

crime, they should have a reasonable period of time to check their fingerprint and other files to ascertain whether the suspect is a "wanted" person. They would be justifiably subject to censure should they release from their custody one of the FBI's most sorely wanted criminals.

The third obligation—getting statements from victims and witnesses:

The victim of a criminal assault may be unconscious in a hospital. All witnesses to the assault may not yet be known to the police. The police have an obligation to search out witnesses and to obtain statements from them and the victim; they should have a reasonable time to do so before releasing the suspect when there is strong reason to believe him guilty of the assault even though they lack, at that moment, the quantum of proof required for his prosecution.

The fourth obligation—making laboratory analysis of physical evidence:

The suspect may have in his possession a substance which may be a contraband drug, or a firearm which may be a murder weapon, or a punch or other tool which may have been used in a safe burglary or other crime. The police would look pretty silly to the public they are charged with protecting should they release a suspect, and then in a few hours learn from their crime laboratory that the firearm he had in his possession was used in a heinous sex-murder of a school-girl. The police have an obligation to make these laboratory tests and they should have a reasonable time to do so.

The fifth obligation—to search for the murder weapon and loot:

The investigation sometimes uncovers leads as to the location of a hidden murder weapon or loot that has been concealed or disposed of. Their recovery may provide the quantum of proof needed to justify prosecution. The police have an obligation to effect their recovery and should have a reasonable time to do so.

The sixth obligation—a lineup for victims and witnesses:

The police often arrest a person on probable cause and yet are not in a position to place a formal charge because the suspect has not yet been identified by the victim or witnesses. A reasonable delay is necessary in order to arrange for the victims and witnesses to view and identify the suspect. Moreover, a criminal often commits a series of similar crimes in such a manner and in such a chronological and geographical pattern as to justify the police in believing that all of the crimes were committed by the same man. When a suspect is in custody, the police have an obligation to bring in all victims and witnesses to observe him in a lineup. They should have reasonable time to do so.

Again, I maintain that these are necessary police procedures. I know of no other reasonable alternative procedure. What other course can the police pursue?

The police could release the suspect with the understanding that he make himself available for viewing by the victim at a time mutually convenient to all parties. This might be practicable if the suspect were a person well known in the community, a family man, or property owner who would be unlikely to flee. But robbers, burglars, and sex offenders are usually a different type of person. If you let them go today you would be unlikely to find them tomorrow.