

the difference in these terms. I understand that may not satisfy the gentleman, but the 5-year term was not put there arbitrarily. It was with the idea of continuity and, as I say, I see no greater virtue in 3 over 5 to begin with.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes, sir; I am glad to yield.

Mr. GROSS. We had in the Government, advising President Kennedy on administrative procedures, a gentleman—I shall not mention his name, he is now dead—who, had there been a permanent organization such as you are proposing to create here today, I would not have been surprised would have been designated the permanent chairman. Yet this gentleman who was advising the President on administrative procedure at that time did not find it convenient to pay his Federal income taxes.

I cannot think of any good reason why the proposed Chairman should have a 5-year tenure in a new and untried field. Let us give him 3 years and see how he performs.

Mr. WILLIS. I will say to the gentleman that the man who has been heading this Conference under Executive order, first under President Eisenhower and then under former President Kennedy, was Judge Prettyman.

Mr. GROSS. I understand; and I made no allusion to Judge Prettyman.

Mr. WILLIS. I know that; I caught that. The gentleman to whom he was referring was not Judge Prettyman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Iowa about continued conferences and permanent organizations in the Government. I would agree, as has been said here, that there are probably many that we could curtail and we should consider most carefully the question of the establishment of others. But this is one which I think has been so well justified here, we can say it is needed. As I have said innumerable times the large and powerful regulatory agencies of this Government have the economy of our country in the palm of their hand. If you do not think they do not control activities in the field of economics through the regulatory procedures of this country, you should survey the authority they have. Here we are trying to do something about it. We are trying to do something about inefficiency, and have been doing it over the years—inefficiency in the administrative agencies of this Government. We are trying to do something about the delays that we have discovered.

As has been stated here this afternoon there are cases that have been pending for years and years; someone mentioned 16 years. I can tell you of cases that that have been before the agency for years. That is because of inefficiencies. And we found in the investigation that we carried on for 4 years that the thing which brought about inefficiencies and delays were often ex parte contacts in the Government. We discovered that so many things resulted from ex parte contacts which should not have been per-

mitted, because there was no way for the people on the outside, as has been mentioned, to talk to members of the regulatory agencies that have quasi-judicial responsibilities in these fields and who should have been talked to about procedure in many instances.

This provides a method, a procedure for those in the agencies, the Chairmen of the various regulatory agencies of the Government or some one designated by them, those on the outside—perhaps a member of the Federal bar or a member of the American bar, or organizations or individuals on the outside who could become a member of this group, and have their meetings constantly in the Conference.

There they can discuss these matters of administrative procedures without being charged with ex parte proceedings with the regulatory commissioners who are serving in these responsible positions.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any one man who ought to know what he is doing, it is the chairman of this Conference. Every member of the independent regulatory agencies who is going to serve on this has an appointment for 5 to 7 years, everyone of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, why should not the man who is going to have charge and whose responsibility it is to direct the discussion at these conferences of regulatory procedures not have the same kind of tenure of office in order that these matters may be developed with the people who are going to consider the recommendations made? I believe that is one way we can get at inefficiency and ex parte contacts, which we cannot permit, as well as the long delays that exist in these agencies in attending to the business of the people who have business before them.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I believe the 5-year tenure of office should be the minimum.

I strongly support the action of this committee which gave such careful consideration to this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This several years old case about which the gentleman speaks, insofar as this new Administrative Conference is concerned, could stay right in that department or agency for another 18 years. They could not force it out. All they can do is recommend to Congress that someone in Congress or someone dig it out. That is all they can do. If they cannot find an official of the department or agency to do it, they would have to come to Congress, where they now come.

Mr. HARRIS. The major responsibility is reviewing the procedures of these regulatory agencies. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. GROSS. All they do is make recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 22, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ELLIOTT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 1664) to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 824, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on an amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS ON THE COLORADO RIVER BELOW GLEN CANYON DAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 502) to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the bill, H.R. 9752, which passed the House earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 502, and insert the provisions of the bill, H.R. 9752, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9752) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL OF LAOS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 823 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1627) to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 823 makes in order the consideration of S. 1627, which is a bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

S. 1627 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos (ICC) as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos dated July 23, 1962. Under the terms of the protocol the U.S. share of the ICC costs is 17.6 percent. The budget of the ICC has not finally been agreed upon for the current fiscal year. The estimated figure is \$3,780,000 of which 17.6 percent would be about \$655,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 823.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 823 makes in order consideration of S. 1627 which would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. It is estimated that this involves an authorization of approximately \$655,000 or 17.6 percent of the sum which will be required to operate this Commission during the ensuing year. This bill has previously passed the other body and has been reported unanimously out of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, our obligation to pay this amount for the operations of the ICC rests on the protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos dated July 23, 1962. The United States was 1 of the 14 signatories to that agreement whereby among other things we undertook to share the costs of operations of the ICC.

Mr. Speaker, I have always maintained and continue to maintain that our Gov-

ernment committed an egregious foreign policy blunder when it entered into the Geneva Agreement. This abortive attempt to neutralize Laos by providing for a coalition government which included the Communist Pathet Lao has been a signal failure. Laos is and continues to be a staging area for North Vietnamese assaults on the Republic of South Vietnam. The unhappy experiences under the Geneva Agreement of 1962 should end for all time the illusion that still seems to exist in the minds of our State Department that it is possible to neutralize a country by including Communists as a part of the government of that country.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that we have made a commitment which is cognizable under international law to discharge a portion of the obligations incurred in the operation of the International Control Commission. This country has historically and traditionally stood by its agreements and has not followed the example of those nations who have consistently defaulted on their financial commitments. Our vote on this measure today must be judged in the light of the action that is scheduled to take place in the General Assembly of the United Nations when that body reconvenes some time in November.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been among those who believe that if the Soviet Union, or for that matter, any other country, persists in defaulting on its obligations to the United Nations that they should be barred from a vote in the General Assembly pursuant to the terms of article 19 of the charter. The Soviet Union and certain other nations who are now in default do have legal commitments cognizable under international law to meet a certain fixed share of the expenses of the United Nations. The failure to pay their assessed obligations should and must be dealt with firmly in the coming months. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the United States in this instance and in this hour must before the world display its willingness to discharge the legal commitment which it made under the Geneva Agreement of 1962. I think that by so doing we will be in a much stronger position to urge upon the other members of the General Assembly of the United Nations that they invoke the provisions of article 19 against the U.S.S.R. if she persists in her default.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I do want to make it abundantly clear that I do not and cannot condone the Geneva Agreement of July 23, 1962. Furthermore, I would make it completely clear that I do not agree with our policy of vacillation and irresolution with respect to Laos and southeast Asia generally. I hope that never again will this Government make the kind of mistake that it made in concluding the agreement referred to.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration

of the bill (S. 1627) to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1627, with Mr. ELLIOTT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, only last week Congress passed the southeast Asia resolution supporting and approving the actions of the President in resisting Communist military aggression in southeast Asia.

On June 2 the President summarized four simple propositions that are our policy in southeast Asia when he stated:

1. America keeps her word. Here as elsewhere, we must and shall honor our commitments.
2. The issue is the future of southeast Asia as a whole. A threat to any nation in that region is a threat to all, and a threat to us.
3. Our purpose is peace. We have no military, political, or territorial ambitions in the area.
4. This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity.

Some may ask what is the connection between that joint resolution and the content of this bill.

I think these four points are the connection.

Some may ask why is this bill necessary? That is a reasonable and proper question that I shall try to answer.

It should be remembered that the resolution of last week did not rule out the desire of our Government to pursue every honorable method to bring peace to southeast Asia. This bill is a logical complement to that resolution and is evidence of the intent of the United States to use such machinery as is available to end the strife in wartorn Laos.

Let me briefly outline the events that have made this bill necessary. When Laos gained its independence in 1954, there was created an International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos, popularly referred to as the ICC. It consisted of three Commissioners—an Indian, a Canadian, and a Pole—representing a neutral power, a pro-Western power, and a Communist power. Their responsibility was to assure that foreign intervention in Laos was brought to an end. By 1958 Laos felt confident that it

could maintain itself and the work of the ICC ended.

By 1961, the Communists had stepped up their activities in that country. To meet that threat, the ICC was reestablished. A conference of 14 interested powers was convened in Geneva to deal with the Laotian situation. The United States was one of the participants. Out of the Geneva Conference came a declaration on the neutrality of Laos and a protocol to that declaration.

The declaration called for the neutrality of Laos and the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country. The protocol, among other matters, gave to the International Control Commission the responsibility to make certain that the provisions of the Geneva Conference were carried out. Specifically, the ICC was given these responsibilities:

First. To supervise and control the withdrawal of foreign military personnel from Laos;

Second. To supervise and control the cease-fire in Laos;

Third. To investigate cases of illegal introduction of foreign military personnel into Laos;

Fourth. To assist the Government of Laos in cases of illegal introduction of armaments into Laos; and

Fifth. To investigate other possible violations of the provisions of the protocol and agreement.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. During the time of the International Control Commission in Korea, according to my understanding, the Commission was not permitted to go to North Korea. I wonder if there is a provision which makes it mandatory so that this Commission would have authority which it could exercise?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. To the gentleman from Ohio, I wish to say that I intend to deal with the problems facing the International Control Commission. Of course, the gentleman realizes that the United Nations Commission in Korea was an entirely different body from the International Control Commission we are discussing this afternoon.

I will deal with the difficulties which the International Control Commission has had, and it has had difficulties. The Communists prevented the International Control Commission from going into the northern provinces of Laos, which is self-incriminating and evidence that the Communists are not carrying out the agreements embodied in the Geneva accord.

It is common knowledge that the Commission has not been able to discharge all of its responsibilities in Laos. The Commission had not been able to exercise its powers in the northern provinces.

This is not because of any lack of desire on the Commission's part but is due entirely to the failure of the Communist elements to enable it to do so. On the other hand, the ICC has carried out investigations on numerous occasions, often under most difficult circumstances. On 31 occasions the ICC has made reports. Acting under major-

ity rule, the Indian and Canadian members have conducted numerous investigations of violations of the Geneva agreement and reported these to the British and Soviet co-chairmen of the Geneva meeting. It has facilitated meetings between the competing factions of the Laotian Government. Through special arrangements it has been able to insure security at meetings of rival and hostile elements and has played a helpful role in support of the Lao Government against attempts to overthrow that Government. No one of these accomplishments in itself may seem important. But taken together they do indicate that the precarious stability within the Lao Government is largely the result of the Commission's efforts.

Let me refer to the financial side of the Commission. That is the matter of most immediate consideration so far as this bill is concerned. For the period during which the Geneva Conference was meeting and the Commission was reactivated—that is, from May 1961 to July 1962—the five principal powers—the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and Communist China—each agreed to contribute \$450,000.

The Geneva agreement of July 1962, included a method of annual assessments. Each of the five principal powers agreed to pay 17.6 percent of the Commission's costs. That accounts for 88 percent of the budget. The three Commission powers—India, Canada, and Poland—are to pay 1 percent each. And the six small powers are to pay 1.5 percent each.

The authorization for an appropriation contained in this bill will enable the United States to pay its assessed share. During each of the last 2 years the ICC budget has been about \$3.8 million of which the United States share has been about \$680,000.

The question was asked before the Rules Committee as to for what the money is used. The money is used to support the operations of the Commission. Details of the budget may be found in the hearings on this bill on pages 8 to 14.

I have just this morning received the budget for fiscal year 1964. If the gentleman or any other members of the committee desire to see it, I will be delighted to show it to them. It is unfortunate we do not have additional copies for general distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

We must remember that there are problems for the ICC other than those created by the obstinacy of the Communists. Laos is a country of mountains and jungles about the size of Great Britain. Communication between points is either poor or nonexistent. Contact with field investigating teams is maintained by radio. Personnel must be moved by helicopter or light aircraft when jeeps cannot get over the terrain. All the equipment must be serviced in Laos. That is one of the principal purposes for which the money is used.

The next question one may ask is how

much has the United States paid to date. As I indicated, for the period from May 1961 to July 1962, the five principal powers each agreed to contribute \$450,000. The United States has paid that sum. For fiscal 1963 the U.S. share under the formula of the Geneva agreement was \$665,280. The United States has also paid that. But the Department of State lacks authority to make any further payments without congressional authorization. That is why this bill is before the Congress. Hence our Government has not paid its assessment of \$683,000 for the last year, fiscal year 1964.

What about the payments by the other principal powers? Only Communist China owes more than the United States. The United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union have paid all that they owe for fiscal year 1963 and have made substantial payments for fiscal year 1964.

If there are these defaults, it may be asked how has the Commission been able to operate. The Commission is operational because the three supervisory powers—India, Canada, and Poland—have advanced about \$1.5 million above their own assessments to cover travel and personnel costs. Further, the Commission is simply not paying some of their bills. For example, it owes the United States \$379,000 for the cost of helicopters. This amount will be deducted from the U.S. payments when we make our future payments.

Although this bill carries permanent authorization, I should like to point out that the parties to the Geneva accord agreed to make recommendations regarding its continuation not later than 1965. Thus, next year the 14 powers will make a determination on the future of the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I was the chairman of a special study mission that visited Laos last fall. Our group had an opportunity to meet with the Indian and the Canadian Commissioners and had a firsthand report of their work and the difficulties under which they operate. I can assure the Members that they are not living a life of luxury and ease in Laos. They are trying to do their very best under most difficult and trying circumstances.

In urging the passage of this bill I am making my case on the simple ground that the United States entered into an agreement to maintain some peacekeeping mechanism alive in Laos. I want to make plain that our payment is not the difference between success and failure in Laos. If we were to write off the Commission, we would be committing a tremendous political and psychological blunder. Our continued support of the Commission is only one bit of tangible evidence that we intend to exert our efforts to maintain peace in that part of the world. I urge the passage of S. 1627.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, last fall I was one of eight members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who made a trip to southeast Asia to study

at first hand the nature of our programs and policies in that area. We included Laos in our itinerary because we were aware of its importance as one of the probing points of Communist expansion.

Since its independence in 1954, the landlocked Kingdom of Laos has been seeking to achieve some degree of unity and national identification. It is a fascinating country of mountains and jungles inhabited by about 2½ million people who are divided by ethnic and linguistic differences. Loosely organized factions centering around personalities rather than issues give the country a veneer of political organization. Its problems of survival have been complicated by the presence and pressure of Communist elements that draw their principal support from North Vietnam.

The 1962 Geneva agreements to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has referred were designed to enable this small nation to preserve its neutral status and thereby survive as a sovereign, independent, non-Communist state and a buffer between Communist China and North Vietnam and the free nations of Thailand, Cambodia, and the Republic of Vietnam.

The United States has taken every occasion to make abundantly clear its support of the Geneva agreements. In accordance with those agreements the United States withdrew its military advisory group. The same cannot be said of the Communists who have not only remained in the country but have been actively engaged in seizing more territory.

The three-member International Control Commission created to supervise the arrangements made at Geneva for the neutrality of Laos plays an important role in the current situation in Laos. Despite obstructionism by the Polish member who has always sided with the Communist Pathet Lao, the Commission under its Indian chairman has taken significant steps to preserve the 1962 agreements and to help stabilize the political-military situation. The Polish member, acting in conjunction with the Pathet Lao representatives, has so far thwarted all efforts of the Commission to institute an investigation into the presence of North Vietnamese troops in Laos.

I think that all eight of us who visited Laos last fall and met with the Indian and Canadian members of the Commission were tremendously impressed by the enormity of their task and their determination to discharge their responsibilities to the best of their ability. The fact that they have not always been successful is no reflection on them. Rather it underscores the Communist determination to prevent the execution of the Geneva agreements to which the Communists subscribed. In my opinion there is a lesson in foreign policy for us in the attitude of the Communists. Simply stated it is that we need not go to the conference table for more negotiations and agreements. Let the Communists abide by the agreements they have already entered into.

I would like to amplify one further point made by my colleague from Wisconsin. That is on the matter of fi-

ancing the Commission. During the 14 months when the Geneva conference was meeting, the \$450,000 that constituted our contribution toward the expenses of the Commission was funded under the section of the Foreign Assistance Act dealing with voluntary contributions to international organizations. Once the Geneva agreements were signed, the United States assumed an annual assessment of 17.6 percent of the cost of the Commission. It was possible to appropriate funds for our fiscal year 1963 share under the authority given the Department of State which permits our payment of assessments in international bodies such as the ICC for 1 year without congressional approval. Beyond the 1 year period congressional authorization is necessary for continued financial support. That is why this bill is before the Congress.

For the preaccord period from May 1961 to July 1962, we have contributed our share of \$450,000. For fiscal year 1963 we have paid \$665,280—our assessed share for that year. Thus our total payments have amounted to \$1,115,280. We have not paid \$683,000 that we owe for the last fiscal year; nor is there authority to pay our share for the current fiscal year which will be about the same amount as last year.

Briefly, for the 3 fiscal years 1962 through 1964, Communist China owes \$1,099,056; the United States owes \$683,000; the Soviet Union, \$411,400; France, \$330,228; and the United Kingdom, \$311,695. The latter three countries—the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union—have made partial payments on their 1964 assessment.

Mr. Chairman, there are few alternative courses of action open to us in Laos that will permit us to carry out our policy objectives. The support of the International Control Commission is perhaps the most important one available to us. Like my colleagues who have given this matter some study, I can offer no assurance that the Commission will succeed. But I am certain that its failure will only multiply our problems in that country and in that area. I urge the passage of S. 1627.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

(Mr. BRUCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time solely for the purpose of trying to bring my own thinking into line and into mind as to what exactly we are dealing with in Laos.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all aware that we are dealing here with matters of security and that some of the information is under the security label. I do want to ask some questions of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I will understand if at any time I am getting into a sensitive area he waves me off, and I know the gentleman will.

But, Mr. Chairman, in view of the situation those of us who are interested in foreign affairs to a certain degree must find our own source of information. It is

paramount upon us to check where we can as to the validity of information that we receive.

Is it a correct assessment that the purpose of our support of the ICC is to stop Communist aggression in Laos?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. That is our purpose.

Mr. BRUCE. Is the statement that was made earlier, that the Polish members of the Commission have blocked any real inspection of the Communist Pathet Lao-controlled areas of Laos, correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The ICC in Laos operates under a majority rule. Therefore, if the Polish member did not cooperate or should try to put stumbling blocks before the ICC, the two remaining members, India and Canada, can operate as a majority. These two members have undertaken investigations.

As I said in my opening statement the problem is not in the ICC. It is the Communists who have tried to prevent the ICC from investigating the situation with reference to the Plaine des Jarres.

We have a report as recently as June 1964. If the gentleman will come to the table, I shall be happy to show him the report. It does indicate that the situation with reference to the Plaine des Jarres plainly lies with the fault of the Communists.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is splitting a hair right down the middle to say that the Communists might do it, but the Poles do not.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Even in this case, the committee was able to investigate and has made a report as recently as June 1964.

Mr. BRUCE. Has the Commission itself actually had full access to the free areas of Laos?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No.

Mr. BRUCE. Who is blocking that?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The Communists.

Mr. BRUCE. Have the Polish members of the ICC cooperated with the Canadians and the Indians, or both, or did they engage in harassment and the blocking of it?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not cooperative.

Mr. BRUCE. The Communist members of the Commission are appointed by the Polish Government?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes.

Mr. BRUCE. The Polish Government is Communist, so they would appoint Communist members as their representatives?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes.

Mr. BRUCE. Do the Polish members have full and free access in the non-Communist area?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. We have nothing to hide. There is no aggression on the part of the freedom-loving people over there.

Mr. BRUCE. It would be within the purview of the intelligence of the Polish members of the Commission to know the troop location, the supplies location, by their free access as a member of the Commission?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They would know how many troops there are. I refer to the troops of the Kingdom of Laos.

Mr. BRUCE. Is the Commission the one that takes credit for the Royal Government of Laos merging the Pathet Lao into their Armed Forces?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That was worked out under the Geneva agreement.

Mr. BRUCE. It was not the ICC that was charged with carrying this out? As I read the report that is the impression I get.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

Mr. BRUCE. When the Commission finds a violation of the agreement somewhere in Laos to whom do they report?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They report to the cochairman.

Mr. BRUCE. Who are the cochairmen.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The British and the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank the gentleman very much for his cooperation in answering these questions.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There is one other observation I would like to make; if we did not have the ICC we would not have that report.

Mr. BRUCE. May I pursue that for a moment? Has the situation, since the letter of Secretary Rusk, dated May 20, changed in Plaine des Jarres? Has it changed any?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. It is our position that there will be no reconvening of the 14 powers until there is a ceasefire and the Communists withdraw from areas in the Plaine des Jarres that they have seized.

Mr. BRUCE. Is this not a rather accurate description of the situation in Laos right now: In effect, under Communist control, there is a funnel for supplying troops in Vietnam under sanctuary of the Communist controlled area in Laos?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There has been a movement of Communist equipment and personnel through the northern part of Laos into Vietnam. But I point out if we did not have the ICC there would be even greater movements of troops and military equipment. The ICC in Laos has acted as a deterrent to further Communist activities. Let me make clear at this point that a vote for the bill is not giving aid and comfort to the Communists.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank the chairman very much. It may be that the obligation we have calls upon us to approve the appropriation of these funds. But I raise the grave question of policy, of determining what goal we are leading to. We have time and time again seen the fallacy of trying to form coalitions with Communists. The Poles named to this Commission by the Communist-Polish Government would not be anything except agents of the world Communist conspiracy. I would not talk about separate Communist entities in Vietnam, or South America, or any other place in any meaningful terms. It is part of the same overall conspiracy using different tac-

tics where necessary. To believe that the Poles and the Soviets are not working hand in glove with the Communist leaders elsewhere is the height of naivete. It would seem to me after all the experience we have had that sooner or later we would come to the conclusion we might try to reach a goal that would mean victory in the cold war.

I do not believe we are going to achieve victory by putting our reliance on commissions that include Communists. I do not believe we can take any real steps toward victory by forcing a coalition on a people such as we did in Laos. We should have learned this thing clearly. Literally, we coerce them into taking the Pathet Lao only to have them betray the trust, as was easily predictable. I suggest that the time is long overdue when the United States must recognize that you do not put your trust in Communists. This is what we are doing.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has come to an entirely wrong conclusion. We are opposing Communist aggression.

Mr. BRUCE. They are part of the International Control Commission.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, but in 1961 the situation was deteriorating.

Mr. BRUCE. How did it deteriorate so badly? How did they get into that situation? Why did the royal government get into the position where they took the Communists into the government in a coalition?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We wanted to deal effectively with the Communists, but the gentleman would not want the Communists to have a free hand in Laos.

Mr. BRUCE. I would say to the gentleman the Communists got exactly the free hand they wanted.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman would say they have a free hand?

Mr. BRUCE. I would say they have exactly a free hand. They have the facilities of a funnel for Vietnamese troops, and to get supplies into Vietnam. This is their technique. We are talking at the conference table with them, and they are accomplishing their goal.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos dated July 23, 1962.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. ELLIOTT] Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 1627) to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos pursuant to House Resolution 823, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 268, nays 89, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—268

Abernethy	Corman	Hanna
Adair	Cunningham	Hansen
Addabbo	Curtin	Harding
Albert	Curtis	Hardy
Anderson	Daddario	Harris
Andrews, Ala.	Daniels	Hawkins
Andrews, N. Dak.	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Arends	Dawson	Healey
Ashley	Delaney	Hechler
Ashmore	Denton	Henderson
Aspinall	Derwinski	Herlong
Avery	Donohue	Holifield
Ayres	Duncan	Horan
Baker	Dwyer	Horton
Barrett	Edmondson	Hosmer
Barry	Edwards	Huddleston
Bates	Elliott	Hull
Battin	Ellsworth	Ichord
Beckworth	Everett	Jarman
Bennett, Fla.	Evins	Jennings
Blatnik	Farbstein	Joelson
Boggs	Fascell	Johnson, Calif.
Boland	Findley	Johnson, Pa.
Bonner	Fino	Jonas
Brademas	Fisher	Jones, Mo.
Bromwell	Flood	Karsten
Brooks	Fogarty	Karh
Broomfield	Fountain	Kastenmeter
Brotzman	Fraser	Kelly
Brown, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Keogh
Brown, Ohio	Friedel	Kilgore
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Pa.	King, Calif.
Burke	Fulton, Tenn.	Kluczynski
Burkhalter	Fuqua	Kornegay
Burleson	Gallagher	Kunkel
Burton, Calif.	Gary	Kyl
Byrne, Pa.	Gathings	Laird
Cahill	Giaino	Libonati
Cameron	Gibbons	Long, La.
Carey	Gilbert	Long, Md.
Casey	Gonzalez	McClory
Cederberg	Grabowski	McDade
Celler	Grant	McDowell
Chelf	Gray	McFall
Clark	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Cleveland	Green, Pa.	Madden
Colmer	Griffin	Mahon
Conte	Griffiths	Marsh
Cooley	Hagen, Calif.	Martin, Mass.
Corbett	Halleck	Matsunaga
	Halpern	Matthews

Miller, Calif.	Purcell	Stafford
Milliken	Quie	Steed
Mills	Randall	Stephens
Minish	Reid, N.Y.	Stratton
Monagan	Reifel	Stubblefield
Montoya	Reuss	Sullivan
Moorhead	Rhodes, Pa.	Taft
Morgan	Riehlman	Taylor
Morris	Rivers, Alaska	Teague, Calif.
Morrisson	Rivers, S.C.	Teague, Tex.
Morse	Robison	Thomas
Mosher	Rodino	Thompson, N.J.
Moss	Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, Tex.
Multer	Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, Wis.
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.	Tollefson
Murphy, N.Y.	Rooney, N.Y.	Trumble
Murray	Rooney, Pa.	Trimb
Natcher	Roosevelt	Tupper
Norblad	Rosenthal	Tuten
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rostenkowski	Udall
O'Hara, Ill.	Roush	Ullman
O'Hara, Mich.	Roybal	Van Deerlin
Olsen, Mont.	Rumsfeld	Vanik
O'Neill	Ryan, N.Y.	Watson
Osmers	St. Onge	Watts
Ostertag	Schneebell	Weaver
Fatman	Schweiker	Welther
Fatten	Schwengel	Whalley
Felly	Secrest	White
Pepper	Seiden	Whitener
Perkins	Senner	Whitten
Philbin	Shriver	Wickersham
Pickle	Sibal	Widnall
Pike	Sickles	Wilson
Pillion	Sikes	Charles H.
Plinie	Skubitz	Wright
Poage	Slack	Wyder
Price	Smith, Iowa	Young
Pucinski	Springer	Zablocki

NAYS—89

Abbutt	Glenn	Moore
Abele	Goodell	Morton
Ashbrook	Goodling	Neisen
Baldwin	Gross	O'Konski
Becker	Grover	Poff
Beermann	Gubser	Pool
Beicher	Gurney	Quillen
Bell	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Harrison	Rhodes, Ariz.
Betts	Harsha	Rich
Bolton	Harvey, Ind.	Roudebush
Oliver P.	Hoeven	St. George
Bow	Hutchinson	Saylor
Bray	Jensen	Schadeberg
Broyhill, N.C.	Johansen	Schenck
Bruce	Keith	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Siler
Chamberlain	King, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Knox	Snyder
Clausen,	Langen	Stinson
Don H.	Latta	Talcott
Clawson, Del.	Lennon	Utt
Cramer	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Dague	McCulloch	Waggonner
Derounian	McIntire	Williams
Devine	McLoskey	Wilson, Bob
Dole	MacGregor	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	Wyman
Dowdy	May	Younger
Dulski	Michel	
Ford	Minshall	

NOT VOTING—74

Alger	Gill	Olson, Minn.
Auchincloss	Hagan, Ga.	Passman
Baring	Haley	Pflicher
Bass	Harvey, Mich.	Powell
Bolling	Hébert	Rains
Bolton	Hoffman	Roberts, Ala.
Frances P.	Holland	Roberts, Tex.
Brock	Johnson, Wis.	Ryan, Mich.
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Burton, Utah	Kee	Scott
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cohelan	Landrum	Shipley
Collier	Lankford	Sisk
Davis, Tenn.	Leggett	Smith, Va.
Dent	Lesinski	Staebler
Diggs	Lindsay	Staggers
Dingell	Lloyd	Thompson, La.
Downing	McMillan	Toll
Fallon	Mailliard	Vinson
Feighan	Martin, Calif.	Wallhauser
Finnegan	Mathias	Westland
Flynt	Meader	Wharton
Foreman	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Forrester	Nedzi	Winstead
Garmatz	Nix	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Burton of Utah against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Martin of California against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Wallhauser for, with Mr. Foreman against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Meader against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Westland against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Wharton against.

Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Harvey of Michigan against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Finnegan against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Ryan of Michigan against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Holland against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Lankford against.

Mr. Nedzi for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama for, with Mr. Shepard against.

Mr. Downing for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Gill for, with Mr. Plicher against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Staebler against.

Mr. Roberts of Texas for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.

Mr. Olson of Minnesota for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Bass against.

Messrs. SHORT, SCHADEBERG, BOB WILSON, and CHAMBERLAIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8334) to transfer to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community certain lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, Arizona, consisting of approximately 27,3625 acres, purchased for school purposes from Indian moneys proceeds of labor funds and now excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:

"South half north half south half north-east quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter,

"South half south half northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter,

"North half northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter,

"North half north half south half north-west quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter,

"West half east half southeast quarter southwest quarter,

"West half east half east half southeast quarter southwest quarter,

"East half northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter,

"North half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter,

"Section 32, township 2 north, range 5 east, G & SRP & M, Arizona.

"Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim the United States determined by the Commission."

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that this is one of the bills the gentleman intends to call up this evening?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. This is one of three bills I am going to call up and ask to concur in the Senate amendments. I may say to the gentleman that all the amendments are germane to those bills.

Mr. GROSS. All the amendments to those bills are germane?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1988) to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That the Congress hereby assumes