to the parole board in one year whether he gets a sentence of 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6 years. So there is basically no justification in my mind, except for some exceptional cases, for any man going to prison for less than a 6 year term. If he should be released or considered for release at the earliest possible time you could still accomplish this in 6 years.

As a result of some of the Attorney General's opinions, the average length of time served in prison is going up. If you can not substantiate the priors and the fact that a man had counsel on his priors, then he is eligible for parole no matter how many priors he has. The law in itself isn't equitable among the people it applies to. We have to be able to establish the validity of the priors. In doing that, of the people that appear to be ineligible that did have priors, we have been able to certify less than half of those as being ineligible for parole. The final result of the system is the fact that fewer and fewer are getting out on parole and more and more are getting out on expiration of sentence. I want to distribute these statistics on parole releases to you. (Attachment 2).

Senator Wilson: We spent most of the morning discussing the difficulties of the present parole and probation policy and the disparity in sentencing. I think we should develop some answers to what this bill is after. When this person serves his time and after he's released, it seems to me he ought to be on some kind of supervision as though he were on parole. That is the point of S.B. #247, and I'd like to develop testimony, opinion, and judgement whether or not this type of approach is the right one.

Senator Dodge: How many of these type of repeaters can you really tell that after they've served their time, they are going to come back. Can you tell in most cases if the guy is really rehabilitated, or with this supervision that Senator Wilson is talking about, he would stay out of trouble.

Mr. A. A. Campos: When your in this business you develop a reliable professional opinion.

Senator Foley: Is there any critical time period when he would most likely go back to crime.

Mr. A. A. Campos: The critical time is the time between when he's released and when he can fit back into whatever community he's in. They are very depressed within 24 hours after their release, the glory is gone, and they are faced with a real problem of survival. Under our current policies a man is paroled, but not released until he has a verified job, residence, and so on. Ordinarily if a man can get through his first 6 months of parole, its not too likely that he's going to fall for at least a technical violation. One of the

problems we have is the fact that so much of our prison population is transient. 1- 221

Senator Close: How many times does the court give the maximum sentence available for a particular crime?

Mr. A. A. Campos: Rarely.

Senator Close: Most of the problems come if a judge gives a sentence of less than 6 years. I think the existing law provides that when the fellow has served the maximum time the judge has given to him, he's off parole. Many times, at least looking at the sheet you handed out, he serves his maximum time before he's even released from prison. As a suggestion to the committee to take care of this problem immediately, if we took the maximum time for each crime, regardless of what time the judge sentenced for the maximum, and said that person could be under parole supervision up to the maximum time allowed by law. Then if the parole and probation department determines that person should be off at an earlier time, they have the power to do so. This would do two things: If the judge gives six years then he could be under supervision from the time he's released, whether it be one year or whatever, for six years. If the judge only gives him 4 years, and he serves four years, he's still under parole supervision for 2 more years, which would give you some hold on the guy. What would you say about that? Keeping in mind that rarely does the judge give the maximum penalty, so therefore, it does little good to double the maximum penalty.

Mr. A. A. Campos: It is the general feeling that what we need are statutes that will last instead of us having to come back every two years. There are some problems with what you suggested that perhaps could be straightened out by the language of the law. The supreme court has held parole in some respects a contract between the individual and the state. If he is not obligated to be paroled, he can refuse it. I'm not too sure you could word that so you could effectively force him to be on parole.

That is what is basically done on the federal system, what they call "mandatory release parole supervision". It works pretty well in the federal system for a couple of reasons. One important reason is that under the federal system this man can be supervised anywhere in the country without having to go through an interstate compact. He can be returned from anywhere without the necessity of an extradition. Also, he can be housed in any facility in the event he violates parole. Their costs in cases of violation are considerable reduced. Another factor is that if his term expired in prison and would be on parole for 8 or 9 months or a year, subsequent to that. If not we are not able to establish a job or residence, I don't see how we could keep him in prison until we are able to accomplish those.

Senator Wilson: That would be infinitely better than dropping him on the street with no supervision at all.

Senator Close: We are offering you a controlled supervision over person mandatory released from prison. Don't you think its an appropriate step to take at this time?

Mr. A. A. Campos: I think we should look at results of what the proposal is first.

Senator Dodge: The theory advanced when we passed the present sentencing concept is that the judge or maybe the jury were going to be in the best position to make a determination about the sentence. Apropos of that, I'd like to ask you, the parole and probation end, who are removed from the courtroom, do you feel when you are able to review the person's record and observe him in prison life, that you can make a valid determination of how long he should remain in prison for that crime, or at least as good a determination as the judge made in the first instance.

Mr. A. A. Campos: I think we could make a better determination.

Warden Hocker: In the first place the primary interest we have in the bill has several facets to it. I certainly agree with Senator Wilson that a task force be assigned to this problem for several reasons. At the present time inmates are serving time under three different sets of circumstances. Passage of this bill would assure there would be a fourth set of circumstances which would be confusing to the inmates and the institution. We agree with some of the provision of the bill; particular reference to the four time loser law, the consecutive sentence provision, and the authority for the jurist to grant county jail time. We have not particularly addressed ourselves to the problems that arose during this discussion.

I have two of my staff members here who I feel could make a contribution to the committee.

Senator Wilson: I will put to you the same question Senator Close and I have been putting to Mr. Campos. Would you favor a proposal to provide some kind of post sentence supervision over this guy so he's not just a drifter, and make it fit each individual case as it comes along depending on all the circumstances.

Warden Hocker: Based on practical experience and observation, I would certainly agree to that. Sometimes there are people going out the gate we strongly feel should not be turned loose without supervision.

Chairman Monroe: I think we should ask ourselves how much society can afford to pay to take care of the maximum effort against these criminals. If we kept everybody in prison, how big and what kind of expense would we have to keep the people in there that ought to actually be in prison.

Warden Hocker: I really don't think the numbers would be very great.

Senator Close: I think the important thing is not only how long they are in prison, but what happens when they get out. It costs much less to put a guy on parole than to keep him in prison. If we can give the parole and probation department some handle on these fellows so they could control them after they're released from prison, you will find less people coming back in a months time. I think you save money with good parole supervision. What does it cost for one prisoner per year?

Warden Hocker: Something in excess of \$3,000.

Senator Close: That's \$3,000 compared to what for probation?

Mr. A. A. Campos: I'd say whatever amount it costs to keep them in prison, it costs 1/4 of that on parole. Plus when you're talking about cost you have to

consider that in addition to the decreased cost under supervision, he is also productive, paying taxes, off welfare, etc.

Senator Close: We recognize the fact that if we pass this, we will have to go to the Finance Committee to get money for additional probation officers.

Ed Pogne, Deputy Warden of the Prison: I might suggest on mandatory release feature, I feel you should consider requiring that the prison release the person 6 months or so before he is to expire his sentence that has been determined by the judge. He could spend the rest of that time under parole supervision unless there is good cause why he should not be released. A proviso in case the guy is so messed up that we can't even trust him on parole for those few months.

Then if he violates parole, the parole board would also have the authority to revoke his statutory time which would result in him completing the calendar sentence. This is one possible way of coming up with this type of sentence.

Gene Coughlin, Head Counselor at the Prison: To my knowledge, since the inception of parole it has been a contractual agreement, and a person can not be forced to engage in parole supervision.

Senator Wilson: I think we ought to change that, that theory's crazy. Seems to me we ought to have the policy and jurisdiction to say sentence is twofold. Part of it is prison and the other part is the return to society under supervision.

Gene Coughlin: This was an Attorney General's opinion which says two things: A person can not be forced on parole, and secondly, his parole can not extend upon the original expiration of his term.

Our presentation was based primarily on an analysis of S.B. #247. Since this bill will be held in committee, I will get duplicates of our presentation and send them to you.

I would like to make a general statement. We would like to beseech you rather than passing remedial legislation at this session, to allow a task force to be composed. The aim of the task force would be to acknowledge and look at the problems existing now, and provide suggestive remedial legislation for next session. We are in complete agreement with everyone that has spoken today that there are glaring errors in the current penal statutes of this state. There are complications, inequities, and everything that goes with it.

One thought as far as the feeling that not enough people are being able to get parole, we and the parole and probation department feel that many of the restrictions in this area are on the basis of the attorney general's opinions.

There are three or four items we totally are in agreement with in S.B. #247, particularly putting the county jail time credit back into the hands of the committing judge. The pardon court wants no part in handling it, we want no part in handling it.

Senate Judiciary Committee
Public Hearing on S.B. #247
March 3, 1971

1-234

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Eileen Wynkoop, Secretary

Approved: _____

1-

I am in support of Senate Bill Number 247 and am in agreement with many of the proposed changes in criminal statutes proposed by Mr. A. A. Campos, Deputy Chief of Nevada State Department of Parole and Probation.

Considerations for our laws should be based primarily on punishment, rehabilitation and retention of dangerous people in prison. Our present laws fall short in all of the above-mentioned areas. The short maximum sentences, as well as the short sentences in many cases handed down by the courts create a variety of problems and do not afford the measure of protection to society which criminal statutes must provide in order to be effective.

Nevada is presently operating on a determinate sentencing basis. With the exception of certain major offenses, a man is sentenced to a determinate number of years in prison and is eligible for parole after serving one year or one fourth of his sentence, whichever is longer. Nevadans were dissatisfied with the leniency of the laws and what they considered to be a leniency of paroling authorities. In the revision of the laws in 1967,

the immediate goal was to stiffen the punishment by placing it in the hands of judges on a determinate sentencing basis. The overall effect has been a fairly wide disparity of sentencing between jurisdictions, which has to make rehabilitation efforts in a prison setting much more difficult.

The maximum sentences in themselves, particularly for crimes of robbery and assault, are not sufficient enough to insure that dangerous people can be retained in the institutional setting. It is all too common to see a man released on expiration of sentence who is not only unprepared to compete in the free community, but poses a definite threat to it.

In a greater amount of cases, it is quite evident that the short sentence makes it very difficult for the prison to motivate inmates in the area of self-improvement. It is a fact that a Nevada inmate with a two year sentence, which can be completed in sixteen months, will not make an effort to do much of a constructive nature. Instead, he absorbs the more negative subcultural values of the prison and leaves in a worse condition than when he arrived.

A good deal of controversy, previously encountered in

determinate sentencing, had to do with the feeling that the parole board in some instances was too lenient. It is proposed that a system of indeterminate sentencing be re-enacted with the minimum term to be set by the courts. N. R. S. 176.033, dealing with sentence of imprisonment, should be amended so that the minimum sentence shall be set by the courts and shall be not less than one year and not more than half of the maximum sentence, taking into account the gravity of the offense and the character of the defendant. When dealing with felony offenses, parole eligibility would occur when an inmate had served one calendar year, or the minimum sentence less good time credits, whichever was the longest. In most cases, the proposed sentences give the courts a greater degree of discretion than they now have. For example, the maximum sentence presently in effect for burglary is ten years. The greatest minimum sentence which could be given by a court under the present proposal is ten years. However, it should be noted that this ten years is much more significant than the previous maximum of ten years, inasmuch as under the present laws if the court gave a maximum of ten years for burglary, a man would be eligible

in one-quarter of that time, which would be two and one-half years, less good time credits. Under the proposed law, if the court felt a high minimum of ten years should be imposed, the man would be eligible for parole only after he had completed ten years, less good time credit.

In considering the number of inmates released from the Nevada State Prison within the last five years, the percentage of those released on parole has rapidly decreased. For example, I have some statistics regarding all releases from the Nevada State Prison within the last five years. In 1965 there were 162 inmates released from prison of which 82% were released on parole. In 1970, there were 300 inmates released from prison of which 48% were released on parole.

Year	Number released (including parolees)	Number Paroled	All releases Percent Paroled
1965	162	133	82%
1966	250	196	78%
1967	308	240	78%
1968	268	177	66%
1969	259	140	54%
1970	300	144	48%

In 1970, more than half of all released from the Nevada State Prison were expiration of sentences. Without job and residence placement, assistance and surveillance, the inmates constitute an immeasurable threat

and cost to the community. It would be a greater service to our state if the majority of prisoners released from prison were released under supervision. If a man is inclined to return to his old habits, this usually occurs during the early period of his release.

There were two recent incidents within this community involving the discharge of inmates from the Nevada State Prison. On one occasion, an individual was released from the prison at 9:00 a. m. and by noon of that same day he was in the custody of the local Sheriff's office on two counts of burglary. Between the hours of 9:00 a. m. and noon, he had burglarized several state offices, including the State Legislative Counsel Bureau. The other individual had been released from the Nevada State Prison in the early morning hours and by mid-afternoon he was in the custody of the Sheriff's office for auto theft, hit and run, and assault and battery.

Law enforcement agencies and the State Department of Parole and Probation have always worked closely together, and I am sure they will continue to do so. This close association has tremendously assisted law

1-

enforcement agencies. While an individual is on parole, a law enforcement agency is able to know of his whereabouts and activities which has assisted in the clearance of many cases where time is of the essence in making an arrest of the perpetrator and the recovery of stolen property as well as narcotics and contraband.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that parole for the majority of prisoners released is a necessity for his readaptation to community life as well as for the suppression of crime in our society.

###

1-241

Adults released and adults paroled during calendar
years
1965-1970

Year	Number released (including parolees)	Number paroled
1965	<u>162</u>	<u>133</u> 82%
1966	<u>250</u>	<u>196</u> 78%
1967	<u>308</u>	<u>240</u> 78%
1968	<u>268</u>	<u>177</u> 66%
1969	<u>259</u>	<u>140</u> 54%
1970	<u>300</u>	<u>144</u> 48%

67% 6 year avg.

Bruce - Please obtain above
info for me on or
before 1-15-71 ddc