

The policy of this department is to follow the procedure outlined in *Wax v. McGrath, supra*. We are not aware of any dissatisfaction with this procedure.
Sincerely,

FRANK S. GILES,
Commissioner of Public Safety.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Baltimore, Md., March 16, 1961.

Mr. EDGAR E. SCOTT,
*Deputy Chief of Police, Metropolitan Police Department,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SCOTT: I have your letter of March 14, inquiring as to our procedure in holding persons under suspicion of having committed a crime, and must advise that we are allowed to hold such persons for a reasonable length of time pending investigation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. HEPBRON, *Police Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
New Orleans, La., May 22, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT V. MURRAY,
*Chief of Police, Government of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHIEF MURRAY: I am submitting the enclosed information in response to your request for information pertaining to holding charges in this jurisdiction. The enclosures consist of (a) The excerpt pertaining to the Louisiana Revised Statutes, title 14, section 107 (R.S. 14:107, Vagrancy) from the "1960 Cumulative Annual Pocket Part" and (b) The excerpt from the Louisiana Statutes Annotated, 1950 pertaining to R.S. 14:107, Vagrancy.

Our basic procedure in this regard is as follows. Our vagrancy statute, as you will observe, is very broad in its coverage. When we find a person whom we strongly suspect of having committed a serious crime, we book him with vagrancy (specifying the particular misconduct of which he is in violation under the vagrancy statute), and the judges—by an informal or tacit working agreement—permit us to interrogate the prisoner and complete our investigation for a period of approximately 72 hours. In unusual cases requiring additional investigation, or in situations in which the release of the suspect would undoubtedly tip off his confederates or coconspirators, the judges have been known to permit us to hold the prisoner for more than 72 hours. By and large, however, our investigations must be completed and a charge of the serious offense either accepted or refused within 72 hours.

This procedure has been an exceptionally valuable police tool in the interest of public safety and the detection of crime. We in the department naturally appreciate the consideration shown us in this regard, and we are ever vigilant to avoid abuse of this procedure. If some attorney comes in and complains about a particular client's being detained, we immediately check with the investigating officers, and if it should appear that the investigating officers are dragging their feet in the investigation, then we order expeditious completion of the investigation and assign additional men to assist in the investigation. In my opinion, this program has been most successful and has not worked an undue hardship on any citizen.

My staff and I would strongly urge the congressional committee investigating this matter to recommend that such a procedure be approved for the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department. As you know, so much investigative work is required in many instances before a person can be either properly charged or properly released without a charge in connection with a particular serious crime. If you are going to require a police officer either to charge or release a suspect on the spot, then many persons will be charged who should not be charged, and many criminals will not be brought to justice. I submit to you that the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has proven itself on many occasions to be highly competent and zealously respectful of the civil rights of persons with whom it deals. Over the years this Department has earned the respect and confidence of police departments and the general public throughout the entire country. We respectfully submit that the Congress