has with Latin America. The paraphrase of section 251, which seems to constitute the initial part of the resolution, strikes me as perhaps undesirable.

Is it any more than a paraphrase and perhaps an updating of that language in the act? If so, has any thought been given—certainly not by us—has any thought been given by you as to the difference in the language with which we specifically endorse the special relationship with Latin America through the Alliance for Progress? Why should we buy, without really having a chance to digest it, changes in the language when we already have pretty solid language in section 251 with respect to our relationships with Latin America?

Secretary RUSK. May I ask to which paragraph—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. All the preambulatory language, Mr. Secretary. Would there be anything lacking if we took out all the "Whereases" because there is already language in the existing legislation; namely, section 251. What is the point of this fulsome language with respect to our relationships?

Secretary RUSK. I think, sir, there was no intention in this resolution to present major departures of policy. I do think it was felt that, in drawing together this expression of policy and intent on the part of the Congress, it was well to draw together those elements which are important for the decisions which the Presidents of the hemisphere will consider at their meeting at Punta del Este in the middle of April.

It will be for Congress, of course, to consider the exact language in which it wishes to reflect these matters of policy, but there was no purpose here to avoid or change the statement of these policies as they have appeared elsewhere in action taken by the Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. By updating and reparaphrasing what we already have now in legislation, are we casting some doubt on the language in section 251?

Secretary RUSK. I think that is a matter that could be examined to see whether or not there is any clash or conflict there that needs resolution or whether some language might not be improved here.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Perhaps this is unfair, but to submit a resolution which needs to be acted upon affirmatively before the President leaves for South America looks like pointing a gun at the head of Congress and saying:

> If you do not act, this will be an evidence of your lack of support for what he is trying to accomplish in South America.

It doesn't seem fair that this should be the case, especially as Congress specifically described already our relationships and our desire to help Latin America.

You say this resolution is going to show that we are prepared to work with them in partnership. I refer to page 2 of your statement. Well, surely we can do that without a new resolution. If we get down to the guts of the resolution, the recommending, operating paragraphs, this seems to me very unusual language, that the Congress recommends that the United States provide an increase in assistance under the Alliance for Progress.

To whom are we recommending? This is an increase over what?

Surely the President now has authority within the ceiling already granted, as you have pointed out, the right to request an increase.