

*Q. 5. In your opinion, what type of assistance could Federal laboratories now provide to law enforcement agencies or to the Department of Justice?*

A. This is so broad a question that any general answer would be almost meaningless. The number of possible contributions is limitless. All of the technical roles discussed in the Science and Technology Task Force Report, for instance, could possibly be handled by Federal laboratories, although in many cases, industry, universities or other research institutions might be more appropriate. The important point in my testimony is that a Federal laboratory could either take on a specific project (just as could any other industrial, university, or non-profit research organization) or it could establish a special private relationship with a local, state, regional, or national criminal justice agency or technical support organization. If it were to do the latter, then it would have to make a commitment to become intimately familiar with the operating problems and to hire the appropriate specialists on its technical staff.

*Q. 6. To what extent should government laboratories test and evaluate equipment and hardware in order to provide law enforcement agencies with performance information?*

A. There should be at least one central laboratory that tests and evaluates equipment and hardware for law enforcement agencies. This could well be an existing government laboratory, but it need not necessarily be a government laboratory.

*Q. 6a. What was the basis for Task Force recommendation that an agency such as the National Bureau of Standards "coordinate the establishment of standards for equipment to be used by criminal justice agencies and to provide those agencies technical assistance?" Was the Bureau consulted? Would this function be handled by the institute if the Safe Streets Act is passed?*

A. The basis for the recommendation for a standards agency derives from the considerations mentioned in answer to Question 1. The needs are as follows:

1. To collect the needs of the dispersed police market and aggregate them into a more cohesive demand, thereby providing better guidance to industry in conducting its development.

2. To provide an opportunity for more sophisticated development of standards than would be possible by any single police department.

3. To make the standards reflect police needs rather than only a manufacturer's decision, where that decision may have been dictated more by existing products or by a related but different market.

4. To provide standards to which all manufacturers would adhere, thereby permitting interchangeability of modules, ease of modification, more free choice of suppliers, and larger volumes of identical units (and hence lower unit costs).

The National Bureau of Standards was used only as an illustration of an agency that could perform this function; no formal request was made of them, although the possibility was discussed informally with NBS staff members. Responsibility for creating this standards agency would be a responsibility of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice called for in the Safe Streets Act. I would not expect, however, that the Institute would perform this function internally; rather it would probably contract with a government or private organization.

*Q. 7. To what extent do Federal policies and scientific and technological matters conflict with law enforcement needs (for example, possible FCC decision on frequency allocations as between television, police or citizens' communications)?*

A. The most significant Federal technical policy area impacting on police is in the FCC policies with regard to police radio communication problems. These issues are discussed in detail on Pages 29-33 and Pages 132-136 of the Science and Technology Task Force Report. In addition, there is, of course, significant interaction with much of the research and development performed by the Defense Department (e.g., non-lethal weapons, command and control) since much of the technology resulting from Defense could be applied to police problems.

*Q. 8. It has been proposed that the directors of Federal laboratories have funds available to them to pursue research relevant to national problems (such as crime) up to the point where proposals could then be submitted to the agency having the primary mission responsibility. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of such a concept?*

A. From the viewpoint of crime control, there could only be advantages to this concept. The Federal laboratories are institutions of considerable technical competence and I would think that if the scientists in them had the opportunity to think about and do some research on the problems of crime control, we would