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

On November 8, 1966:

H.R. 9167. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico;

H.R. 13551. An act to amend the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15111. An act to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty;

H.R. 15766. An act to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws;

H.R. 17607. An act to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property; and

H.R. 18119. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, 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. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of 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 economic development, and for other purposes.

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 1958 to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of 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:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL

Crime in the Nation's Capital affects every man, woman, and child who lives or visits here. 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 responsibility 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 provoke years of litigation. 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 taking him before a judicial officer. No one doubts the necessity of the police questioning persons on the street with respect to criminal activities. The law has always 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 his 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 necessities 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. Any citizen at the scene of a crime—including the victim—can be taken into custody as a material witness. It is not necessary either to obtain a subpena, or to take the witness before a magistrate, until 6 hours after 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 suspected criminal, however, the Bail Reform Act, passed by Congress this year, would permit his release on his own responsibility. These provisions are much more severe than existing law. The U.S. attorney informs me that he can recall no case in which inability to detain material witnesses 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 pander 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, prohibiting the future use of any real or personal property involved in the publication or sale of obscene material.

This language is imprecise and confusing but at the very least, it would empower a court, using its contempt authority, to imprison or fine a previously convicted publisher of a book, magazine, or newspaper, if the court concluded that one of his new publications was also offensive—even though it had never been judicially found obscene in a full trial on the merits.

The Acting Attorney General informs me that this sort of prior restraint has been condemned by the courts as unconstitutional—in violation of the first amendment upon which our freedom to spread, to publish, to read 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 judicial and correction policy. Indeed it is directly contrary to previous action taken by the Congress. Under the indeterminate sentencing laws, the Congress has recognized that the potential for rehabilitation is increased when courts and correction systems are given flexibility to determine sentences on case-by-case basis. Moreover, there is no need for such mandatory minimum sentences in the District of Columbia. Sentences now being imposed in the District are among the highest in the United States.

I have given long and careful thought to this legislation.

I recognize that its sponsors believed it would arm the police and the courts with more effective tools in combating crime. Yet all agencies of government asked to comment on the bill—as well as the two civilian District Commissioners who live in Washington, and a majority of the District of Columbia Bar Association—have urged me to veto it.

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 raise the most serious doubts.

We are engaged in a great national effort to lift the blight of bad housing, poor education, and unemployment from our cities. This effort is attacking the conditions that nourish high crime rates. But, in addition, State and local 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 policemen 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 are designed 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 for the Police Department recommended by the District of Columbia Crime Commission.

Better staffed courts are part of the answer. This year, five new judgeships were added to the court of general sessions. They will help eliminate the delays 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 law-abiding 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, for example, the steam from a single geothermal spring is generating enough electricity to serve a community of 50,000 people. Geothermal springs may also hold untapped 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 these developers, and gives them an undue advantage over other prospective developers.

Second. It provides for maximum leases of 51,200 acres—an area four times greater than our experts say 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 readjust the lease terms and conditions at suitable intervals. The public deserves this protection because we still know so little about our geothermal resources.

Fifth. It provides for perpetual leases to the developer if steam is produced in commercial quantities. As a result, future generations of Americans will have lost 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 people's 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 today or 5 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 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 ask for legislation 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. 13955, "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 these very lands. The bill comes after the Government's ownership has been established with respect to almost 1,000 other occupants of land in this area.

In the late 1950's investigation by 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 making a special exception here and 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.*