Mr. ROGERS of Colorado submitted the following conference report and amendments of the House to the bill (S. 167) to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious national unemployment, and for other purposes, 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:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 11257) entitled "An Act to amend section 815 (article 15) of title 10, United States Code, relating to nonjudicial punishment, and for other purposes" do pass with the following amendments: On page 2, line 6, after "demand", insert: "However, except in the case of a member attached to or embarked in a vessel, punishment may not be imposed upon any member of the Armed Forces under this article if the member has, before the imposition of such punishment, demanded trial by court-martial in lieu of such punishment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado submitted the following conference report and statement 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, subject the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 3: Provide formal changes made necessary by the deletion provided in amendment No. 2 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides for the deletion from the antitrust laws to which the bill applies as proposed by the Senate of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes as proposed by the House reference to "antitrust agency".

Amendment No. 5: Deletes as proposed by the Senate the definition of the term "antitrust agency" as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8: Correct the subparagraph numbering as proposed by the House; and delete the words "any final order of any antitrust agency, or" as proposed by the Senate and stricken out as proposed by the House.

Amendments 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13: Correct the subparagraph numbering.

Amendment No. 14: Adopt amendment No. 14 as proposed by the House which inserts "under investigation." Amendment No. 15: Inserts before "antitrust investigation" as proposed by the Senate "a civil" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: As proposed by the House, the court in any proceeding under section 8(d) may direct the place of production and inspection of the documents demanded.

Amendment No. 17: Eliminates useless phrases as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Strikes out as proposed by the House "or any antitrust agency" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 22: Strike out as proposed by the House "court, grand jury, or antitrust agency", and insert "court or grand jury".

Amendments Nos. 21 and 23: Strike out as proposed by the House "or any antitrust agency" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: As proposed by the Senate any person, not including a natural person by virtue of the definition of person in the bill, could be punished for disobedience of a court order under the bill. The amendment of the House makes a natural person subject to such punishment as is agreed to by the managers on the part of the Senate.

In substance, the conference report makes the following changes in the bill: It deletes from the bill the Robinson-Patman Act as proposed by the House. Persons on whom civil investigative demands may be made would include persons other than natural persons, who may possess documentary material relevant to a civil antitrust investigation.

The civil investigative procedure is limited to such persons who are
under investigation as proposed by the House. As proposed by the Senate the material obtained under a civil investigative demand procedure will be available to any agency charged by law with the administration of any antitrust law prescribed in the bill instead of only the Department where a company is involved in a matter under investigation by the Department.

While a limitation of the civil investigative demand procedure to companies "under investigation" may somewhat restrict the use of this procedure by exempting companies in no way involved in a subject under inquiry by the Department, the essential purpose of the bill is clearly still fulfilled, for the civil investigative demand procedure will be available to the Department, the essential purpose of the bill being made under investigation by the Department.

Similarly, the managers on the part of the Senate have proposed a constitutional amendment to the bill which the Senate has agreed to be added, as the Senate had also agreed to the proposed amendment to the House bill.

Accordingly, the managers on the part of the House, in addition to providing for the civil investigative demand procedure, have proposed a constitutional amendment to the bill which the Senate had agreed to be added.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to round out the Federal holdings in this little national park. As the figures I have already given indicate, there are about 5,650 acres within the authorized boundaries that remain to be acquired. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been advised that some of the remaining owners are unwilling to sell at a price considered a reasonable price. It would, of course, be unfair to expect continued donations in this situation. Hence the amendment to the basic 1956 Act which the Senate proposes to do two things. It will require the provision which forbids land acquisition except by donation or with donated funds, and it will vest the National Park Service here, as is the case in our national park system, with powers of condemnation. The latter is necessary in order to improve the negotiating position of the Government and will, we hope, have the effect even though it may never be used.

The Park Service estimates that the 3,300 acres that remain to be acquired will cost about $3,500,000, or an average of a little less than $760 per acre. An amendment to the bill which the Committee recommends provides, however, that not more than $1,250,000 is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose. The remainder, if expected, will be donated to the Government. In fact, the committee has been informed that $500,000 is already on hand for this purpose. The Park Service has informed me and the committee's estimate of the great value to the Nation of these philanthropies and of the reasonableness of the Government's taking over a share of the burden from here on down.

The second purpose of S. 2429 is to add to the park two areas of submerged land plus a few small cays and rock islands off the coast of Saint John. One area on the north shore includes 4,100 acres, the other on the south shore includes 1,550 acres. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has recommended that areas such as these be included in the park.

These additions will cost little or nothing, since the United States already owns the 1,200-foot mountains which dominate the island and the House will be required to authorize the funds. They are to be included within the park boundaries in order, in the language of the bill, "to preserve for the benefit of the public significant coral gardens, marine life, and seascapes in the vicinity of the park.

It has been our usual practice, in connection with the national seashore program, to provide for the submerged lands where they have already been done at Cape Hatteras, N.C.; Cape Cod, Mass.; and Point Reyes, Calif. Why it was not done at the time the Virgin Islands Park was created, in 1956, I do not know and our records do not show. Perhaps it was not thought of. But as it may, enactment of S. 2429 would correct this defect in the original law and make the Virgin Islands Park still more of an attraction to visitors than it already is. One of the important results would be to put under the protection of the National Park Service law the coral, sponge, and fish and other marine life and fauna with which these two areas abound and thus to fulfill the prime objectives of any national park—to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

The two areas of which I speak include 5,650 acres. All of the land, except possibly for a few rock islands, is already owned by the United States. Enactment of section 1 will confer on the United States nothing. The bill should pass if