public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control, and for other purposes.

On November 8, 1966:
H.R. 9197. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to determine effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border height Preservation bank of Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chasimal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico; and
H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

On November 9, 1966:
H.R. 10151. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo.

On November 10, 1966:
H.R. 8450. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, to freeze the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States; and
H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, and for other purposes.

On November 11, 1966:
H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further national trade in agricultural commodities, to promote the domestic production of and demand for commodities of the United States, and for other purposes. This bill contains provisions even more extreme than those applicable to suspects themselves. Any citizen at the scene of a crime may be taken into custody as a material witness. And that there is a reasonable probability that he will not be available to testify at the trial.

On November 13, 1966:
H.R. 13103. An act to provide equitable tax treatment for foreign investment in the United States, to establish a Presidential Election Campaign Fund to assist in financing the costs of presidential election campaigns, and for other purposes; and
H.R. 15857. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the salaries of teachers' salary Act of 1955 to increase the exisitent on teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

On November 1, 1966:
H.R. 10563. An act to amend the Columbia and Firemen's Salaries Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the salaries of teachers' salary Act of 1955 to increase the exisitent on teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

On November 22, 1966:
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following House bills and Senate bill, of the following titles:

H.R. 10563. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the salaries of teachers' salary Act of 1955 to increase the exisitent on teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND A SENATE BILL DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following House bills and Senate bill, of the following titles:

H.R. 10563. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the salaries of teachers' salary Act of 1955 to increase the exisitent on teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

Crime in the Nation's Capital affects every man, woman, and child who lives or visits there. Wealthy and poor, Negro and white, slum and suburban dweller—all suffer when our streets are not safe. For the sake of the whole community, we must do everything in our power to protect innocent people from those who seek to harm them.

I am acutely conscious of my responsibilities as President to do all in my power to prevent crime. I mean to take any and all actions, within my power, which will help relieve today's unsatisfactory conditions.

I have before me the District of Columbia crime bill, passed in the closing hours of the Congress. It deals exclusively with rules for police and the courts. It does not touch the quality or quantity of law enforcement resources: more, better trained, better equipped and better paid police and corrections workers.

In my opinion, the present bill would create problems instead of solving them. If I thought that this bill would diminish crime in the District of Columbia, I would sign it. I believe, however, that this legislation would add endless complications and confusion to an already complex situation. It would make the job of the policeman on the beat and of the public prosecutor much more difficult. I cannot approve it.

This bill provides that a policeman may pick up a person and question him for 4 hours without making an arrest—6 hours, exclusive of interrogation, after an arrest—perhaps 10 hours of questioning without first before a judge or official officer. No one doubts the necessity for the police questioning persons on the street with respect to criminal activities. The law has permitted this. The law properly provides, however, that after a person is deprived of his freedom—after he is arrested—the police must take him before a magistrate who will determine whether the arrest is arbitrary or based on probable cause. This must be done without unnecessary delay.

I am advised that the periods of questioning provided in this bill go far beyond the necessity of interrogation in practically all cases. In the case of a material witness, the bill contains provisions even more extreme than those applicable to suspects themselves. As a result, the citizen at the scene of a crime—including the accused person—can be taken into custody as a material witness. It is not necessary either to obtain a subpoena, or to take the witness before a magistrate. It is sufficient if he is picked up. In effect, the person can disappear from sight merely on an individual policeman's judgment that he is a material witness. And that there is a reasonable probability that he will not be available to testify at the trial.

When the citizen is finally taken before a magistrate, he can be released only by posting bond or collateral as security. He cannot be released on his own recognizance. If he were under arrest as a material witness has resulted from the inadequacy of existing law.

The bill contains a provision intended to stop the traffic in obscene pictures and literature. No one can have sympathy for those who panders to degraded instincts in man. But this provision is phrased so broadly that it clearly threatens freedom of the press. It authorizes an official in the District of Columbia—the U.S. attorney—to seek the prior restraint of publications. If he thinks that a newspaper, magazine, or book is indecent, he may go to court and obtain, without a full hearing on the merits, a preliminary injunction authorizing him to restrain its publication or sale.

This section also provides for a permanent injunction, in addition, in violation of the first amendment upon which our freedom to speak and to exchange ideas is dependent.

The bill also would establish mandatory minimum sentences on conviction of certain crimes. This is a step backward in criminal law enforcement resources: more, better trained, better equipped and better paid police and corrections workers.

They are convinced that it does not strengthen law enforcement in the District and does not meet the needs of the fight against crime, but rather introduces confusion and uncertainties into police and judicial practices.

The Acting Attorney General advises me that fundamental constitutional questions pervade the bill—four of its six titles, the most serious doubts.

We are engaged in a great national effort to lift the bight of bad housing, poor education, and unemployment from our cities. This work is being attacked under the conditions that Natural high crime rates. But, in addition, State, local, and Federal officials, and the Federal Government in its limited sphere, must devise more effective ways of preventing crime and bringing criminals to account.

Better trained and better paid police men are part of the answer to crime.
Last year Congress enacted the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, to finance pilot projects in the most modern police techniques. Today, I am signing into law a substantial—and well deserved—pay increase for District policemen.

Better police organization is part of the answer. Last year I appointed a District of Columbia Crime Commission and asked its members to recommend better ways of reducing crime in Washington. Many of the Commission's recommendations concerned the need to make the organization of the District Police Department a model for the Nation. Most are already being carried out. And the District of Columbia Commissioners have informed me that they have signed and are putting into effect the reorganization plan recommended by the District of Columbia Crime Commission.

Salaries and staffing courts are part of the answer. This year, five new judgeships were added to the court of general sessions. They will help eliminate the delay which have impeded swift and effective justice.

Each of these steps has the same goal: more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia.

The problem of crime outside of the District of Columbia must primarily be dealt with by local officials. I have promised them the complete cooperation of the Federal Government within its proper sphere. We have already begun that cooperation with the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. We are prepared to expand our cooperative efforts. I will act promptly on the recommendations of the National Crime Commission, which I appointed in July of 1965, when they are received.

We know that criminal behavior, and the conditions out of which it springs, will not yield easily to our efforts. But we have given the highest priority to an intelligent, relentless fight to make the streets of the District of Columbia safe for its inhabitants—people—and we shall make them so.

I renew my pledge to pursue every avenue, use every tool, support any law that holds promise of advancing us in our drive against crime. In doing so I will need the cooperation of every man and woman whose commitment—as is mine—is to a capital where civic order and social justice prevail.

GEOTHERMAL STEAM ACT OF 1966

I am withholding my approval from the Geothermal Steam Act of 1966.

I am taking this action because many of the principles embodied in the bill violate the public interest.

Geothermal steam is produced by the internal heat of the earth. It is well known to every schoolchild in America under other names. Old Faithful at Yellowstone is one example of a geothermal steam spring.

We know very little about how extensive or valuable our geothermal resources are. They may be an inexhaustible supply of energy. Today, I am signing into law the bill from a single geothermal spring is generating enough electricity to serve a community of 50,000 people. Geothermal springs may also hold unappreciated mineral wealth—such as gold, lithium, and silver.

These circumstances dictate a policy of prudence and reason in the leasing of Federal lands to develop this resource. S. 1674 does just the opposite.

It ignores the basic lessons we have learned much to our sorrow—that our natural resources are priceless treasures which must be developed with wisdom and foresight.

The bill is flawed by six major provisions which run counter to sound public policy:

First. It provides for unfair and unlimited "grandfather" rights. The holders of mineral or mining leases on Federal lands as of September 7, 1965, would be automatically entitled to convert them into geothermal leases. This amounts to a free gift of valuable public property rights to those who have chosen to exercise an undue advantage over other prospective developers.

Second. It provides for maximum leases of 5,200 acres—an area four times greater than is needed for economical development. This could result in a single developer monopolizing the geothermal resources of entire States.

Third. It provides that royalties are payable only on steam "sold or utilized." This could encourage the wanton waste of a precious natural asset.

Fourth. It fails to provide specific and clear authority for the Government to make its land available for productive development. This could result in a single developer monopolizing the geothermal resources of entire States.

Fifth. It provides for perpetual leases to the developer if steam is produced in commercial quantities. As a result, future generations of Americans will lose their stake in the formulation of policies for a natural resource which may be inexhaustible, and whose potential we are only beginning to appreciate.

Sixth. It gives the developer 20 years in which to begin production. Our scientists and engineers say that this is too long a period and will encourage speculation.

In short, I have withheld my approval because this bill does not sufficiently protect the interests of the American people.

If these were only technical flaws in a measure providing for the necessary development of geothermal energy, I would gladly sign the bill. For I believe we must move vigorously to make use of this promising national asset.

But they are more than technical flaws. They represent a serious failure to protect the public interest.

When we consider landmark legislation of this sort, dealing with a vast and little-known natural resource, we must remember that we are acting—not just for years from today—but for decades to come. Once we have given away the people's interest in the wealth of their land, we cannot easily retrieve what has been lost. We must understand that we are trustees for 200 million Americans. All that we do must protect their interest—and the interest of their children and grandchildren—in the rich legacy with which nature has endowed us.

This bill does not do that. And because it does not, I will not give it my approval.

This does not mean we should delay the development and use of these resources. Wise and prudent trustees do not lose opportunities to increase the value of the estate they manage. But we must assure ourselves that we have first protected the people's interest before we make our geothermal springs available for the productive development.

I have directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Attorney General to prepare a new proposal to accomplish our objectives—one that eliminates the pitfalls of the present bill.

Next year we will ask Congress for legislation to transform the potential of this national treasure into a reality. We will present a bill that will protect the public interest, encourage economic and efficient development with a fair and just return to the developer, and conserve the benefits of that development in coming generations. When that legislation comes before me, I shall sign it enthusiastically.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 14, 1966.

ESTABLISHING THE PAST AND PRESENT LOCATION OF A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE COLORADO RIVER

I have withheld my approval from H.R. 13853, "Establishing the past and present location of a certain portion of the Colorado River for certain purposes."

This bill would have the effect of conveying 2,100 acres of public lands to a group of 19 individuals and corporations without payment of compensation. This bill comes at a time when the U.S. District Court in Arizona has, under active consideration, the complex and legal factual issues involving the ownership of very large areas after the Government's ownership has been established with respect to almost 1,000 other occupants of land in this area.

In the late 1940's, the Department of the Interior disclosed that more than 1,000 persons were illegally occupying public lands along the lower Colorado River. Subsequently, the Department initiated actions under which most of these occupants either vacated the land or explicitly recognized Federal ownership. Other occupants were removed following successful legal action by the Government. Litigation in regard to others is still pending.

The courts are the traditional forum for determining legal questions relating to landownership and I see no reason for Congress to act as an independent judge or interfering with the orderly judicial process. If the case is resolved in favor of the claimants, they will receive title to the land without the present bill. If the case is resolved against the claimants and the Congress believes that the equities were so compelling that relief should have been granted, the Congress can act after the factual issues have been fully litigated and a complete record has been assembled.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 14, 1966.