

1. Removing the language which restricts the application of the section to property which is movable.

2. Broadening the section to cover the malicious destruction of any property whether personal or real.

3. Increasing the value line of demarcation between misdemeanors and felonies from \$50 to \$200.

4. Increasing the maximum fine for misdemeanors from \$200 to \$1,000, and changing the penalty for felonies from the present mandatory minimum of 1 year and maximum of 10 years to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or both.

The effects of the change would be to simplify prosecutions for malicious destruction of property and, by the change in penalties, to provide a more effective deterrent.

SECTION 2. DISFIGUREMENT OF PROPERTY

This section would amend section 1 of the act approved July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 322, ch. 320), as amended by the act approved July 8, 1898 (30 Stat. 723, ch. 638) and by the act approved April 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 126, ch. 1647) (District of Columbia Code, sec. 22-3112), by—

1. Striking out the language which permits a defendant who has willfully or wantonly destroyed, broken, or injured property to be prosecuted under this section which relates principally to disfiguring of property and which subjects the offender to relatively minor punishment.

2. Conforming the coverage of the section to the expanded coverage of section 1 of this act.

SECTION 3. KIDNAPING

This section would amend section 812 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1322, ch. 854), as amended by the act approved February 18, 1933 (47 Stat. 858, ch. 103) (District of Columbia Code, sec. 22-2101), by—

1. Conforming the existing local law relating to kidnaping to the Federal statute applicable in all other Federal jurisdictions.

2. Excepting parents, as regards their minor children, from the coverage of the statute.

3. Broadening the local kidnaping statute which now makes punishable only a holding for ransom or reward to include instances where no ransom or reward is demanded but where the motive may be lust, a desire for companionship, revenge, or any other nonmonetary motivation.

SECTION 4. IMMUNITY

This section would amend section 9 of the act approved February 7, 1914 (38 Stat. 282, ch. 16), as amended by section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909, ch. 646) (District of Columbia Code, sec. 22-2721), by—

1. Broadening the coverage of the section, now applicable only to civil actions relating to the abatement of the nuisances of disorderly houses to include criminal prosecutions for keeping disorderly houses.

2. Granting authority to the courts upon application of the prosecutor to compel a witness to testify in a criminal prosecution for keeping a disorderly house notwithstanding his claim of privilege under the fifth amendment.

3. Granting witnesses immunity from prosecution on the matters on which testimony was compelled, after a claim of privilege against self-discrimination.

4. Subjecting such witnesses to whom immunity is granted to the ordinary possibilities of prosecution for perjury or contempt of court committed in connection with their testimony.

5. Harmonizing this local immunity statute to comparable Federal laws.

SECTION 5. HEALING ARTS PRACTICES

This section would amend section 46 of the act approved February 29, 1929 (45 Stat. 1340, ch. 352), as amended by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909, ch. 646) (District of Columbia Code, sec. 2-137), by—

1. Substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for the U.S. attorney as the party who shall conduct certain proceedings relating principally to the suspension or revocation of doctors' licenses; this follows naturally from a recent change effected by the District Commissioners in the composition of the District Commission on Licensure by which the Corporation Counsel was substituted for the U.S. attorney.