

memorandum outlining his suspected activities and his description, and a directive that, if he or any other suspicious subject was observed around any apartment building occupied by elderly women, he be kept under surveillance and that the Detective Division be notified.

On June 11, 1963, this criminal struck again, this time breaking into the home of a 72-year-old woman, choking her, and robbing her of \$17.

Again, on June 29, 1963, over here on Capitol Hill, he forced his way into the apartment of a 59-year-old woman and robbed her of \$137. While he was in the apartment, two visitors to her apartment knocked on the door and he left, through the front door, passing the visitors on his way out.

Fortunately, these witnesses were able to identify the criminal from his photograph, and a warrant for his arrest was then issued by the U.S. Commissioner at about 10 a.m. on July 2, 1963. A lookout was sent to all units of the Department, and soon afterward, this criminal, who had been preying on the elderly women of this community for nearly 2 full months, and who had committed at least two serious offenses after we had come to the conclusion that he was guilty of the previous three offenses, was in custody of this Department.

I might add that, of the five victims, only the victim and the witnesses in the last case were able to positively identify the accused, but, stating "you got me good, I might just as well get all of them straightened out," he confessed to all five of the crimes.

He was subsequently indicted and recently was sentenced to imprisonment for from 3 to 9 years.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabor the point or waste the time of this committee by pursuing too long a single line of testimony. But I think these cases, and particularly this last criminal I have described, show what the police of the community are up against. I submit that at least after the commission of the first three of these cases, there was, from the modus operandi and general physical description alone, adequate evidence to create in the mind of a reasonable and prudent man probable cause for the arrest and questioning of this known criminal. But, just as certainly, without a statement from the defendant there was not sufficient evidence to arraign and convict him.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the last two victims of this criminal enjoyed in theory only their right to be secure in their persons and houses.

Mr. Chairman, I can honestly testify to this committee that, even today, we have walking in the streets of this city criminals who we have reason—ample reason to believe have committed series of crimes, but who we cannot arrest because they have not been careless enough to leave fingerprints behind, and who will continue in their criminal careers until they become careless with their fingerprints or until their criminal act is witnessed by someone who can testify against them.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that, in terms of current nationwide crime rates, the District compares favorably. For the period January through June 1963, among the 16 cities in our class of 500,000 to 1 million population, the District ranked 8th in total serious offenses; 6th in murder, 9th in rape, 2d in robbery, 1st in aggravated assault,