

maliciously injure or destroy property valued at \$50 or more. Section 1 of the bill increases this limitation to \$200 or more.

This is in line with current depreciation in values. The first section of the bill also revises the penalties established for such felonies by eliminating the mandatory maximum and minimum sentences of not less than 1 year nor more than 10 years' imprisonment, and substitutes instead a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both. In addition, it increases the maximum fine for misdemeanors in such cases from \$200 to \$1,000, and provides that the penalty for a misdemeanor shall be a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both. The Commissioners believe that these amendments will result in more effective prosecution of those offenses which would be affected by the amendments.

The second section of the bill eliminates from an existing provision of law relating to willful or wanton disfigurement of property (sec. 1 of the act of July 29, 1892), language relating to the destruction of property, inasmuch as all prosecutions for malicious injury to or destruction of property would, by the first section of the bill, be brought under the amended section 848 of the act of March 3, 1901.

Section 3 of the bill amends existing District of Columbia law relating to kidnaping by striking the words "for ransom or reward" and submitting in lieu thereof the words "for ransom or reward or otherwise, except, in the case of a minor, by a parent thereof." The purpose of this amendment is to broaden the kidnaping statute, which now makes it unlawful only to hold a person for ransom for reward. The amendment would make the statute also applicable to those kidnaping cases in which the motive is lust, a desire for companionship, revenge, or some other motive not involving a desire for ransom or reward. However, in order to make the language of the statute inapplicable to cases involving the taking of a minor child by one of the parents of such child, the proposed amendment expressly excepts any such case from the operation of the statute. The Commissioners are informed that the proposed amendments of existing District of Columbia law will bring the District's law into conformity with the Federal statute.

Section 4 of the bill broadens immunity privileges now granted under the law to witnesses in cases involving civil actions relating to the abatement of disorderly house nuisances by authorizing the granting of similar immunity in criminal prosecutions for keeping such houses. Under this amendment the courts, upon application of the prosecutor, may compel a witness to testify in any such criminal prosecution notwithstanding his claim of privilege under the fifth amendment. Such witnesses, nevertheless, remain subject, under the amendment, to prosecution for perjury or contempt of court in connection with their testimony. It is expected that the broadening of the immunity statute to include cases involving criminal charges for keeping a bawdy or disorderly house will aid in the successful prosecution of such charges.

Section 5 of the bill amends the Healing Arts Practice Act by substituting the Corporation Counsel for the U.S. attorney as the official to conduct proceedings with regard to the suspension or revocation of licenses issued under the authority of such act. Similarly,