

Mr. WINN. I understand. This was for the purpose of a parade; right?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WINN. Do you know if the permit was granted for the parade yesterday?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know whether it was or not. Frankly, Mr. Winn, I do not think it makes any difference. I do not know whether they requested it. Perhaps the authorities will be able to answer that question.

Mr. WINN. Thank you.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Steiger?

DAMAGES OR DISORDER

Mr. STEIGER. I also would like to join my colleagues in commending you on your very excellent statement.

I do not know whether you have seen a copy of the D.C. government report over the signature of Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Washington on the bill. On page two of that report it says, "Under the bill, no criteria are provided to guide the government official or employee as to what constitutes 'property damage or disorder.'"

What they are saying is that in your bill you are asking for something that is beyond the ability of anybody to determine.

I would then refer to the permit signed by Mr. Castro who is the Regional Director of the National Park Service, and a part of that language says, and I will quote it: "Permitee shall hold the United States and the District of Columbia harmless in the event of the death or injury of any person, for the destruction or damage to any property," et cetera.

Additionally, no explosives or such flammable fuels shall be permitted in the designated area. It would seem to me that Mr. Castro has been able to anticipate some problems. He also would be the man who would make the judgment as to what constitutes property damage, et cetera.

It occurs to me, and I would welcome your comment on this: If the official granting the permit is not capable of anticipating violence or damage it would seem to me that he should not be permitted to grant a permit and that somebody who is capable of anticipating the problem should be selected instead. You might choose to comment on that.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Steiger, your point is well taken there. In my judgment I do not think that anyone could answer it. Again, we get back to the basic proposition that we are dealing with a most unusual set of circumstances here. Apparently they will cut the cloth to fit the pattern. And if it does not make sense when you and I raise the question, if it suits their purpose later on, it can make sense within their interpretation. And I agree with you that if they cannot conclude as to what would be a reasonable and adequate bond, as others have done, then, perhaps, they should let others who are more competent and qualified to make such determination for them.

If I may make one further point here, I do not know where we are headed. I have been trying to help the committee, if I can. I do not know whether I have made a worthwhile contribution. But we have