

tion prior to the *Mallory* decision; that is, to insure the admissibility of confessions which are freely and voluntarily made. Of course, this excludes confessions which result from improper compulsions.

In our investigation and subsequent support of title III, we have discovered that the laws of many States relating to the apprehension, detention, and questioning of persons held on "probable cause" in connection with a crime, and the practice of local police departments in the various States under the authority of the respective legislatures, contain one essential uniformity. This uniform element is that all jurisdictions permit and practice the detention of persons after "probable cause" for interrogation during investigation and solution of the crime. The length of the permissible period varies widely. Expert testimony developed earlier this week before this committee revealed that the statutory law in San Joaquin County, Calif., permits the detention of a suspect for investigation for a period of 48 hours including Sundays; in Chicago, Ill., the suspect may be held until the next court session which, in some cases, may run over a weekend. The few States whose laws appear to be most nearly alike, were those States which have adopted the provisions, with minor modifications, of the Uniform Arrest Act. The language embodied in title III, H.R. 7525, incorporated from H.R. 1929, 88th Congress, which we supported, applies the substance of the Uniform Arrest Act to the District of Columbia.

Under the amendments to the police regulations of the District of Columbia which became effective on March 15, 1963, the language of the regulation now states, "arrests shall not be made for investigation." Under section 301(c) of title III, H.R. 7525, a period not to exceed 6 hours would be provided in the police regulations for detention for interrogation and investigation. And that is not the 3 days referred to by a previous witness, but 6 hours.

At the end of this period, the person shall be released or arrested and charged with a specific crime. The detention shall not be recorded as an official arrest in any records. This allowance of 6 hours places the suspect in a much more favorable position than many other States and jurisdictions throughout the Nation.

The effect of the *Mallory* decision has been felt, to some extent, throughout our Nation by those bodies vested with the responsibility of upholding the law and developing effective prosecution in criminal cases. By far the greatest influence has been in the District of Columbia where the effect has been to seriously impede crime detection and ultimate conviction. Today's police need modern tools to combat the cunning and knowledgeable modern criminal. The legislation now before us will, if enacted into law, be a tremendous stride in a positive direction in the battle to balance the pendulum of justice more equally between the rights of society and the rights of the criminal in the District of Columbia.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before the Senate District Committee and express the views of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade in support of title I and title III of H.R. 7525, the omnibus crime bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very happy to have you before us, Mr. Norwood. You have been very faithful in giving us your views on these problems that arise under H.R. 7525. I appreciate the interest