

The premise regarding police brutality is an obviously fallacious one. First of all, police brutality had nothing whatever to do with the *Mallory* ruling; not the slightest suggestion was made that *Mallory* was physically abused by the police. I would also add a doubt that any citizen familiar with our operations believes that this Department employs so-called third degree methods. And certainly, even if police brutality in the questioning of criminals were a problem in this jurisdiction, society should be able to find many alternative solutions to that problem which would not, as the *Mallory* ruling has done, shackle the hands of the police in the investigation of crime.

On the subject of police efficiency, I think I can proudly state that, except to the extent we are rendered ineffective by restrictions such as the *Mallory* rule, inefficient police operations are not adding measurably to the crime problems of this city. We have made great strides in improving our operations during the past decade, and I believe that the effects of our efforts are reflected by the reduction of crime in this city from 1952 through 1957, when we dropped from 3d place in serious offenses per thousand population to 12th place among the 16 cities in our population group. Like any organization, large or small, there is always room for improvement in our Department, and we are constantly working toward changes which give promise of better operations, but I assure you that there are no changes or improvements within logic or reason which can effectively offset the encumbrances imposed upon us by the *Mallory* ruling and corollary decisions.

On the subject of increased use of scientific detection techniques, I can assure this committee that we are relying on those techniques to the fullest extent possible. But too many of our serious crimes are committed at locations or under circumstances where scientific crime detection techniques are not applicable. For example, I might cite the case of the so-called butcher knife bandit who robbed some 50 business establishments in this city over a period of almost 3 years, using a butcher knife to threaten his victims. True, he was finally apprehended when he carelessly left a fingerprint on one of his discarded weapons, but only after he had committed about 50 robberies with the resulting fear, loss, and danger to his victims.

Another case which I believe will illustrate our problems under the *Mallory* ruling, involves one of these misguided youths who has developed into a predatory criminal in the midst of society.

This particular individual was born about 26 years ago. In 1954, at age 16, he was arrested and charged with 15 housebreakings into private homes in the northwest area; he admitted his guilt in these cases and was committed to the National Training School for Boys for a period of nearly 4 years.

In 1958, shortly after his release from custody, he was again arrested by this Department, this time on a charge of housebreaking with robbery by force and violence. I would like to read, for the consideration of this committee, the statement of facts in this case:

The complainant, a 70-year-old woman, reported that at about 3 o'clock in the afternoon a colored man knocked on her door and asked if the elderly man who had just left the house lived there. He stated that the elderly man had just been hurt down on the corner. As she went from the door to get her coat, he asked for a glass of water.