

Mr. Justice:

Here are my suggestions for the SEC case. The length of the riders is somewhat greater than my usual quota, and lest you think that I aspire for your opinions to equal Justice White's in wordy length, a word of explanation is in order.

1) I have suggested adding several footnotes to put the statutory cites (e.g. to the stats. at large which the Reporter always inserts in the text later) in ~~■~~ footnotes. That gets them out of the way.

2) Rider D adds some persuasive legislative history. I think it is necessary because a strong attack is made by Resp. on Senator Wheeler's statement, on the ground that it ~~xxx~~ was made after the Bill was passed. (And I have tried to answer that objection in a footnote (f.n. 11, which is in Rider E).

3) Rider X adds a footnote (12) which you asked for: this reviews the SEC's administrative practice.

4) Rider G expands your original footnote. You asked me to do this to ~~pxxxx~~ demonstrate more explicitly the legislative intent to deal with anti-competitive forces

resulting from holding companies.

5) Finally, the last rider--actually two riders, H and I--I have added sua sponte. They required a word of explanation, which I have on p. 8 of the riders.

JBF