he should have given you was a statistic identifying and associating a higher clearance rate with fingerprints being the basis on which those crimes were cleared. He didn't do that and he should have done it. But here is something else you need to look at. When police agencies are trying to make their statistical records look good they will take one act from which several crimes can be derived and when they want to look good they will catch that criminal and they will specify each one of those crimes that can grow out of that particular act and that becomes a statistically large number of crimes although it involves only one. Now our throaty, elderly colleague brings me a letter that says, after they had AFIS. It still doesn't say that it was because fingerprints being identified led to the crime being cleared. Pay attention. Some people say that the greatest, most foolish things are done by kids 16 or 18 to 20 years old. Why, I think some of those least able to understand and follow directions and take advice are those greatly in excess of 18 to 20 and beyond that I won't say. But look at this. First of all, let me ask Senator Goodrich a question. Senator Goodrich...

SENATOR GOODRICH: Yup.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Does this machine produce a precise match with fingerprints or are there variances?

SENATOR GOODRICH: It will identify right down to the last few alternatives you have as far as people to select from. Then you can actually physically match fingerprints with a machine that will actually blend them together and make a positive identification for verification after the machine pulls them out and identifies the person.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It does not give a...it doesn't give a precise match, isn't that the answer to the question that I asked you?

SENATOR GOODRICH: It gives you down to what is supposed to be a very close, like, for example, in the San Francisco case...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, no, I don't want an example of my time, thank you.

SENATOR GOODRICH: It took six minutes for this machine...