

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than by sending a letter to the Department.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE MANAGER PUBLISHING Co.,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 13, 1956.
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Generally speaking publishers do not object to paying their way so far as postal rates are concerned, but once in a while things arise which tend to make one wonder whether all the the money in the world would make the post office personnel efficient and cost-conscious.

The enclosed is a case in point. The writer is not too familiar with Omaha but certainly 2509 cannot be separated more than two doors from 2511.

Just as a matter of cost to the post office in this one instance there have been at least 2 carriers, 2 clerks, 2 truck drivers, a mail clerk on a train, freight, and so forth, involved for the post office. Our costs in making this correction are about 75 cents to \$1. The solution of course is simple * * * the post office for years has provided cards by which postal employees make changes of address to publishers.

Yours sincerely,

W. D. FLEMMING,
Publisher.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, not long ago I introduced for myself and several cosponsors S. 4013, a bill designed to set up a new Wilderness Preservation System. Among the encouraging editorials which have come to my attention is one from the Minneapolis Star on June 28, 1956, entitled "A Wilderness Law?" I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A WILDERNESS LAW?

Sigurd Olson, of Ely, president of the National Parks Association, is arguing strongly for the wilderness preservation bill introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. Olson contends that congressional sanctions are necessary if our wilderness areas are to be preserved from the mounting pressures of population and industrialization in the mid-twentieth century.

Olson points out that the so-called wilderness and roadless areas in national parks and monuments, national forests, national wildlife refuges, and Indian reservations are set up by administrative orders and not by law. There has been some confusion in the minds of some people on this point because the overall areas, such as national parks, are established by Congress while smaller "wilderness" areas within them are not.

Wilderness and roadless areas are administered by four different Federal agencies: The Park Service, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. All these, of course, are subject to various pressures to modify, enlarge, or eliminate administrative orders covering such districts.

Conservation leaders generally are expected to support the wilderness bill. Opposition is

predicted from the many groups seeking commercial or industrial exploitation of the areas involved.

Proponents argue that the bill would create no new wilderness areas, but would simply give the protection of law to 165 already existing federally owned regions of this kind. Congress will not act on the bill at the present session and it probably will be under study in the Senate Interior Committee for the next year.

Sigurd Olson undoubtedly is correct in his contention that the accelerating pressures of modern life and industry threaten what is left of the American wilderness. We have seen some of that pressure here in Minnesota. Whether this bill is the best way of preserving what we have left is a matter that calls for thorough study by all those concerned with this aspect of the American heritage.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND THE ISSUE OF COLONIALISM

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, one of the most difficult and vexing problems facing the foreign policy of the United States these days is the issue of colonialism. Often this issue arises in a form acutely embarrassing to our closest Western allies. The recent debate on Algeria and the decision against placing the Algerian question on the U. N. agenda is an excellent case in point.

I do not pretend to know all of the answers to the so-called colonial question, Mr. President, but I am frank to say that I am not always satisfied with the legalistic reflex action which we so constantly seem to exhibit when such questions are raised in the U. N. In this area, as in many others, I think our foreign policy is in need of a soul-searching reexamination.

On the Algerian issue, some of the aspects which have concerned me are admirably set out in a recent editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Star on Thursday, June 28, 1956. The editorial is entitled "Is Algeria France?" I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IS ALGERIA FRANCE?

In refusing to put the Algerian question on their agenda, the members of the U. N. Security Council take refuge in a U. N. legalism to uphold a French legalism. France's contribution is its contention that Algeria, though it lies across the Mediterranean Sea from Christian France and is mainly peopled by Moslem Arabs, is legally part of metropolitan France.

This makes it possible for Paris to say the Algerian revolt, which threatens to involve all Arab north Africa, is really a domestic French matter and in nowise subject to U. N. jurisdiction. In bowing to the French contention, Security Council members refer to section 7, article 2, chapter I of the U. N. Charter:

"Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter;"

Note that the above quotation ends with a semicolon. There follows a concluding phrase which might reasonably be considered to affect the broad prohibition of the

first passage: "but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII."

Chapter VII begins with article 39, which reads:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken * * * to maintain or restore international peace and security."

No one who has observed the surge of popular sympathy for the Algerians in other Arab countries, especially in north Africa and, even now, among the previously moderate Tunisians, could say that the war in Algeria does not threaten the peace in that part of the world. The Tunisians are now backing away from a tentatively agreed upon defense treaty with France, because of their concern about Algeria.

It needs to be emphasized that it is France's declaration alone which defines Algeria as part of metropolitan France. The Algerians weren't asked if they wanted to be considered Frenchmen. And if they were asked, they would reject the idea.

One wonders how far the United States or the U. N. should go in recognizing such unilateral declarations as France's in this matter. One wonders, too, if there is not some parallel between this case and that of Russia's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. By their own unilateral action the Soviets made the fate of the Baltic States a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of Russia.

The United States has never recognized Russia's annexation of the Baltic States. Perhaps we should reexamine our acceptance of France's declaration on Algeria.

REVISIONS IN GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701s), is amended by striking out "\$3,000,000" and inserting "\$10,000,000", by striking out "and not within areas intended to be protected by projects so authorized," and by striking out "\$150,000" and inserting "\$400,000."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senate passed S. 3272. The House in acting favorably on the bill has suggested some amendments.

The bill was originally introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. He is willing to accept the amendments of the House. Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

TERMINATION OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.