

punished for violation of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, the Commission must conduct three successive investigations and must on three successive occasions prove violations of the law.

Quite obviously that procedure is laborious, time consuming, very expensive, and entirely unnecessary. Yet the same situation used to prevail under the Federal Trade Commission Act prior to its amendment in 1938.

This legislation would do no more than make enforcement procedures under the Clayton Act the same as they are and since 1938 have been under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

This bill is the same as S. 721 in the last Congress which, after hearings, was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee to the Senate in Senate Report 1808. This bill has been sponsored and put forward by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. It was recommended by the Senate Small Business Committee of which Senator SPARKMAN is chairman. In the hearings all affected agencies supported the measure. The bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House where it was referred to the Judiciary Committee which failed to take any action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 714) to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO INDECENT PUBLICATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. LANGER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia.

This measure would allow the police or the U.S. marshal in the District to confiscate any vehicle, fixture, equipment, stock, or personalty used in the sale, distribution, manufacture, showing, advertising, or staging an exhibition of publications of an obscene or lewd nature. This, in effect, would increase the penalty against the peddlers of pornography in the District of Columbia.

Testimony before the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency a few years ago revealed that much of the pornography being distributed in this country was getting into the hands of juveniles. In the report which we issued on this subject, we recommended that local ordinances and State statutes be reexamined and reevaluated to assure that modern and effective means are available to law enforcement officials to deter the production, distribution, and sale of pornographic material.

A representative of the Metropolitan Police Department testified at our hearings that he felt that the penalties im-

posed on the purveyors of indecent material were so light as to constitute little more than a "license fee." He gave the following dispositions of cases as examples: "\$250 or 90 days; \$100 or 60 days; nol prossed; nol prossed; \$100 or 60 days; \$100 or 60 days; not guilty; nol prossed; \$100 or 90 days; \$100 or 90 days." This is small punishment indeed for the unscrupulous characters who corrupt the morals of our young people for profit. In many instances, such fines can be paid out of the profits that can be garnered in a short time with little effort.

This measure, if enacted into law, would, I believe, be a strong deterrent to the hucksters of indecency in the District of Columbia. In discharging our responsibility to the citizens of the District, it is our duty to provide the local law enforcement officials with the necessary tools to keep the community a clean and decent place to live and to rear children.

Mr. President, I commend this bill to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 715) to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the purpose of authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. This is one of the measures urged by the President in his Economic Report of January 20.

Judge Hansen, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, testified in hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last year that the authority such as provided in this bill would greatly aid the enforcement of the antitrust laws in civil cases.

Under the bill, when the Attorney General has reason to believe that any person has documentary material bearing on any antitrust investigation he may issue in writing a civil investigative demand for the production of such evidence.

The bill provides for the enforcement of the demand in the courts. It also protects the public against an unreasonable demand by requiring the demand to meet the standards which apply in the courts to a grand jury subpoena duces tecum. It also safeguards the confidentiality of the documents furnished, the preservation and the return of the documents. In my opinion, the civil enforcement would be greatly strengthened by the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lay on the desk for 1 week in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to consider joining me in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 716) 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, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AFTERCARE POSTHOSPITAL TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR DRUG ADDICTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and Senators HENNING, CARROLL, and LANGER a bill concerning the aftercare treatment of narcotic addicts. The overall purpose of the bill is to strengthen and improve the Federal program for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts who have been confined to the two Federal hospitals that handle narcotic drug addiction cases.

The bill contains amendments to sections 341 and 344 of the Public Health Service Act. It authorizes for the establishment by the Federal Government of aftercare treatment units for addict patients who have been released from the Federal hospitals at Lexington and at Fort Worth.

It has been estimated that two-thirds of the drug patients admitted to the hospital at Lexington, Ky., the largest U.S. Public Health Service hospital treating drug addicts, come as volunteers. The remainder are Federal prisoners. Of this two-thirds, 73 percent leave before they have stayed the minimum prescribed 4½-month period which the hospital physicians feel is necessary for treatment. More important, neither of the two hospitals has a formal aftercare treatment program. It is known both by physicians in the hospital and by local law-enforcement officials in our large urban areas that the majority of these patients immediately resume their drug use upon release from the institutions. As in all fields of correctional treatment, there is an imperative need for a complete treatment program, that is, a program that includes some sort of supervision and help back in the community. It is there, after all, that the trouble began in the first place—and it is there that important changes must be wrought if we are to have even a modicum of success in treating the drug addict.

As chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency for several years, I was impressed by the fact that unlike other types of juvenile offenders, where it is at least several weeks or months before they repeat their delinquent behavior, if at all, in the case of young drug addicts it is many times a matter of minutes or hours upon release from an institution before they are once again taking narcotic drugs.