

capabilities within the Justice Department so that this work which it is doing could then be done better, or would it be done better?

Mr. TAMM. I think it would be done better, and I do support the concept of this National Institute of Justice.

Two years ago, in the magazine published by the IACP which I edit, I wrote an editorial pointing out the need for the concept which you have, an institute very similar to the National Science Foundation, separated from and supported by Federal funds, but also giving the opportunity to industry to assist in this problem or to foundation grants so that worthwhile research could be conducted in a very, very necessary field.

From the practical standpoint of what has gone on as far as the law enforcement and criminal assistant agencies, I feel that the first step in this direction would be the National Institute of Justice, and if it is a part of the Department of Justice, it should be a separate part of the Department of Justice, but it could come under the supervision of the Attorney General. This must be done because we have to have some research capability in law enforcement. Otherwise, we are not going to meet this rising crime problem.

Mr. DADDARIO. We are talking about an either/or situation, and I wonder if some experience this committee has had in this area might help. When this subcommittee reviewed the work being done by the National Science Foundation, there was a proposal that it ought to be the only agency in Government really to do basic research.

As we examined that, we came to the conclusion that this should not be so, that it should retain that unique function, but that the mission-oriented agencies, and I would certainly put the Justice Department in this area, ought to have a basic research competence of their own in order to develop the quality necessary to do a better job. It seems to me that analogy applies here. If we were to apply that capability and then develop some other type of institute, we might accomplish much more than if we separate these functions as has been suggested.

Mr. TAMM. I would agree with you. I feel that there are a couple of basic needs here. For instance, industry has done a tremendous amount of development work that could be applied to law enforcement, but law enforcement has no way of getting access to this. I have talked to a great many people on this subject, and there is a very practical problem that exists as far as industry is concerned; that is the market is limited, and they just aren't about to spend a great deal of money and make a one-shot sale of radios to a police department. They ask how many do you want. If you give every one of them a means of radio communication when the man leaves the force and there is a turnover in law enforcement, will you buy a new radio or will you give the new man a used one.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Roush.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Tamm, I have a great appreciation for the FBI. I served as a prosecuting attorney for 4 years, and I have used their laboratories. I have used them with great confidence. The point I was trying to make was that when we talk about the national effort in crime control, I believe we are trapped by the thought that the FBI