

views regarding the bill it is obvious that many competent men will demonstrate to this committee the specific advantages and disadvantages of this legislation. Therefore, I asked myself what I could say that would be helpful to the committee which would not be a repetition of other witnesses' observations. I concluded that some comments concerning the stated needs for this legislation might be helpful.

It seems to me there has been far too much reliance upon the opinion of experts and far too little attention to verifiable facts.

These facts, to the extent possible, are the ones that I would like to speak about.

It seems to me from what I read in the paper day after day that the public, and indeed the Congress, has been subjected to a campaign arising from fear and frustration, and the arguments which have been made to support this legislation are so obviously false as in my judgment to manifest an intellectual contempt for Congress and the public.

For example, these arguments may be summarized from the House committee report, that this legislation is needed, first, to protect innocent people from charges that would later be dismissed, leaving them with a stigma of a police arrest record; and, too, as Professor Inbau has just said, to catch and convict the guilty. And finally, of course, if this legislation is enacted, that famous telegram to the underworld that Washington is soft on crime will be retracted.

In my statement, which I have submitted—

The CHAIRMAN. And it will be incorporated in full in the record. (The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. SHADOAN, ATTORNEY AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF LAW,
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity of presenting my comments concerning titles I and III of H.R. 7525 to the committee.

I am George Shadoan. Until August 1 of this year I was an associate professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center and director of the Georgetown legal internship program.

I would like to preface my remarks by saying that in the course of participating in or supervising the handling of some 1,000 to 1,500 criminal cases in the District of Columbia, I have come to recognize a need for the police interrogation of suspects. I do not automatically oppose any bill which seeks to allow increased police interrogation of suspects. I believe that the bill advocated by U.S. Attorney Acheson sometime earlier this year warrants serious consideration, and I believe that with modification it would be acceptable to me and to most fair-minded people. I do not endorse H.R. 7525 which has been popularized as the omnibus crime bill. Looking over the list of imposing witnesses appearing before this committee to present their views regarding the bill, it is obvious that many competent men will demonstrate to this committee the specific advantages and disadvantages of this legislation. Therefore, I asked myself what I could say that would be helpful to the committee which would not be a repetition of other witnesses' observations. I concluded that some comments concerning the stated needs for this legislation might be helpful.

Out of the fear and frustration of this emergency—and I recognize the emergency—otherwise responsible public figures have waged a campaign of hysteria. In doing so, they have used arguments so obviously false as to manifest an intellectual contempt for Congress and the public. The result is illustrated by the committee report of the present bill. It urges that the legislation is necessary (1) to protect innocent persons who would otherwise be charged with crime because of police inability to investigate and clear them prior to formal charge, (2) to catch and convict the guilty, and (3) to retract that "telegram" to the underworld that Washington courts molycoddle criminals and are soft on crime.