

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have confidence in the source of this because I am also——

The CHAIRMAN. I am not questioning the source. Do not misunderstand me. I am not questioning the source.

I do not think that this tells the whole story for two reasons; No. 1, it takes 1 year, 1962, and I think the statistics have got to be broader than for 1 year.

No. 2, it lists, according to your recitation, the cities that have less crime. It does not list the cities that have more crime, and it seems to me that this is the only way that you can fit them into the tabulation for whatever value the comparison of one city to another may have.

Obviously, this is a problem. This has been testified to time and time again during these hearings, that the racial component and racial makeup of communities has some direct relationship to this problem that we are considering today.

I do not think we can blindfold ourselves to that fact.

Mr. PATTERSON. There is a lot of material in relation to this.

I am also on the protection committee of the board of trade, and we have gone into this quite thoroughly and I feel certain that this is a comparable setup to Washington, but we will be glad to get further information and submit it within the week to the staff.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if it is not too much trouble, I would appreciate it.

I would rather have a broader look at Buffalo or Washington or Philadelphia or San Francisco than just one isolated year such as 1962.

Mr. PATTERSON. I agree with you that often the whole picture is better. But those are the statistics that we got and we brought it out for the very reason that you said, to bring out one city to prove the point, but I will be very happy to get the other information.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Patterson, I am delighted to have you here and I am delighted at the interest that the citizens' associations show in these matters.

Now, the hearing record will remain open until 5 p.m., Thursday, November 14, for rebuttal statements from any and all witnesses, and we welcome rebuttal statements.

There are many areas upon which we have heard testimony over the last several weeks in which there are differences of opinion, and we would be delighted to have any comments that anyone whatever wants to make pro or con on the matter before us.

A letter from Frank J. Remington, professor of law, University of Wisconsin Law School, dated November 4, 1963, whose views were sought by the committee and who was unable to testify personally, will be included in the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LAW SCHOOL,
Madison, Wis., November 4, 1963.

CHESTER H. SMITH,
Staff Director, Committee on the District of Columbia,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: This is a reply to your letter of October 16 in which you ask for my views of titles I and III of H.R. 7525.

These two titles deal with the general issue of incustody investigation, a matter of great current interest and importance to law enforcement. I have had an