RESOLVED, that the American Bar Association urges:

(1) Every state and territory to meet the full intent of the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, whereby every child in the United States who is the subject of a civil child protection related judicial proceeding will be represented at all stages of these proceedings by a fully-trained, monitored, and evaluated guardian ad litem in addition to appointed legal counsel.

(2) That state, territory and local bar associations and law schools become involved in setting standards of practice for such guardians ad litem, clarify the ethical responsibilities of these individuals and establish minimum ethical performance requirements for their work, and provide comprehensive multidisciplinary training for all who serve as such guardians ad litem.

(3) That in every state and territory, where judges are given discretion to appoint a guardian ad litem in private child custody and visitation related proceedings, the bench and bar jointly develop guidelines to aid judges in determining when such an appointment is necessary to protect the best interests of the child.
This resolution follows upon a series of policy actions taken by the Association's House of Delegates over the past twelve years. In 1979, the House approved a multi-volume set of Juvenile Justice Standards, one volume of which is entitled Standards Relating to Counsel for Private Parties. This volume includes a provision stating that: "Independent counsel should ... be provided for the juvenile who is the subject of proceedings affecting his or her status or custody" (Standard 2.3(b)). The title to this Standard, "Child protection, custody and adoption proceedings," and the Commentary that follows the text of the Standard, make it clear that children in child abuse, neglect, and dependency related cases are meant to receive mandatory appointed counsel.

The Commentary further states that a non-legally trained person might be appropriate to provide independent advocacy for children in such court proceedings. Indeed, in 1974 the United States Congress had enacted the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 5101, et seq., which requires that States receiving Federal funds under the Act assure that all children subject to civil child protection court proceedings be represented by a "guardian ad litem" who, depending upon the language in each state's law, may or may not be an attorney.

The House of Delegates has previously passed the following relevant resolutions:
1) An August, 1981 resolution stating that attorneys and bar organizations "should work to assure quality legal representation for children ....";
2) A February, 1984 resolution urging attorneys and bar organizations to direct their attention to the "establishment of guardian ad litem programs";
3) A February, 1987 resolution stating that bar associations should determine whether children are being provided with quality legal representation, as well as support educational opportunities for court-appointed lawyers for children, so as to be in compliance with the 1979 Standards;
4) An August, 1989 resolution that supported and endorsed the use of "well trained lay volunteers, Court Appointed Special Advocates, in addition to providing attorney representation" in child abuse and neglect proceedings; and
5) A February, 1991 resolution supporting United States ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Article 12 of the Convention is meant to assure the child's right to be heard and represented in all judicial matters affecting his or her interests. This would include child abuse and neglect related court actions.
Reasons Why Further Association and Bar Leadership Action is Necessary

Notwithstanding all of these ABA policies, renewed attention and Association commitment to this pressing problem is essential. In recent years, there has been a staggering increase in child abuse and neglect court dockets. For example, the New York City Family Courts experienced a 400% increase in abuse and neglect petitions between 1986 and 1989. Substance abuse in families is the most often cited cause for this docket explosion. At the same time, judicial resources have not appreciably grown. Thus, difficult decisions having profound effects upon the lives of children and families are being made in an increasingly hurried fashion.

Moreover, experts agree that the children entering our child protection system have a multitude of increasingly severe problems, ranging from HIV infection and other chronic illnesses, to homelessness, to severe learning disabilities. In short, these children need more services than earlier generations of child welfare cases. Ironically, with budget restraints these services are harder to come by.

For these reasons, to help ensure the effective administration of justice for children brought involuntarily before our juvenile and family courts, the provision of a knowledgeable guardian ad litem or legal counsel for the child is more important than ever. Only the child's representative can assure that all relevant factors are being considered by the judge. Only the child's representative will seek out and advocate for all essential services, regardless of the cost. Only this person will assure that a future generation of citizens' experiences with our legal and judicial systems do not appear to be haphazard and arbitrary.

The improvement of representation of children in child protective proceedings by both legal counsel, attorney guardians ad litem, non-attorney guardians ad litem and Court Appointed Special Advocates (C.A.S.A.) has long been a focus of the work of the Young Lawyers Division's ABA Center on Children and the Law, as well as the Section of Family Law's Task Force on the Needs of Children. Yet, as explained below, much more needs to be done to assure that every child in abuse and neglect related court cases actually has this representation, and that the person providing such court-appointed representation is adequately trained, monitored, and evaluated. Further, since almost all States — despite the 1979 Standards Relating to Counsel for Private Parties urging that representation be mandated — give judges discretion whether to appoint representation for a child in a private custody or visitation dispute, there is a pressing need for courts to have guidelines to help identify those cases where such independent representation is most critical.
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Congress in 1988 required the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study that would determine how each State was complying with the intent of the 1974 Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act's mandate of independent guardian ad litem representation for children. In October, 1990 the report of this study was issued. It found that Congress' mandate in the 1974 law "has clearly not been adequately met." In over half of the States, despite State laws mandating appointments in every case, many children went unrepresented. Another eight States were found to not make such appointments mandatory. Only five States were found to have a comprehensive description of the role and responsibilities of the person providing court-appointed independent representation for the child. Formal monitoring and evaluation of those who provided such representation was also found to be almost nonexistent. This is particularly troublesome to the fair administration of justice when one considers that the child-clients, due to legal and mental incapacities, are unable to effectively monitor and evaluate the performance of their own counsel.

The U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect, in its first report issued in September, 1990, highlighted a need for much more to be done "to help assure that all abused and neglected children ... have both vigorous advocates and competent legal counsel." The report cited the inadequate training and compensation of such representatives. It recommended that leaders of the organized bar "take steps to assure that every child has independent advocacy and legal representation." In its September, 1991 report, the Board further called for improved handling of child protection cases by court-appointed counsel and guardians ad litem for children.

These reports confirm earlier statewide evaluations in North Carolina and New York: court-appointed guardians ad litem are too often ill-trained and poorly prepared to meet the difficult challenges of representing children in maltreatment proceedings. This message has been repeated by numerous statewide task forces that have examined the child protection system in their States. Without fail, these bodies have issued recommendations calling for more training for, and guidance to, guardians ad litem.

Many attorneys who are appointed to serve as guardians ad litem have little understanding of what is expected of them in this highly specialized field, one that is often totally unlike their usual area of practice. Such attorneys are often confused about their responsibilities to either advocate for the expressed wishes of the child or for the best interests of the child as the attorney perceives it. They are often troubled by the adversarial character of the proceedings in such sensitive cases. They often wonder whether or not to aggressively challenge the positions of other parties to the litigation. Finally, they are often confused about whether to defer to the judgments of social workers and other child welfare agency personnel and when to seek out other, independent expert opinions.
As a result of such confusion, some attorneys serving as guardians ad litem take an inappropriately passive and acquiescent posture in child protection court proceedings. This approach fails to protect the interests of these highly vulnerable children and may constitute a violation of ethical standards.

To allay this confusion, State and local bar associations must take a far more active role, not only in ensuring better selection, supervision, and training of guardians ad litem, but also in more clearly defining their responsibilities. Not only should there be specific standards outlining the mandatory and desirable elements of representation in these cases, but lawyers also should be made aware of the ethical considerations present in child protection related judicial proceedings.

Despite the Association’s call for all children in private divorce-related custody or visitation conflicts to have independent representation, only a handful of States have enacted legislation mandating such appointments. Judges may be reluctant to appoint such representatives without clear statutory, court-approved, or bar-generated guidelines addressing when and how such representation should be provided. Since such guidelines rarely exist, the best interests of children in such contentious parental litigation often being unrepresented.

The duties and ethical responsibilities of lawyers performing the role of counsel or guardian ad litem for a child in State-initiated child protection cases, or parent-initiated custody or visitation litigation, have rarely been adequately described by any State laws, court rules, or bar association opinions. This has resulted in a great deal of role confusion for those who provide this difficult and important representation.
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Conclusions

One objective of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (P.L. 93-247) of 1974 was to provide for a system in which children involved in civil abuse and neglect judicial proceedings would have representation in court. To some extent, this objective has been realized by the institution of GAL programs at both State and local jurisdictional levels. However, the lack of representation of all abused and neglected children found in the 50 States and 555 counties in this study indicates that Congress' mandate so clearly stated in P.L. 93-247 has not been adequately met.

Despite statutory requirements for representation, less than 100 percent of all children receive it in 26 States. In six of these States, less than 70 percent of children are represented. State laws in 8 of the 16 States do not require a GAL to be appointed in all cases. Where GALs were not assigned universally, informants cited a number of reasons for not providing a GAL including: the judge determined that the cases were not complex or severe enough to appoint a GAL; not enough attorneys, volunteers or CASAs were available; insufficient funds were available; and a GAL was appointed only in cases where the abuse was in the home or when the child was to be removed from the home. We also found that GAL appointment time varied in some States, often reflecting the local judge's policy.

This study found little consistency between or within the States as to who is to serve as the GAL, what the GAL's responsibilities are, and how conflicts are to be resolved. While the vast majority of GALs are attorneys (72.4 percent of the jurisdictions used private attorneys, 21 percent staff attorneys), many States and local jurisdictions (21.6 percent) also use trained volunteers and CASAs to serve in this role. With the exception of the States where statute requires either the attorney or the CASA to serve as the primary GAL, there are no clear guidelines for the appointment of one or the other for this lead role. Generally, the judge, based on his/her personal assessment of the case, will decide if the GAL should be a CASA or an attorney. In addition, the relationship between attorneys and CASAs is often unclear. In cases where the CASAs and attorneys coexist, there does not appear to be a systematic method for coordination of their respective activities.

Only five States were found to have a comprehensive description of the role and responsibilities of the GAL. The responsibilities of the GAL in most other cases are broadly defined, with no specific direction as to what constitutes minimal required effort on behalf of the child. This confusion and blurring of roles has the potential for creating conflict among the social workers, attorneys, and volunteers and CASAs, each of whom may feel that the other is intruding into his or her sphere of responsibility. Ultimately, the lack of clear guidelines for responsibilities can lead to inadequate representation for the child.

The lack of clear guidelines can exacerbate the confusion of roles when coordination of the activities of a CASA and an attorney is required. Without clear rules as to who is responsible for what, the possibility exists for important functions to be missed. Clearly, one individual should be...
required to take the lead in coordinating the efforts of the team if comprehensive representation and service coordination is to be achieved.

Of concern to many respondents was the issue of the GAL's responsibility when the child's wishes and best interests are in conflict. There is clearly disagreement within the legal profession as to whether the GAL must present the child's wishes—as in other attorney-client relationships—or the child's best interests. While a few States address this problem in the Statute or State policy, in many States the dilemma continues to exist.

While private attorneys were usually paid by the hour, about one quarter of all jurisdictions maintained contractual relationships with attorneys to serve as GALs. Over 80 percent of these contracts were with staff attorneys such as the Public Defenders or Legal Aid. This study found wide disparity in the rates of compensation to attorneys who serve as GALs. While $42 per hour was the average fee in court pay and $35 was the average fee out of court pay, rates as low as $10 per hour were identified. Likewise, while the average pay ceiling per case was $685, it could be as low as $10. It is hard to imagine an instance where a child could have adequate representation for a total of $10. Contracted fees were paid on a fixed fee per case basis or a fixed annual amount for all cases. The fee per case ceiling ranged between $40 and $2,500.

There is also some concern regarding the adequacy of reimbursement of expenses. Here, as elsewhere in the study, we found wide variation in reimbursement, with only two-thirds of the counties compensating expenses incurred in the process of representing a child. Clearly in those jurisdictions with no or low levels of reimbursement, the GAL is discouraged from providing comprehensive investigations or from obtaining expert testimony.

Where it exists, the training of CASAs and volunteers covers a wide range of topics relating to fulfillment of multiple responsibilities. The range of training time and the content of training programs, however, varies considerably across jurisdictions. While all CASA and volunteer programs require training, only 8 States, the District of Columbia, and a small number of local jurisdictions have training for attorney GALs. Given that our study found that the majority of attorney GALs do not specialize in family law, this lack of training is conspicuous.

In almost all jurisdictions that use them, evaluation and monitoring of GAL performance is conducted on a regular basis for CASAs and volunteers. While monitoring of staff attorneys is less common, 33 percent of the counties that used them performed this activity. While private attorneys were used in almost three-quarters of the jurisdictions studied, only 15 percent of the jurisdictions performed formal monitoring of the performance of private attorneys. Central to the issue of monitoring and evaluation is the lack of a standard against which such judgements are made. Without clear guidelines addressing the duties and actions to be taken in fulfilling the GAL role, there can be no systematic method of assessing individual performance.

Finally, we have identified consistent confusion on the issue of GAL immunity from liability. In most instances, the confusion exists because the issue of liability has not come up in the States; there had never been a case. The respondents in this study had generally not given thought to the issue prior to this study.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendations

CSR has developed nine recommendations based on our understanding of the intent of P.L. 93-247 and the findings of the State study. These recommendations have also been reviewed by the panel of experts who are recognized in our acknowledgements to this report.

Recommendation 1. The Federal Government should take into account the findings presented in this report and the findings of the upcoming Phase II report in order to develop a uniform description of the roles and responsibilities, as well as minimum performance expectations, of the GAL. This guidance should be made available to all States and localities, as well as to the individual GALs upon their appointment. In addition, the Government should develop guidelines that address the distribution of responsibilities and coordination of effort in cases where a volunteer or CASA works in tandem with an attorney. Overall, this guidance will provide the basis for (1) establishing minimum training standards and (2) monitoring and evaluating GAL performance.

Recommendation 2. Federal legislation stipulates that States are required to appoint a GAL for children involved in legal proceedings arising from abuse or neglect, as a condition of receiving Federal funds under P.L. 93-247. Our study findings indicate that not all States and localities meet the full intent of the law. We are cognizant that case circumstances and resource limitations might influence occasional discretion by the courts over whether or not to appoint a GAL. However, the study findings also indicate that in some court systems there is a persistent disregard for Federal (and often State) legislative intent which is not warranted by occasional case circumstances or resource limitations.

We recommend that the Federal Government consider adopting two mechanisms to remedy these problems. First, the Department of Health and Human Services should provide additional guidance to those States which require mandatory appointment by statute or practice on the need to educate judges about the role and value of using a GAL. This guidance might include guidelines to address the discretionary power of judges to appoint a GAL. For example, we found in the study that, in many instances, a GAL is not appointed because the judge deems the case insufficiently complex or severe to warrant an appointment. Many child welfare experts believe that subjective assessments of case complexity, unsupported by additional guidelines, should not be the sole factor in denying representation.

Second, we recommend that the Department of Health and Human Services consider ways to strengthen their annual process of reviewing State certification applications so that States which consistently disregard this requirement may be identified. It appears that certain States might technically be out of compliance and we think that the Department in conjunction with the States should use these preliminary results to further examine these practices. Moreover, the second part of this study will help identify criteria under which a GAL’s appointment is considered to be absolutely necessary to the best interest of the child. At that time we will be better able to determine whether this “technical noncompliance” might be sufficient to warrant stronger action by the Department to enforce compliance.
Recommendation 3. Although it appears that judges choose to use a CASA as GAL when the child
needs services or the case needs investigation and an attorney when the case requires complex legal
expertise, the consistency of this choice is not assured. The Federal Government should begin to
develop guidelines to assist the judge with discretionary power in choosing between assigning a CASA
or an attorney as GAL.

Recommendation 4. Phase II of this project will investigate the relationship between level of
payment/expense reimbursement and quality of representation. Certainly, the preliminary Phase I
results of this study suggest that guidelines should be established to set minimum levels of
reimbursement. At this point it is premature to make such recommendations; however, if Phase II
results confirm that the quality is limited by financial constraints, we will recommend that guidelines
regarding minimum level of effort be tied to payment and reimbursement guidelines.

The opportunity for enforcing minimum performance criteria lies in the development of
contracted obligations for a uniform, specified fee, at least in those jurisdictions that use contracted
attorneys.

Recommendation 5. The effects of an attorney GAL presenting either the child’s best interests or the
child’s wishes needs further investigation. This issue will be addressed by the research in Phase II of
this project.

Recommendation 6. The results of this study indicate that the CASA GAL training, monitoring and
evaluation, recruitment, and consistency in assignment may be related to the existence of a statewide
program and strength of a central CASA Program Office. Although this will be investigated in greater
depth in Phase II of this project, preliminary findings suggest that the States, at a minimum, should
conform to existing requirements, and further they should be encouraged to institute a statewide,
mandatory GAL program. In those States where such a program is not currently feasible, the State
should at least have a statute setting forth the GAL requirements and establishing a uniform policy on
GAL appointment and responsibilities. In addition, it may be beneficial to the GAL program, in
general, to have a State administrative person or office responsible for coordinating GAL functions.
This could be accomplished in States that do not have a Statewide GAL Program, but wish to insure
quality standards in the GAL programs that do exist.

Recommendation 7. The States should be encouraged to review their laws concerning GAL liability.
It is recommended that States clarify their immunity requirements and make them known to all GALs.
For optimal operation of the GAL program, every participant should know his/her level of liability.
The Federal Government should begin to develop guidelines for a good faith immunity in future
legislation. They can begin by investigating State statutes that incorporate this concept and frame the
Federal legislation requirements so that they parallel the best State practices. This review will be a
special focus of Phase II of this project.

Recommendation 8. Local Bar Associations and law schools should be involved in setting standards
and providing training to attorney GALs. This study found that while CASAs and volunteer GALs are
routinely trained in their role prior to appointment, attorneys rarely receive GAL specific training.
Only seven States, the District of Columbia, and a small number of local jurisdictions have training

Conclusions and Recommendations

requirements for attorney GALs. Local Bar Associations should be the leaders in their communities for establishing training requirements, providing both initial and ongoing training to all GAL attorneys, and ensuring these training requirements are enforced.

Recommendation 9. Standards and methods for evaluating GAL performance should be established within local jurisdictions. While volunteer GALs are periodically evaluated by the court or program staff, attorney performance is rarely reviewed. Courts and local Bar Associations should implement procedures and standards for assessing GALs at least annually. In addition, standardized procedures should be developed and used uniformly within jurisdictions for both volunteer and attorney GALs. These procedures should include objective assessment instruments, such as questionnaires and observational checklists that evaluate performance. These instruments can be developed with guidance from research and the literature on the representation of children. The criteria for evaluating GAL performance should be made known to all GALs in the jurisdiction prior to appointment.
61.401 Appointment of guardian ad litem.—In an action for dissolution of marriage, modification, parental responsibility, custody, or visitation, if the court finds it is in the best interest of the child, the court may appoint a guardian ad litem to represent the child. In such actions which involve an allegation of child abuse or neglect as defined in s. 415.052(3), which allegation is verified and determined by the court to be well-founded, the court shall appoint a guardian ad litem for the child. Sex.—s. 1, ch. 90-380.

61.402 Qualifications of guardian ad litem.—A guardian ad litem shall be neither a citizen certified by the State of Florida Guardian Ad Litem Program to act in family law cases nor an attorney who is a member of The Florida Bar in good standing.

61.403 Guardians ad litem: powers and authority. A guardian ad litem when appointed shall act as a representative of the child and shall act in the child's best interest. A guardian ad litem shall have the powers, privileges, and responsibilities to the extent necessary to advance the best interest of the child, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. The guardian ad litem may investigate the allegations of the pleadings affecting the child, and, after proper notice to interested parties to the litigation and subject to conditions set by the court, may interview the child, witnesses, or any other person having information concerning the welfare of the child.

2. The guardian ad litem, through counsel, may petition the court for an order directed to a specified person, agency, or organization, including, but not limited to, hospitals, medical doctors, dentists, psychologists, and psychiatrists, which order directs that the guardian ad litem be allowed to inspect and copy any records and documents which relate to the minor child or to the child's parents or other custodial persons or household members with whom the child resides. Such order shall be obtained only after notice to all parties and hearing thereon.

3. The guardian ad litem, through counsel, may request the court to order expert examinations of the child, the child's parents, or other interested parties in the action, by medical doctors, dentists, and other providers of health care including psychiatrists, psychologists, or other mental health professionals.

4. The guardian ad litem may assist the court in obtaining impartial expert examinations.

5. The guardian ad litem may address the court and make written or oral recommendations to the court. The guardian ad litem shall file a written report which may include recommendations to the court of the wishes of the child. The report must be filed and served on all parties at least 20 days prior to the hearing at which it will be presented unless the court waives such time limit. The guardian ad litem shall be provided with copies of all pleadings, notices, and other documents filed in the action and is entitled to reasonable notice before any action affecting the child is taken by either of the parties, their counsel, or the court.

6. A guardian ad litem, acting through counsel, may file such pleadings, motions, or petitions for relief as the guardian ad litem deems appropriate or necessary and may request and provide discovery. The guardian ad litem may request the court to order expert examinations of the child or the child's parents or other interested persons or household members whose wishes the child resides.

7. The duties and rights of non-attorney guardians shall not include the right to practice law.

8. The guardian ad litem shall submit his recommendations to the court regarding any stipulation or agreement, whether incidental, temporary, or permanent, which affects the interest or welfare of the minor child, within 10 days after the date such stipulation or agreement is served upon the guardian ad litem.
63.102 Filing of petition; venue.—
(1) A proceeding for adoption shall be commenced by filing a petition entitled, "In the Matter of the Adoption of..." in the circuit court. The person to be adopted shall be designated in the caption in the name by which he is to be known if the petition is granted. If the child is then a minor, the court shall enter such orders as it deems necessary and suitable to protect and promote the best interests of the person to be adopted.

(2) A petition for adoption or for a declaratory statement as to the adoption contract shall be filed in the county where the petitioners or petitioners or the child resides or where the agency in which the child has been placed is located.

(3) Except for adoptions involving placement of a child with a relative within the third degree of consanguinity, a petition for adoption by an adoption agency shall be filed within 30 working days after placement of a child with a parent seeking to adopt the child. If no petition is filed within 30 days, any interested party, including the state, may file an action challenging the prospective adoptive parent's physical custody of the child.

(4) If the filing of the petition for adoption or for a declaratory statement as to the adoption contract in the circuit court where the petitionit is filed would tend to endanger the privacy of the petitioners, the petition for adoption may be filed in a different county, provided the substantive rights of any person will not thereby be affected.

63.097 Approval of fees to intermediaries.—Any fee, including attorney or attorney fees over $1,000 and those costs paid out in s. 63.212(1)(d) over $2,500, paid to an intermediary other than actual, documented medical costs, court costs, and hospital costs must be approved by the court prior to assessment of the fee by the intermediary and upon a showing of justification for the larger fee.
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Submitting Entity: Section of Family Law
Submitted By: Kenneth G. Raggio, Chair

1. Summary of Recommendation(s).

That the ABA urges (1) that every state and territory assures that each abused and neglected child is represented by a trained guardian ad litem; (2) that state, territory and local bars and law schools become involved in setting standards and providing training for guardians ad litem; and (3) each state and territory be encouraged to authorize appointment of a guardian ad litem in custody and visitation cases to protect the best interest of the child.

2. Approval by Submitting Entity.

This recommendation was approved by the Family Law Section Council in August, 1991.

3. Previous submission to the House or relevant Association position.

In August, 1989, endorsed the concept of utilizing carefully selected, well-trained lay volunteers, Court Appointed Special Advocates, in addition to providing attorney representation in dependency proceedings to assist the court in determining what is in the best interests of abused and neglected children. Encouraged ABA members to support the development of CASA programs in their communities.

4. Need for Action at This Meeting.

Few states have enacted legislation to provide for a guardian ad litem to protect the best interest of the child in custody cases. Judges are reluctant to appoint a GAL in such cases without statutory authorization.
5. Status of Legislation. (If applicable.)
N/A

6. Cost to the Association. (Both direct and indirect costs.)
N/A

7. Disclosure of Interest. (If applicable.)
N/A

8. Referrals.
Approved by Law Student Division Board of Governors in August, 1991. Referred to Sections of General Practice, Individual Rights and Responsibilities, and Legal Education; Judicial Administration Division; Young Lawyers Division; and state and local bar associations in November, 1991. Referred to all sections and divisions in December, 1991.

9. Contact Person. (Prior to meeting.)
Marc L. Sallus
1088 Century Park East, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90067
213/379-4481

10. Contact Person. (Who will present the report to the House.)
Harvey L. Golden and Samuel V. Schoonmaker III, Section Delegates
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