

section 6 substitutes the Corporation Counsel for the U.S. attorney with regard to the conduct of proceedings leading to the suspension or revocation of licenses issued to nurses under the authority of the act of February 9, 1907.

Sections 7 and 8 amend existing law so as to designate the Corporation Counsel as the prosecutor of violations relating to the licensing of optometrists and accountants.

Section 9 repeals certain provisions originally enacted June 22, 1874, relating to the appointment and bonding of private detectives in the District. These provisions for a number of years have been considered as having been superseded by paragraph 41 of section 7 of the act of July 1, 1932, requiring the licensing of private detectives.

Section 10 of the bill substitutes the Corporation Counsel for the U.S. attorney in cases involving certain actions dealing with receivership of properties belonging to absentees or absconders. The amendment would, in effect, require that the District of Columbia, instead of the United States, be made a necessary party in proceedings involving receivership of such property when the absentees or absconders have left the District without making provision for support of a wife or minor children, or when such assets are to be treated as though the absentee had died intestate.

Finally, section 11 of the bill provides for the effective dates of the amendments of existing law made by the several sections of the bill.

In summing up my testimony on titles IV and V of H.R. 7525 and on S. 486, I desire to reiterate that the Commissioners favor the enactment of title IV of H.R. 7525 and the enactment of S. 486. With respect to the sections of title V which I have discussed for the reasons I have stated earlier the Commissioners object to those provisions which would have the effect of establishing a mandatory minimum penalty for certain offenses, or increasing an existing mandatory minimum penalty. Subject to the foregoing comment, the Commissioners favor the enactment of section 502 of the title, relating to burglary. The Commissioners see no good for the balance of the provisions of title V of H.R. 7525, and accordingly they recommend against the enactment of all of the sections of that title with the exception of section 502.

Thank you very much for affording the Commissioners an opportunity to express their views with respect to the merits of titles IV and V of H.R. 7525 and of S. 486.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Tobriner. I appreciate your testimony. I have no questions to direct to you. I previously indicated that we will have our hearing on the *Mallory* rule, which presents many problems, either next Tuesday or the Tuesday after that, and we will, likewise, have a full week of hearings on the *Durham* rule. We will look forward to seeing you back on those two separate occasions.

Mr. TOBRINER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions, Senator Dominick?

Senator DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not really have any questions, because I was unable to be here for the full testimony and have not had a chance to read it, but I do want to get clear what I understood from your last comment, Mr. Tobriner, and that is it is my understanding that you are against section V or all provisions at this point?