

Mr. COHELAN. How about the American Municipal Association or the League of California Cities or leagues of cities, organizations like that, which have to do with public administration?

Mr. MONK. I just cannot answer that question, except the code has been adopted now by the legislatures of 23 States, and I suppose if they did have opposition, it would have been reflected in that respect.

Mr. COHELAN. Then it is your testimony that you know of no group that is actively opposed to this program?

Mr. MONK. I know of no group that is actively opposed to it; that is correct.

Mr. COHELAN. Have you any information about the status of the uniform code arrangement in the State of California, which is the State I represent?

Mr. MONK. I think it is in the legislature there.

Mr. COHELAN. You say it is pending in the legislature. Do you know what its prospects are?

Mr. MONK. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. COHELAN. How about the large jurisdictions like New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, California, and so on? I see Massachusetts has passed it, and Pennsylvania and New York have, too.

Mr. MONK. Of course, Pennsylvania was the first State to pass it. Pennsylvania passed it in 1954, so it has had almost a 10-year trial in Pennsylvania. Everyone that I have come in contact with from Pennsylvania is very much delighted with it. I am sure some people are not happy with it, but I have not found any from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder, sir, if you could give me a little detail in regard to article III. The outline I have in front of me says this article replaces the uniform Negotiable Instruments Act. Then you go on to discuss it. It says that numerous conflicting judicial interpretations which have developed concerning provisions of NIL over the last 65 years have been eliminated, and so on. What are the differences? How does this differ in respect to this particular matter from what exists today?

Mr. MONK. I would say the main difference is bringing the NIL up to date. The NIL is approximately 60 years old. During the course of its stay in this country it has served commerce and the businessman very well. As I recall, there are at least 65 provisions of it which are the subject of judicial conflict. This code eliminates those. It brings the language of it up to date. I cannot list the specific ways in which it changes. They have been the subject of many law review articles and many comments. I can say it does not make abrupt changes in the law. It is more a matter of development, rather than any radical change in what the NIL effects.

Mr. COHELAN. Can you help me in this way? What were the conflicts in legal opinions that are resolved by this action?

Mr. MONK. I just cannot list them. I have seen 65 of them. I have read them, but I just cannot list them. I could get that for you.

Mr. COHELAN. That is not necessary.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. NELSEN. I have no questions.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have no questions.