

out of a computer in most cases than you put in. Therefore, to merely put more information in a computer and take an ineffective operational technique and magnify that information which is utilized in the operational technique is in a sense multiplying fractions of effectiveness. So we have done a very, very considerable amount of research and study on the problem of scene-of-the-crime prints.

I feel that this is appropriate to call to your attention because I think it does relate to what a computer can do. The Henry system of fingerprinting is now over 60 years of age. It was obviously conceived of and developed long before the age of computers. It is not computer-compatible and it has never served us well as in terms of the scene-of-the-crime prints despite what one might read in detective novels. In order to search a large fingerprint file it is necessary to have a completely visible and readable set of 10 prints from the individual. It is possible in the great bank robbery in England, or the Weinberg kidnapping, to make special efforts to go into your main files. But barring this, the normal procedure for a scene-of-the-crime print is to search it through what is known as a single fingerprint type of system. In New York State where we have I am advised is the largest single fingerprint file of any State in the Nation, we have only 20,000 people in that latent print comparison file, 200,000 individual prints. So if you do not happen to be, as a burglar or a car thief, in that particular file, your chances of being identified by having left a chance impression, anything less than a conveniently rolled set of 10 prints, means that you are "home free."

Only twice in the history of the State of New York has any criminal been so cooperative as to leave us a perfect set of 10 prints.

We have, of course, a very large file in New York State. If we can get into this total file of millions of prints as opposed to 20,000 prints, we are that much better off. I believe that the Federal file is no larger than that of New York State in terms of single fingerprints. So we see the same type of problem at the Federal level. In other words, you have this tremendous number of sets of prints which are not normally searchable and retrievable by any scene-of-the-crime print process, but only by the careful rolling and ink printing of individuals, that is, the normal way in which to assess these files.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Director, I think I sense an instantaneous retrieval call on me to get over to the House and vote. I think I am going to have to leave. I was hoping that Mr. Horton or Mr. Rosenthal would be back. I would like to say that we appreciate very much your coming down here and giving us the benefit of your experience. We will be happy to include in the record the documents that you have offered.

(The documents follow:)

NEW YORK CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N.Y., March 18, 1965.

Mr. ROBERT R. J. GALLATI,
Director, Identification and Intelligence Project,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR BOB: Thank you for forwarding copies of senate introduction 1481 and assembly introduction 2625 creating the New York State identification and intelligence system in the executive department. As you know, I have been much impressed by your efforts to improve the processes of criminal justice for many years, and I have been most pleased with the emphasis upon civil rights and liberties which you stressed both as dean of the police academy and in your