a nation of wealth and power these attributes of the spirit which are expressed in the arts and humanities.

I am today introducing a bill which provides for the creation of a new National Institute for the Arts and Humanities within the Office of Education which would have as its function the stimulation and support of educational and cultural activities on a broad scale. Obviously, the programs of the Federal Government in this area must be approached with a sensitivity to national objectives on the one hand, and with the responsibilities of local and private agencies, on the other. My bill calls for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and Humanities which will provide advice on areas of Federal support and will identify critical needs to the Commissioner of Education and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

To summarize the principal ways in which the arts and humanities will be advanced, the legislation provides for the following:

First. Authority to conduct broad investigations of studies of national needs in the arts and humanities in order to clearly establish areas for Federal stimulation and support.

Second. The creation of a Cultural Service Center to perform functions analogous to a national clearinghouse of information on all aspects of culture, with responsibility to disseminate this information and provide leadership and assistance.

Third. Creation of a major research and demonstration program within the Federal Government to stimulate new approaches and new techniques for the creative application of the arts and humanities throughout our society.

Fourth. Establish a fellowship and training program for teachers and talented students in the arts and humanities.

Fifth. Provide matching grants for the expansion and improvement of arts and humanities projects conducted by public and nonprofit agencies.
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tion from nonviolating companies, is, of course, necessary to such a judgment.

Second. Third parties that might be adversely affected by a merger or monopoly would be reluctant to supply information without being subpoenaed, for fear of industry retaliation.

Third. Thus, small businesses who might be placed under a severe squeeze by a merger or monopoly might not be fully heard, and thus one of the crucial purposes of the antitrust laws would be thwarted, namely, to prevent the destruction of small businesses. Fourth. Persons would receive adverse publicity. In the early stages of an investigation certain parties might be considered as potential defendants, but after investigation would prove not to be. If they protested, the civil investigative demand publicity might suggest that they were guilty, whereas after supplying the information the evidence might not indicate such guilt.

Fifth. The Department of Justice might be tempted to include many parties as under investigation, whether those were guilty or not, and then only file a complaint against a few. Thus all the parties would be subject to being stigmatized during the period of investigation.

Sixth. In the past the Department has been accused of filing skeleton complaints. The purpose of CID to avoid this would be thwarted because the Department might again file skeleton complaints, relying upon its subpoena power after complaint to secure third-party information.

Seventh. Parties not subject to investigation but willing to cooperate would be severely handicapped as compared with those unwilling to cooperate.

Thus it may be seen that limiting the CID to corporations under investigation would do great harm rather than protect third parties. This would apply particularly to small business.

Question: Is it not necessary in virtually every case to secure information from witnesses who are not defendants?

Answer: Yes. Even in simple accident cases, witness testimony is essential—and such witnesses are typically not defendants. In fact, third-party testimony is often crucial to antitrust cases, as demonstrated in the recent Brown Shoe case, just decided by the Supreme Court.

Question: Should the Federal Trade Commission be permitted to use documentary evidence received under the CID?

Answer: Yes; in the interests of effective enforcement of the antitrust laws, which give concurrent jurisdiction to both the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission of certain sections and statutes, the agency with the privilege should in many instances be given the opportunity to carry forward the prosecution. The purpose would be defeated by restricting the use of documents secured under the CID to the Antitrust Division.

Question: Would the CID enable the Department of Justice to embark upon fishing expeditions?

Answer: No. In the first place the demand cannot be used against natural persons. It is only applied against corporations and other business firms. The proposal provides appropriate court remedies to those upon whom civil investigative demands are made. The demand cannot require the production of any privileged material or of any material which would not be disclosed if demanded by a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged violations; nor can the demand contain any requirement which would be unreasonable if contained in a subpoena duces tecum issued in a grand jury investigation.

Question: What are the key provisions of the bill as reported out of the conference committee?

Answer: The bill as reported by the conference committee would 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. The use of documentary evidence so secured would be limited to the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission. The authority would not be limited merely to corporations under investigation.

Question: Who signed the conference report?

Answer: The report was signed by the following: Emanuel Celler, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Byron G. Rogers, managers on the part of the House; James O. Eastland, Estes Kefauver, Olin D. Johnston, managers on the part of the Senate.

REVIEW OF NEW GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

(Mr. FOUNTAIN, at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ, was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 12565, as a substitute for H.R. 7802, which I had introduced last year to provide a uniform procedure for the periodic congressional review of new grants-in-aid to State and local governments.

Bills identical to H.R. 7802 were also sponsored by Mrs. DWYER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. Lazen, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, Mr. PELLY, Mr. SEELEY-BROWN, Mr. KING of Utah, Mr. LINDSAY, and former Representative TEDD of Texas.

This legislation was proposed by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which Mrs. DWYER, Mr. KECH, and I presently serve as representatives of this House. The membership of the Commission, which was established by the 86th Congress to give continuing attention to intergovernmental problems, includes Governors, State legislators, mayors, and county officials, in addition to Federal officials and Members of the Congress.

Hearings on this legislation were held by the Intergovernmental Relations Sub-committee, which favorably reported H.R. 7802 with amendments to the full Committee on Government Operations, where it is presently under consideration.

Earlier this month the Governors' Conference, at its annual meeting in Hershey, Pa., unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing this legislation.

The bill which I have introduced today was drafted as a substitute for H.R. 7802 in order to improve and perfect the original language. I am pleased to note that Mrs. DWYER and Mr. LANGEN, my colleagues on the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, are also introducing identical bills at this time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARTSON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ASBIRT), for the rest of the week, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JONAS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPEN (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), to address the House on July 19 for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHARTON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. MAY to extend her remarks in the Record following Mr. FENTON in Committee.

Mr. MONGAN and extend extraneous material.

Mr. BOLAND and include extraneous material.

Mr. MADSEN and include a statement from the AFL-CIO.

Mr. DORN and include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LARR.

Mr. MURP.

Mr. GUS.

Mr. BYRNS of Wisconsin.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. VANCE in two instances.

Mr. SEELEY-BROWN.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in three instances.

Mr. NEILSEN in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. WIDNALL.