

as well as an impending threat to its peace and security. The violation of the following treaties is manifest and obvious.

The "Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance" (Rio de Janeiro, 1947), article 6; the "Letter of the Organization of American States" (Bogotá, 1942), especially articles 4 and 25; the "Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Ministers and Secretaries of State" (Punta del Este, Uruguay, 1962).

Consequently, the sanctions foreseen in articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; article 30 of the Letter of the Organization of American States; and the resolution II of the Eighth Foreign Ministers Conference, should be applied in the Cuban case.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE REQUIRED IN CERTAIN CIVIL INVESTIGATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to 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. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 21, 1962, pp. 10570-10571, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this is an important piece of legislation, which has been recommended by the President, the Attorney General, and the American Bar Association. In its present form there is no objection to it.

The purpose of the bill is to enable the Department of Justice to secure certain documents by way of civil demand in antitrust cases. The present procedure makes it necessary to convene a grand jury for another purpose and then get the documents in that way. The bill would alleviate that kind of procedure.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained two provisions which have been taken out by the conference. One of them provided for a demand to be made on another corporation other than the one that was under immediate antitrust investigation. In the House of Representatives an amendment was adopted which required that the one on whom the demand was made must be under investigation in an antitrust case.

Another House change removed the provision making information available to the Federal Trade Commission as well as to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Personally, I thought these two provisions which were taken out of the bill were important and should not have been taken out. However, in order to reach

agreement, the Senate conferees receded and agreed to the two House amendments. Therefore, the report comes to us as the unanimous report of the conferees. I move its adoption.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This matter had long consideration in the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Legislation and was roundly considered by the full Judiciary Committee. When it went to the House the bill was modified by the subcommittee before it finally came to the floor for action. The House recommitted the bill to the House Judiciary Committee. With respect to the one amendment to which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has alluded, we believe it is in good form, and we urge concurrence in the conference report.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the conferees, in deciding to uphold the action of the House in limiting the investigatory powers contained in the bill, focused their attention at great length on this limitation. In my judgment, and apparently in the judgment of the House and of the conference committee, the action was sound and very much to be desired. Otherwise, there would have been vested in the Department of Justice a power to ramble virtually at will into the confidential records of any business corporation. That would not have served the purpose for which the bill is designed. I am pleased that the section was inserted, and I believe the bill is the sounder for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed on.

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS MOVE INTO OPEN FIELD—HUNTING AREAS NEEDED MORE AND MORE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, C. R. Gutermuth, the distinguished vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington, D.C., and a leader of wildlife conservation in America, said in the September 1962 article in the American Rifleman:

Out of the cumulative experiences of past generations of American sportsmen, there has emerged the composite hunter of 1962. He comes from no particular walk of life, since hunting is one of the most cosmopolitan sports. The next hunter you meet in the field may be a bank president or a day laborer, a shop clerk or a corporation executive—it is difficult to distinguish one from the other in field clothes.

Mr. President, the Federal Government has an increasing responsibility to meet the needs of the composite hunter of 1962, as well as the needs of his children and grandchildren. We are taking some steps in that direction.

For example, a 1961 act cleared the way for use of \$105 million from the U.S. Treasury to buy wet lands for waterfowl. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has set forth recommendations to help create game areas. An agreement has been made by the Departments of Interior and Defense to open and develop land around

Federal reservoirs for recreation and wildlife.

One of the facts which I regard as most significant is the statement by the Department of Agriculture that 51 million fewer acres will be needed in crop production in the United States by 1980. This is despite the certain increase in population.

Opening up of this unused cropland for recreational purposes can be a goal worthy of a forward-looking government, concerned for the needs of the people.

There are many areas where the Federal Government can work in concert with States to help provide more recreational facilities, particularly in hunting, fishing, camping, boating, and so forth.

Mr. Gutermuth has performed a great service by his article "Public Hunting in America," from an address he delivered at the NRA annual meetings in Washington, D.C., earlier this year. C. R. Gutermuth's 40 years of work in conservation and wildlife management qualifies him as one of the outstanding authorities in America. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HUNTING IN AMERICA

(By C. R. Gutermuth)

Oddly, in this land of abundance, we have been showered too abundantly with explanations of why public hunting is doomed, why it is falling into disfavor with landowners, and why it is destined to become a thing of the past.

Why should people be saying that public hunting is doomed when it is among the top outdoor sports?

Personally, I do not think we are faced with any insurmountable obstacles. There are some trouble spots, to be sure. But they are few in number and can be solved if sportsmen can be awakened to the fact that public hunting, like many other sports, continually is besieged by changing factors.

People who want to hunt today and want their children to hunt tomorrow must resist being overwhelmed by these difficulties. They must single them out, evaluate their true threat, and move to correct or contract them wherever necessary.

Hunting in America has gone through several phases. None can be outlined in sharply etched lines; each has been like a wave sweeping across the Nation in response to deep-lying social and economic forces in the American culture. Every one has left a heritage of experience that affects the thinking and behavior of the modern hunter.

The first was the pioneer phase that rolled west of the Appalachians shortly after the American Revolution, reached the Rockies before 1900, and whose backwash still can be seen, just subsiding, in Arctic Alaska and northern Canada. Hunting then was a necessity of life, with the survival of the individual and sometimes of whole settlements depending upon the skill of the hunter. Our heritage from this phase was a concept of hunting rights entirely different from that found in most European countries, where the game belongs to the landowner as fully as do his sheep, cattle, and poultry. In America, the ownership of the game, until reduced to possession by an individual, is vested in the commonwealth. This is an extension of English law, based upon the Magna Carta; but in this country it was solidified