

opinion of the panel would have been binding upon the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

The bill was mandatory within the limits described immediately above.

Subsequent to the passage of this legislation the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs advised me that he would support the proposal if it were made permissive rather than mandatory. I agreed to this suggestion of the Administrator and the Senate bill as reported is entirely permissive and provides that when necessary in the judgment of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, expert medical opinion may be obtained, from recognized medical schools, universities, or clinics.

Mr. Speaker, I view this as an extremely important piece of legislation. I hope that the Administrator will see to it that the Board of Veterans' Appeals and its members make the widest possible use of this permissive authority. With the greatest facilities for medical research and expertise generally available in the medical field such as at the National Institutes of Health and in world renowned clinics such as those operated by the Mayo Bros. and the Menninger Clinic in Kansas, to name two well-known ones, there is no reason why the veterans of this country should not have the benefit of this expert knowledge. This bill seeks to provide such medical opinions.

RE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 860) to repeal certain obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 5, insert:

"(e) Claims for benefits under sections 2001 through 2009 of chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code, for any benefit week beginning before January 31, 1960, which claims are pending on the date these sections are repealed, shall be adjudicated in the same manner and with the same effect as if the sections had not been repealed. For the purpose of administering the program with respect to such claims, all functions, powers, and duties conferred upon the Secretary of Labor by sections 2001 through 2009 are continued in effect, and all rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to these sections, and in effect when the sections are repealed, shall remain in full force and effect until modified or suspended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill was originally designed to repeal obsolete provisions relating to unemployment compensation for veterans.

It was passed by the House on March 6, 1961, and has recently been approved by the other body. The amendment is purely technical in nature and is entirely consistent with the principal purpose of the legislation.

The amendment preserves the right of those veterans whose claims are awaiting adjudication in the several States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks after each of the bills just acted upon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANTITRUST CIVIL PROCESS ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman propose to take some time to explain what was contained in the conference report?

Mr. CELLER. I will be happy to if the gentleman wishes it.

Mr. MEADER. I think it should be done.

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the so-called civil investigative demand bill permitting the Department of Justice in antitrust investigations to demand and receive from corporations allegedly violating the antitrust laws certain books, documents, and papers pertaining to the alleged violation.

It is limited to corporations under inquiry. The so-called MacGregor amendment, which was adopted in the House, limiting the demand to corporations under inquiry was accepted by the Senate conferees. In fact, the Senate accepted all of the amendments that were adopted in the House, so that the bill now is not controversial.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I concur in the explanation given by the gentleman from New York as to what occurred with respect to the conference report on the bill S. 167. I was a member of the conference committee but did not sign the report for the reason I opposed the bill in committee and on the floor when it was originally passed by the House.

It will be recalled that on July 18, 1962, this conference report was brought up for consideration and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] offered a motion to recommit the report to the conference committee with instructions and on a rollcall that motion carried by a vote of 202 to 200.

My understanding from the conference report itself and from my discussion with the gentleman from New York

and other conferees is that the instructions of the House were followed to the letter. So far as I know, while I do not favor the bill, I know of no objection to the conference report on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of August 28, 1962.)

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House today represents a victory for those vitally concerned with proper law enforcement. As stated in the final conference report of August 26, 1962, the limitations of the civil investigative demand procedure to companies actually under investigation for suspected antitrust violations clearly does no violence to the essential purpose of the legislation.

In seeking to enforce the civil antitrust laws, the Department of Justice has frequently resorted to the improper procedure of a grand jury investigation. In response to admonitions by the courts and criticism on the part of interested citizens, the Attorney General has complained that he could not otherwise obtain the necessary books, records, and papers to prove a civil case. Many, therefore, have agreed that the judicious use of a civil investigative demand would close the enforcement gap.

The Senate sought to provide this tool when it passed the original version of this bill last September 21 in the form requested by the present Attorney General. The power which would have been granted by that bill however, would not properly safeguard the innocent third-party witness from bureaucratic harassment; books and records could have been demanded from anybody and everybody in business, and the Justice Department could have distributed the information obtained indiscriminately throughout various government agencies. The basic individual rights to privacy and to protection against unreasonable search and seizure would have been trampled.

Some corrective steps were taken in our House Committee on the Judiciary in limiting the use to be made of information obtained by the Department of Justice. But nothing was done to safeguard the rights of business entities who were not themselves suspected of any antitrust law violations.

When the bill came before the House on March 13 I proposed an amendment favored by virtually all of the non-governmental experts who had studied this problem. It seemed to me that the recipients of civil investigative demands should only be those under investigation by the Justice Department. During House debate I said:

I do not suggest that this Attorney General or, perhaps, any Attorney General or his assistants would abuse this tremendous

Sept. 4,

1962

grant of authority, but I think we should concern ourselves with the possibilities of its abuse rather than with the prospects and probabilities of its proper exercise.

Just 4 weeks later, the above words proved to be prophetic indeed, when Americans recoiled at the news that FBI agents, acting under a directive from the Office of the Attorney General, roused third-party witnesses out of bed at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning.

In passing the Antitrust Civil Process Act on March 13, the House voted to include my amendment, thus precluding any "fishing expeditions" by the Justice Department. The House agreed that additional antitrust enforcement powers were needed, but not at the expense of the rights of individual businessmen and small business entities.

The bill then went to conference where the Department of Justice sought to ride roughshod over the wishes of the House. Under strong pressure by representatives of the Attorney General, the conference swept aside the safeguards which we had carefully written into the bill. The MacGregor amendment was deleted, and the Attorney General was given carte blanche authority to pass information along to other Government agencies and bureaus.

On July 18, in what reporters referred to as a "cliff-hanging" vote of 202 to 200, the House reaffirmed its support of my amendment. That vote instructed our conferees to return to the conference table and there insist upon Senate concurrence in the MacGregor amendment. The subsequent conference report of August 28 retained this safeguard, wisely noting that "the essential purpose of the bill is clearly still fulfilled" by this reasonable limitation.

Our vote today to accept the final conference report is an action which coincides with the recommendation made to us by the American Bar Association and other experts in the field of anti-trust law. The considered opinion of the American Bar Association was seconded by its affiliated organization, the bar of the city of New York, which stated:

We recommend retention of the words "under investigation" in section 3(a) of the bill.

This amendment has already received the editorial support of many of the Nation's leading newspapers, including that of the Washington Post. The House today is to be complimented for its insistence on protecting individual freedoms and for the proper discharge of its duties as the representative body of the American people. Perhaps we have made a contribution toward the badly needed restoration of harmony between business and Government.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, MARYLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6759) for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMEND ACT AUTHORIZING NATIONAL MEDALS OF SCIENCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4055) to amend the act of August 25, 1959, to authorize the payment of a monetary award to recipients of the National Medal of Science.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS, Mr. RAY, and Mr. FORD objected; and, under the rule, the bill was stricken from the Consent Calendar.

ADDITION OF LAND TO THE WASATCH NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7195) to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1878, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to aid in the control of floods that may originate thereon and the reduction of soil erosion through the restoration of adequate vegetative cover and to promote their management and protection as national forest lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield, the lands described in section 2 hereof are hereby included in the Wasatch National Forest. Subject to any valid claims now existing and hereafter maintained, any of such lands owned or hereafter acquired by the United States or any other land acquired pursuant to this Act are hereby added to such national forest and shall be subject to laws and regulations applicable to the national forests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire any lands described in section 2 hereof and other lands within the national forest situated in the townships within which the described lands are located not owned by the United States which he finds suitable to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 2. This Act shall be applicable to the following described lands:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN

Township 2 north, range 1 east: Section 1, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, south half north half.

Township 3 north, range 1 east: Sections 1 and 2; section 3, lots 1 and 2, south half northeast quarter; section 11, east half; sections 12 and 13; section 35, northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter; section 36, south half northwest quarter, northeast quarter, south half.

Township 4 north, range 1 east: Section 1, lots 3 and 4, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter; sections 2 and 3; section 4, east half; section 9, east half; sections 10

to 15, inclusive; section 16, east half; section 21, east half; sections 22 to 27, inclusive; sections 34 to 36, inclusive.

Township 5 north, range 1 east: South half of sections 26 to 28, inclusive; section 29, southeast quarter; section 33, north half, southeast quarter; sections 34 and 35.

Township 2 north, range 2 east: Sections 6 and 7; section 18, north half; southeast quarter.

Township 3 north, range 2 east: Sections 18, 19, 30, and 31.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$400,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7195) was laid on the table.

PROVIDE FOR MAXIMUM PERSONNEL SECURITY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12082) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me, where proposed legislation provides such a drastic curtailment of the right of cross examination and confrontation, the substantive issues should be debated and the bill should not be passed on the Consent Calendar. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are noted. Three objections are necessary.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. RYAN of New York and Mr. MACGREGOR having objected; under the rule, the bill was stricken from the Consent Calendar.

WORLD WAR I EMERGENCY OFFICER RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8517) to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], several questions concerning this legislation.

Why at this late date is this legislation desired? After all, the individuals did have the option to make a decision at one time. They made such a decision. It appears to me that this legislation at this point is quite tardy. It gives them an opportunity to remedy an option which they had to make at one time previously.

Mr. COHELAN. If the gentleman will yield, yes; I quite understand the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and the gentleman's concern. All of this has been gone into by the committee. I would like to remind the gentleman that the emergency officer's program since that time has been consider-