

Mr. GUDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In line with Mr. Adam's questions about the examinations, Mr. Murphy, you said these oral examinations help the glib tongue. Is there not some concern among police officers and policemen that a person who is very adept at doing written examinations would have the advantage, but the oral exam lends balance.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

I think especially for high level positions, Congressman, the benefit of evaluations of experienced and distinguished police administrators from other large cities is helpful.

Mr. GUDE. Being able to actually talk with the candidates rather than just look at what he is able to put down on paper is important.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. GUDE. I certainly do not want to take any more time, Mr. Chairman. Certainly it is common knowledge we have got to strengthen the police departments in all our big cities. I do not think Mr. Murphy's appointment was a reflection on the quality of our police department here in Washington or on Chief Layton. It is just a problem all over the country, and it is a question of quantity. As Mr. Adams has pointed out, we are below strength in every big police department, and we want to get on with the work. And I hope we do not harass you too much, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Layton. Thank you.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Murphy, reference was made a few moments or two ago to Rochester, New York, the fact that they have a kind of police commissioner system there that did not stop any riots. They also have local democracy in Rochester, do they not?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACOBS. The people get to vote for their government, their own government, in local affairs. Well, a fellow opposed to local democracy, possibly could say that did not help in the recent riots in Rochester, and that might be an argument against local democracy, is that not correct?

Mr. BROYHILL. There you go.

Mr. JACOBS. Maybe you do not want to answer that question. This whole controversy about chain of command immediately reminded me of a controversy that took place just a few years ago in the Army. I believe—

The CHAIRMAN. We do not consider ourselves having a controversy, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. JACOBS. Oh, I know there is no controversy. I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman—this dialogue—

The CHAIRMAN. All we want to do is get some information.

Mr. JACOBS. Right. I did not mean controversy, Mr. Chairman. I mean difference of opinion.

It was called muzzling the military. And I recall that a cartoon appeared in the press—the idea was that the civilian executive was muzzling the military commander under him by supervising his activities. And I recall a cartoon showed a private writing on the wall, "The General is a jerk." And the General was coming after him, and the private said, "Ah, ah, ah, do not muzzle the military."

So rather than talking about what your relationship is with Chief Layton and whether you are looking over his shoulder, I want to