

to know a great deal about these great monuments as well as the city itself, events going on, recreational opportunities that are present. In a way of speaking they serve substantially as interpreters as well as policemen. That is the point we were trying to make there.

Mr. BROYHILL. It is a point well taken. I maintain, however, that the Metropolitan Police Department also has those other functions. It would be impossible for the layman to determine where the jurisdiction of one police department starts and the other ends. They both handle traffic and crowds and both have powers of arrest. How about a function such as an Inaugural, the various activities of the American Legion, and other international functions? There is constant overlapping of jurisdiction and duplication of duties of the Park Police and of the Metropolitan Police.

I cannot see how you can look at the Metropolitan Police Force and say they do not have the training or the knowledge to function properly in handling the public.

Mr. CASTRO. Forgive me. I don't mean to imply that at all. I make the point that in the training of our Park Police, we stress the business of interpretation, of interpreting the parks. This is a major part of our duties and responsibilities.

As to the matter of overlapping jurisdiction, that is no problem because we have concurrent jurisdiction as they have.

Mr. BROYHILL. I think I am sharing a point with you, but again I cannot see how you separate that from the similar duties of the Metropolitan Police Force, other than what is provided for in this legislation.

There is some other language in your statement with which I concur, such as that on page 3. You speak of the Metropolitan Police assisting the Park Police in discharging its obligation to the citizens of the United States.

I and many of my colleagues in Congress are concerned about the national interest and the national welfare, and we feel it is a Federal responsibility to provide the protection required in the Nation's Capital. We are not ignoring the interests of and the need to protect citizens of the District of Columbia, either, but the local citizens are only one portion of this nation.

We feel that since the national interests are paramount here, it is imperative that we bring the control and supervision of all these police departments under the Congress. Or to be more accurate, under a Commissioner appointed by the Congress.

I am most concerned about a coordinated police department under one supervision where the national interest is paramount. It makes no difference who makes that appointment.

Mr. CASTRO. I see.

Mr. BROYHILL. I think we have the tail wagging the dog here, when local misfits start to dictate the activities of the Police Department. I like a lot of the language you have in your statement, and I think it supports the general objective of the legislation.

Of course, you oppose the legislation because you think it may take a certain area of responsibility out from under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CASTRO. Not that so much as the fact that I think it would be terribly cumbersome to have a police chief responsive to a police com-