

of police operating similarly to the chief of police in the city of Chicago.

Mr. INBAU. That's right.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have taken up enough of your time.

I would, however, like to more or less summarize what I have been trying to say here—that the police in Washington, D.C., as in Chicago, or New York, or Los Angeles—they need time to interrogate criminal suspects; they need that opportunity. If the law-abiding public is going to be protected, that is an absolute necessity. Incidentally, it is fashionable now to talk all about individual civil rights—that's fine. There is a Bill of Rights, and for the record I am in favor of the Bill of Rights. But I also am aware of the fact that there is something in the preamble of the Constitution talking about the purposes of the Constitution to protect the public welfare and promote the public tranquillity.

We have got to look at the Constitution as a whole. It was not just a Bill of Rights. There is something else in there—it was designed for the protection of the public generally, and for the public welfare.

Now, the police also need, in the city of Chicago, Washington, D.C., the right to stop people on the street under reasonable circumstances. A man in a dark alley at 3 o'clock in the morning—they need the right to find out who he is, what is he doing there. And I would hazard a guess that the people who are opposed to giving the police this right would be the first ones who would insist it be done if their home had been burglarized, their daughter had been raped, or they had been robbed. They would expect the police to go looking for the man who did it, and to use these very processes that they are opposed to in principle.

The police also need the authority that is given them in this proposed bill for the detention of material witnesses. I think all of these as a package are deserving of favorable congressional attention.

Now, let us all bear in mind that we are not living in a vacuum, we are not living in a make-believe world, we are not living in a world where we can all do as we please without limitations or controls upon our individual conduct.

In driving a car, if I'm in a hurry I find it awfully annoying to stop for a red light, to stop for a stop sign. That is awfully annoying to me. I would prefer to do it another way. But I have come to recognize, as all of us have, that in the public interest, public safety, we have to have these kinds of controls and limitations.

As a businessman, if I were a businessman, I think I would find it very, very inconvenient to comply with the various Federal and States regulations and controls upon my business. I would prefer, as a businessman, I think, to go ahead and do it the way I please. But in the public interest, the businessman today is really handcuffed. I am not saying that is undesirable. I think it is desirable. But let us recognize there are other people than criminals who are being confined to adhere to and forced more or less into complying with rules that are absolutely necessary for our collective existence.

If I'm in a hurry at night, and I run down the street and take a short cut through an alley and a policeman stops me, wanting to know who I am, what I'm doing there, I would find it inconvenient to be detained for this purpose. But I hope I have sense enough to recog-