INDEX—THE SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT AND ITS ENFORCEMENT

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT, 38.
American Column & Lumber Co. v. U. S., 53, 54, 57.
American Steel Foundries v. Tri-City Council, 85.
ANTI-RACKETEERING ACT, 152.
ANTITRUST DIVISION
inadequate personnel of, 9-10, and its effect on handling complaints, 96-98; plan of field organization proposed for, 21-23; organization of Complaints Section in, 90-91; handling of complaints received by, 91-95; considerations affecting action by, on complaints, 95-99. See COMPLAINTS, INVESTIGATIONS, SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT: ENFORCEMENT.
Appalachian Coals, Inc., v. U. S., 43, 44, 54, 147.

BASING POINT SYSTEM
described, 65-66; proposal to prohibit, considered, 72-73.
Bedford Cut Stone Co. v. Journeymen Stone Cutters' Ass'n, 85, 87.
Board of Trade of Chicago v. U. S., 44.
Bonham's Case, 28.
BOOK OF OATHS, 122.
BOYCOTTS
analyses of cases involving, by industrial combinations, 58-60; legal and illegal uses of, by labor unions, 87-88.
Brown v. U. S., 130.
BUILDING INDUSTRY
restraints of trade in, by producers of materials, 12, by distributors, 13, by contractors, 13, by labor, 13, by legislation, 13; effects on, of building investigation, 17-19; freeing competition in, as means of preventing unbalanced economy in wartime, 20.

CAPPER-VOLSTEAD ACT, 38.
Cement Mfrs. Protective Ass'n v. U. S., 58, 69.
Chicago Milk Case (U. S. v. The Borden Co.), 82, 88, 89.
CLAYTON ACT
provisions of, relating to labor unions, 84-85.
COMMON RIGHT TO CALLING
recognition of, in English law, 27-29, 40, in American constitutional law, 30-34, in Sherman Act, 41.
COMPETITION
effect of unevenness in degrees of, 6, of absence of, 7; Sherman Act as dramatizing ideal of, 8-9; prevalence of restraints on, in small businesses, 12, in building industry, 12-14; situations where modified, 14; economic functions of, 31; role of, in development of due process doctrines, 31-34; social legislation to establish equality in, 35-36; limitations on rules permitting relief from, in early English law, 36-37, under various federal statutes, 38-39, classified, 39; effect of price leadership on, in price, 66-68; study of situation as to, in investigating complaints, 95-96, 100-101; proof of, in antitrust cases, 155-156.
COMPLAINTS
of Sherman Act violations: Complaints Section organized in Antitrust Division to handle, 90-91; sources of, illustrated, 91-92; volume of, received, investigated and prosecuted (table), 92-93; initial treatment of, by Antitrust Division, 93-95; economic study in investigation of, 96, 100-101; factors limiting action on, 96-98; processes of investigating, 99-102. See INVESTIGATIONS.
CONSENT DECREES
see SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT: REMEDIES.
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW
invocation of "privileges and immunities" and "due process" clauses against slaughterhouse monopoly, 30-31; "freedom of contract" first recognized as method of assuring competition, 31-33, then as attribute of property, 33-34; indictment not required in antitrust cases, 114; privilege against self-incrimination before grand jury, 131-132, at trial, 152.
CORPORATE OFFICIALS
bills to impose civil penalties on, violating Sherman Act, 110-111; admissions by, as binding corporation, 153-155.
CUMMINGS, HOMER S.
U. S. Atty. Gen., quoted, 15.

DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS
problem of relation of price and, 6; totalitarian versus democratic methods of assuring, contrasted, 6-8; social dangers in failure to achieve adequate 8; relation of Sherman Act to, 8-9; dislocation in, caused by war, 19-20.
Duplex Printing Press Co. v. Deering, 85, 87.

Eastern States Retail Lumber Ass'n v. U. S., 59, 60.
EXPEDITING COURT
resort to, under Sherman Act, 146-147.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
investigations by, in antitrust cases, 94, 99-101.
FISHERIES COOPERATIVE MARKETING ACT, 38.

GERMANY
effect of industrial concentration in, 7.
GRAND JURY
accusatory and inquisitorial uses of, 112-113; need for care in, proceedings in antitrust cases, 113, 115-116; use of, optional in antitrust cases, 114-

115; provisions for summoning of, 116; rules as to terms of court in relation to, proceedings, 116-117; authority to conduct, proceedings, 117-118; qualification and selection of jurors for, 118-119; charge by judge to, 119; use of pleas in abatement for defects in, 115, 119-120; use of stenographer before, 120-121; rules as to secrecy of, proceedings, 121-125, by jurors, 122-124, by witnesses, 124-125, of transcript, 125; prosecutor's privileges before, 125-127; suggestions as to prosecutor's conduct before, 127-129; use of subpoenas *duces tecum* in, proceedings, 129-130; impounding documents in, proceedings, 130-131; privilege against self-incrimination before, 131-132; use of, transcript at trial, 132-134; presentments by, 134-135; question of abuse of process in successive, proceedings, 137.

Hale v. Henkel, 113.
HOBBS BILL, 110.

INCOME STATISTICS
of corporations, 5; of families in U. S., 8.
INFORMATION
use of, in antitrust cases, 112, 114-115.
INJUNCTION SUITS
see SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT: REMEDIES.
"INTEGRATED" COMBINATIONS
defined, 42; decisions involving, analyzed, 46-51; factors considered in cases involving, 51. See "LOOSE" COMBINATIONS.
INTENT
overemphasis on, in past antitrust cases, 10-11; significance of, in "integrated" and "loose" combination cases, 45.
In re Kittle, 136.
INTERROGATORIES
use of, in antitrust civil cases under new Federal Rules, 139-141.
Interstate Circuit, Inc., v. U. S., 70, 71.
INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, 38.
INVESTIGATIONS
preliminary, of complaints of Sherman Act violations, 94, 95-96; selection of cases for major, 96-98; units created for major, 98-99; processes employed in preliminary, 99-102, in aid of grand jury action, 102-103; use of file searches and subpoenas in, 102-103.

LABOR UNIONS
claim of, to exemption from Sherman Act, 82, rebutted by legislative history of act, 83-84, by Supreme Court decisions applying act to, 84, 85, by legislative history of Clayton Act, 84-85, by enactment of other legislation favorable to, 85-86; objections to exemption of, from Sherman Act, 86; need for case by case approach to determine legality of restraints by, 87; refusal of Antitrust Division to prosecute legitimate activities of, 87; illegal restraints by, illustrated, 87-89.

Leader v. Apex Hosiery Co., 82.
Local 167 v. U. S., 85.
Loewe v. Lawler, 84.
"LOOSE" COMBINATIONS
defined, 42-43; types of restraints imposed by, 51-52; analyses of cases involving: price fixing agreements by, 52-55, price uniformity in, 55-56, adherence to published prices by, 56-57, uniform terms or methods of sale in, 57, interchange of trade information by, 57-58; analyses of cases involving coercive restraints by, 58-60. See "INTEGRATED" COMBINATIONS.

Madison Oil Case (U. S. v. Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.), 123, 128.
Maple Flooring Mfrs. Ass'n v. U. S., 58.
MARINE INSURANCE ASS'N ACT, 39.
MARKET LEADERSHIP
compared to price leadership, 65. See PRICE LEADERSHIP.
Montague & Co. v. Lowry, 59.
Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co., 69.

Nat. Ass'n of Window Glass Mfrs. v. U. S., 87.
NORRIS-LAGUARDIA ACT, 86.
Northern Securities Co. v. U. S., 46.

O'MAHONEY BILL, 110.

Paramount Famous Lasky Corp. v. U. S., 59.
PATENTS
restrictions based on, in building industries, 12-13; constitutional provision for, 74, purpose of, 74; evolution of, laws, 75, rights of holder of, 75-76; increasing complexity of industrial uses of, 76; complexity and expense of litigation involving, 76-77, effect of, on imposing restraints, 77; combinations of holders of, to avoid deadlocks, 77; licensing agreements and their abuses, 78; inquiry by TNEC into abuses of, 78-79; suggestions to TNEC for legislation limiting restrictions by, 79-80; need for clarifying law on relation of, to antitrust laws, 80-81; grand jury investigation of abuses of, 81; suit against glass container industry involving restrictions by, 81.
Perlman v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 131.
PRESENTMENTS
by grand jury, described, 134-135.
PRICE FIXING
analyses of cases involving, agreements, 52-55.
PRICE LEADERSHIP
conditions for maintenance of, 56, 64; reasons for resort to, 63-64; relation of, to standardization of product, 64-65, to basing point system, 65-66, 72-73, to formula prices, 66-68, to control of production, 68-69; similarity of, to market leadership, 65; analyses of cases involving legality of, 55-58, 69-71; proposed legislation to restrict, considered, 72-73.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS
policy of issuing, of reasons for instituting antitrust proceedings, 15-16.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE
early common law cases of, 27; relation of, to establishment of common right to calling, 27-29, 40; careful restrictions placed on exceptions to rule against, 36-39; breadth and flexibility of rule against, 40-41.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT, 35, 95.

ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN D.
President, proposes TNEC inquiry into patent abuses, 78.

RULE OF REASON
application of, to determine where combinations legal, 14; development of, described, 43-45; application of, in *Standard Oil* case, 47.

RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
new Federal, discussed: Rule 26, 139, 140, Rule 30, 139, Rule 33, 140, Rule 34, 143, Rule 36, 144, Rule 43, 149, Rule 45, 141.

Schechter Corp. v. U. S., 150.

SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT: ENFORCEMENT
function of, to dramatize ideal of competition, 8, 10; inadequate enforcement of, in past, and its effect, 9-14; sources of confusion as to policy under, 10-11; case method of clarifying, 14-15; use of public statements to clarify, 15-16; choice of remedies under, 16-17, 104-110; need for proceeding under, against all combinations in single field, 17; results obtainable by effective enforcement of, 17-19; as means of preventing unbalanced economy in wartime, 19-20, and profiteering, 20; proposed plan of organization for effective enforcement, 21-23; relative importance of cases involving "integrated" and "loose" combinations, 43; refinement in character of restraints now encountered in, 61-62; policy as to, against patent restraints, 80-81, against labor union restraints, 87-89. See COMPLAINTS, "INTEGRATED" COMBINATIONS, LABOR UNIONS, "LOOSE" COMBINATIONS, PATENTS, PRICE LEADERSHIP.

SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT: HISTORY
economic pressures leading to enactment, 24-25; first bill and its revision, 25-26, 37; early English common law background of, 26-29, 36-37; American constitutional law background of, 30-32; relating to labor union claim of exemption, 83-84.

SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT: REMEDIES
criminal and civil, 104; policy as to use of criminal, 104-105, civil, 105-106; use of injunction to require affirmative action, 106; policy as to concurrent use of criminal and civil, 106-107; considerations governing use of consent decrees, 108-110; proposed legislation for civil penalties, 110-111. See GRAND JURY, TRIALS.

SHIPPING ACT, 39.

Standard Oil Co. of N. J. v. U. S., 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 52, 84, 105.

Standard Sanitary Mfg. Co. v. U. S., 53, 106, 107.

STATUTE OF MONOPOLIES, 28.

SUBPOENAS
file searches in lieu of, *duces tecum*, 102-103; handling of documents obtained by, in grand jury proceedings, 128; scope of, *duces tecum*, 129-130, 142; use of, *duces tecum*, in antitrust trials, 141-143; application of, to foreign documents, 142-143, rules as to inspecting documents obtained by, 144-145, and their authentication, 144-145.

Tailors of Ipswich Case, 29.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
plan of antitrust organization proposed to, 21; permanent functions proposed for, 22-23; consideration of patent restrictions by, 75, 78-79; suggestions to, by Dep't of Justice for new patent legislation, 79-80.

TRIALS
in antitrust cases: pre-trial procedure in preparation for, 138-141; obtaining and selecting documents for use in, 141-145; choice of method for, 145-147; opening statement in, 147-148; selection of witnesses in, 148-149; cross-examination defendants' witnesses in, 150-152; vicarious admissions by corporate defendants in, 153-155; proof of competition in, 155-156.

United Mine Workers v. Coronado Coal Co., 88.

U. S. v. Addyston Pipe and Steel Co., 44, 52.

U. S. v. Aluminum Co. of America, 140, 142, 144, 149.

U. S. v. American Can Co., 43.

U. S. v. American Linseed Oil Co., 56, 58.

U. S. v. American Medical Ass'n, 123.

U. S. v. American Tobacco Co., 43, 45, 47.

U. S. v. Blair, 129.

U. S. v. Brims, 85.

U. S. v. Corn Products Refining Co., 43.

U. S. v. E. C. Knight Co., 46.

U. S. v. Goldman, 114.

U. S. v. Greater New York Live Poultry Chamber of Commerce, 132.

U. S. v. First National Pictures, Inc., 60.

U. S. v. International Harvester Co., 43, 50, 54, 69.

U. S. v. Joint Traffic Ass'n, 44, 52.

U. S. v. Lehigh Valley R. R., 49.

U. S. v. McHie, 131.

U. S. v. Reading Co., 48.

U. S. v. Rintelen, 125.

U. S. v. Southern Pacific Co., 48.

U. S. v. Sugar Institute, Inc., 56, 57, 58, 59, 141.

U. S. v. Swift & Co., 105, 106.

U. S. v. Trans-Missouri Freight Ass'n, 44, 52.

U. S. v. Trenton Potteries Co., 52, 53, 54, 115, 156.

U. S. v. Union Pacific R. R., 48.

U. S. v. United Shoe Machinery Co., 49, 50, 69.

U. S. v. U. S. Steel Corp., 49, 54, 70.

U. S. v. Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., 154.

U. S. v. Wells, 126, 128.
U. S. v. Winslow, 49.

VENUE
rule as to, in Sherman Act cases, 115, 145.

WAR
Sherman Act as preventing economic unbalance in time of, 19-21; complaints received by Antitrust Division at outbreak of, 20.
WAGNER ACT (NLRA), 38.
WEBB EXPORT TRADE ACT, 38.

WITNESSES
secrecy of testimony of, before grand jury, 124-125; use of hostile, before grand jury, 127, 128-129, 138-139; privilege of, against self-incrimination before grand juries, 131-132, at trials, 152; impeaching or refreshing recollection of, by use of grand jury transcript, 132-134; selection of, in antitrust cases, 148-149; cross-examination of defendants', 150-152; testimony by corporate officials as corporate admission, 153-155; proof of competition by, 156.