

U.S. Seeks New Restrictions On Protests Near White House

By RICHARD D. LYONS
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 24—
The Government has moved to place new restrictions on political demonstrations near the White House.

The National Park Service, which has jurisdiction over the broad sidewalk in front of the White House, proposed regulations eight days ago that would require a protest group to disclose two weeks before a demonstration in front of the White House any records of arrests, indictments, convictions and jail terms of those due to take part.

The regulations would also require the disclosure of any previous demonstrations in which a protestor had taken part, as well as the degree to which he advocated the use of violence.

Organizations would have to describe in minute detail the banners, placards and signs that would be used. This information would be part of a 33-item questionnaire that would have to be filed with the National Park Service.

The American Civil Liberties Union, which made public the new proposals today, will challenge them Monday in Federal Court here.

"This is another attempt to restrict the freedom of assembly in the District of Columbia," said Mrs. Florence Robin, the director of the local A.C.L.U. chapter.

She added that the "questionnaire is characteristic of the way the Attorney General regards civil liberties in

that is an appropriate question. "I will not answer it."

The proposed regulations stem from a complicated series of legal actions that started on Sept. 20, 1967, when a young Washington woman, Miss Joyce Doreen Williamson, was arrested "for failure to move on" during an antiwar demonstration in front of the White House organized by Women Strike for Peace.

Until 1967, protest groups had an informal agreement with the District of Columbia Police Department that said the police would be notified before a demonstration.

"This was not formally coded but was a composite of police powers," a police spokesman explained.

He said that the intent was to let the department know the time and number of demonstrators so that it could detail sufficient police to keep order.

During the six-day Arab-Israeli war in June of 1967, 30,000 persons supporting Israel demonstrated in Lafayette Park across the street from the White House. It was said to be the largest protest meeting there in many years.

The following month jurisdiction over the sidewalk was handed from the police department to the National Park Service.

One month after that, the Park Service said that demonstrators would need permits and issued a regulation limiting the number of demonstrators on the White House sidewalk to 100 and in Lafayette Square to 500.

A Walk Across the Street

Then in September of '67, Women Strike for Peace demonstrated on the White House sidewalk and Lafayette Park against the Vietnam War. Miss Williamson crossed Pennsylvania Avenue from the park to the sidewalk but was told to move on by the park police, who said that 100 demonstrators were already there.

Miss Williamson refused, was arrested and fined \$10. Her case is being appealed.

Five Washington lawyers, some from prominent law firms here, challenged the right of the Interior Department to restrict the number of demonstrators and to issue permits.

Attorneys for the Justice Department, representing the Interior Department, contended that large demonstrations might jeopardize the safety of the President, interfere with vehicular traffic and damage adjacent shrubbery.

Lawyers for the Civil Liberties Union countered with 233 affidavits attesting to the peacefulness of previous demonstrations and presented studies by urban planners showing that the area could hold as many as 9,000 persons. They maintained that there was no legal basis for the regulations limiting the number of demonstrators.

The United States District Court issued an injunction last May preventing the Government from restricting the number of demonstrators. It also ruled that permits would not be required. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the ruling.

Regulations Restored

Last fall, however, the lower

court all but restored the Park Service regulations, reasoning that the Government had received additional evidence from the Secret Service that large demonstrations did endanger the President's life.

This ruling was reversed by

the Court of Appeals. However, the higher court said that there should be a notification of intent to assemble 15 days before a demonstration. It also asked the lower court to rule on a form that the Government could ask a protest group to file giving its protest plans.

The Government responded with the 33-item questionnaire, and the A.C.L.U. countered with a six-question form. These two versions will be considered on Monday.

The demonstration regulations have not dealt with marches along Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House.

Last fall, when the New Mobilization Committee to End the War tried to hold a march along Pennsylvania, it was de-

nied a permit by the Justice Department. The denial was upheld by local courts. The group marched elsewhere along Pennsylvania Avenue.

Lawrence Lataif, a Washington lawyer, researched local statutes and found that the Interior Department was given jurisdiction over the White House sidewalk in 1898 but that it did not exercise it until 1967.

Attorneys who have figured prominently in presenting the case against permits and restrictions on the number of demonstrators included Ralph J. Temple of the A.C.L.U., James F. Fitzpatrick, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., William A. Dobrovir and Prof. John Murphy Jr. of the Georgetown University Law School.

Continued on Page 22, Column 2

Continued From Page 1, Col. 6
general."

It could not be immediately determined who had drawn up the proposals, but a spokesman for the Interior Department, of which the National Park Service is an arm, disclaimed departmental authorship. Persons familiar with the case said that the Justice Department had written the regulations. The Justice Department declined to comment.

Gilbert Zimmerman, an Assistant United States Attorney, said when asked to identify the author: "I don't believe that



Women Strike for Peace members protesting outside the White House last week

United Press International