

I would also say this to the people who are opposed to this present bill, those who favor the McNabb-Mallory bill. If you want to really put a stop to all police abuses, then outlaw confessions completely. Let's face up to it and outlaw them all. Let's don't fool around with these rules as we have been dealing with them up to now. Let's outlaw all confessions.

I would certainly urge anyone who is in favor of that to bear in mind the consequences of such a rule.

Crime right now is increasing four times faster than population. And I venture to say if you had such a rule as that it is going to increase tremendously faster. It would be inevitable. And I think some commonsense consideration will support that.

We could put a stop to all fatal accidents on the highway, practically all of them, if we required by Federal and State law that all automobiles have governors on them so they cannot go faster than 20 miles an hour. If you want to achieve this kind of objective, you want to get complete safety on the highways, that is one sure way to do it. But we would pay an awful price for safety on the highways if none of us could go faster than 20 miles an hour.

Again, I say if you want to put a stop to all police abuses, prohibit interrogations completely, don't let the police use any confessions. Just bear in mind what the consequences of that would be.

Now, this notion that the police can function effectively with the *McNabb* rule, that they can get along with it fairly well—you have heard from Chief Murray. He has told you what the situation is here in the District of Columbia.

Let me suggest this to you on the basis of my own experience and observation over the years—that most crimes can only be solved by the interrogation of criminal suspects and witnesses. And let me give you just a few simple illustrations of this.

A woman is walking down the street late at night. She is grabbed, taken into a dark alley, and raped. She knows this was a man, he looked big to her, about 6 feet tall, he had on a blue sweater or something of that sort. That is about all she can tell the police. He does not drop his hat at the scene of the crime with his name in it. He does not leave any other clues.

In that type of case you can bring the FBI laboratory to the scene and you would still not be able to find any clue leading to the identity of the perpetrator of that offense. The only way you solve those crimes is by picking up people on reasonable grounds, reasonable suspicion, and questioning them.

The CHAIRMAN. If you have a reasonable ground, at that point, why don't you take him before a committing magistrate and charge him with the crime, if he has reasonable cause to believe he has committed it?

Mr. INBAU. Mr. Chairman, you cannot support a charge before a Federal commissioner by an officer's reasonable belief that this man committed the crime. That may be adequate for the purpose of the apprehension. But if you take him before a Federal commissioner, you are going to be able to support the charge—he has not made an admission. And in those cases, unless you get an admission, and he tells you where he threw this woman's purse after he robbed her following the rape, or something of that sort—unless you get evidence