

witnesses—and I think they pointed to practice in Israel where, if I understand it correctly, there is either some type of recorder or a disinterested witness who becomes a part of the interrogation procedure, so that one could determine whether or not there had been undue influence or coercion or involuntariness, or undue time, simply as a matter of proof.

Now, this has been suggested as a method that would determine the fairness of the interrogation.

I do not know whether this works or not. It has been suggested. I do not know anything about the practice in Israel.

Mr. RAUH. I am sure I don't know. The only Israel trial I ever saw anything about was the Eichmann trials, and I am quite confident that was not a typical trial. So I have no experience in that myself. My own feeling is that would be an improvement, but not a substitute for the *Mallory* rule.

There is something to my mind wrong about getting the proof out of the fellow's own mouth. It is true if he is bubbling over with talk as he is arrested, that's all right, I understand that. But when he is resisting, if he does not give it to them in the ride to the station, or immediately, he is obviously resisting. And I think then he ought not to be forced by delays to do it, even in front of a third party—although I agree it would be better to have a third party than nobody.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. RAUH. I would just like to say a word here, if I may, on the subject—I think there is bipartisan opposition in the District of Columbia. I think it would be helpful if this could be put on the record, Mr. Chairman.

Many times, at least several times, when I have spoken with Mr. Shipley in the same places on these District questions, Mr. Shipley, who is, as you know, the chairman of the Republican Party here, has taken the position that he, too, favors the *Mallory* rule and opposes legislation.

Now, I notice he is not on the list of witnesses. But in view of the fact that he has taken that position—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know how he feels.

Mr. RAUH. I think it would be very helpful. I believe there is bipartisan opposition to changing *Mallory*. And I thought possibly an inquiry might get this. I always think that in those few occasions when we have bipartisan positions here it would be very helpful to the committee to know that.

The CHAIRMAN. I have noticed that occasionally you men come in marching arm in arm. Of course, several times I find you do have differences of opinion.

Mr. RAUH. When we are arm in arm, I would like to bring it forward, and see if it can be helpful to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your suggestion. The staff will note it.

Mr. RAUH. While we oppose any change in the *Mallory* rule, we yield to no group in our desire to reduce the crime rate in the Nation's Capital. Exaggerated though our crime situation often is, we support all reasonable measures to deal with the admittedly high crime rate, including measures both to frustrate crime and to reduce its causes.