

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

December 8, 1969

TO: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

FROM: BRYCE HARLOW

I have discussed with the President the feasibility of legislation that would require those who sponsor big (Moratorium-type) demonstrations in D. C. to post a bond to cover damages caused by the demonstrations.

Lamar Alexander further explored the subject with Tom Kauper in Bill Rehnquist's office.

Although there are some obvious constitutional and policy difficulties, I would appreciate your preparing a memorandum of law weighing the pros and cons of:

- 1 - Drafting a statute requiring organizers of large meetings or demonstrations in D. C. (it would have to apply to Boy Scouts, D. A. R. as well as the New Mobe) to post a bond to cover clean-up expenses and damage to public property on which the demonstrators had obtained a permit to operate. For example, if groups obtain a permit to march on Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues and to camp on the Mall, then they could be held responsible for damage to street lights on those avenues and for destruction of the sod on the mall.
- 2 - Inducing the D. C. Government to require bond of the leaders of big groups to cover all damages.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
E.O. 12958, Section 1.8  
By                      NARA, Date 11/15/10

BNH:LA:nb

cc: Bud Krogh