

that the police have been discredited so long in their contacts with the generally law-abiding public in the traffic context as such that policemen are looked at as those who might, given an opportunity, exploit the very authority that they ought to be protecting.

So it is just wishful thinking to suspect that a prisoner who is contacted perfunctorily by a police officer will just unburden his conscience and say, "You're right, officer, I have committed the offense"—rape, robbery, burglary, the whole gamut of predatory acts.

This is not so. In many instances it takes several hours to gain the confidence of the subject.

Now, the people suggest this is star chamber. But we live in an age where the technological advances have been tremendous. What is wrong with recording everything that the police officer says to the suspect? What is wrong with filming the entire interview—if there is some concern about a possible abuse while this proper kind of rapport is in the developmental stages? This can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't that actually done in certain instances?

Chief SCHROTEL. Sir, we go so far—in fact in the *Mallory* case—mindful of this grim specter of public criticism, they even took Mr. Mallory to a doctor to have him examined so that they would be in a position to say that he bears no particular marks of abuse or physical abuse at the hands of the police. The police constantly have to labor with this.

The CHAIRMAN. You have made reference to the taking of films during an interrogation. Is this actually done in any of your police work, so as to preserve the fact of voluntariness for the jury?

Chief SCHROTEL. When we want to buttress a confession—we have done this in our local jurisdiction—we have had the suspect reenact the crime, and we have filmed his reenactment. We have not gone far enough, because of monetary limitations, to do this in sound, but it certainly could be done. But I am suggesting that in the interrogation room, where you have something akin to a lawyer-client relationship, a doctor-patient relationship, the same kind of confidentiality must prevail if we are to elicit from this individual information that will result in his own undoing.

The CHAIRMAN. You may continue.

Chief SCHROTEL. A police officer should be authorized to arrest under a warrant when the warrant is not in his possession, to arrest without a warrant for any misdemeanor committed in his presence, and to arrest without a warrant for petty thefts and other misdemeanors not committed in his presence when he has reasonable grounds to believe that the defendant could not be found after the warrant was issued.

Suspects should be denied the right to resist illegal arrests by a person the suspect has reasonable grounds to believe to be a police officer. The police should be authorized and urged to use notices to appear in court in lieu of physical arrest in suitable misdemeanor cases when they believe the defendant will appear as agreed.

Persons the police have reasonable grounds to believe to be witnesses to crimes should be legally required to identify themselves to the police.

These are essentially the provisions of the Uniform Arrest Act. To them should be added authority for the police to search any convicted narcotic offender for contraband, without a warrant, when