

what the Latin Americans are doing here is important, the United States ought to be with them.

Now, there are all sorts of considerations which might make a difference in your judgment at this time as to how you would deal with a specific question in front of you, but it would be important to know, whether as a matter of general policy and general intent, this accurately reflects your approach to the question of our relations in this hemisphere.

Mr. TAFT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That completes my questions.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Frelinghuysen. I am glad to have this further opportunity to come back to the nature of the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

It does seem to me very unfortunate that we should be presented with specific language and the necessity for acting very promptly. The executive branch of course knew we were planning and are going to take an Easter recess very shortly. Yet, as the President pointed out in his special message yesterday, the executive branch has been preparing for months with respect to this Punta del Este meeting. The President also told us yesterday that he believes it is important that a partnership between the executive and the legislative branch be developed.

Well, this is a very belated kind of action. As I say, I am not objecting to giving the President support. I think he needs it, and I may even vote for the resolution. However a comparison between this resolution and the Resolution of Bogotá misses a very important point.

If you will read the Resolution of Bogotá—and I don't suppose that many of us have had an opportunity to compare the language. I am not talking about the executive branch, I am talking about the legislative branch. Few of us have been able to compare the language passed on hastily by Congress. It doesn't bear much resemblance to the language we are being asked to pass hastily on now. It gives me little comfort to hear the chairman say he sees nothing unusual about this course of procedure, because we have acted hastily in the past. In neither case should we have acted hastily.

I have reservations about both the preambulatory language and in the specific resolutions that are proposed. In expressing by reservations I am in no way acting as a partisan. I see no justification for suggesting that there is some kind of political maneuvering going on that didn't occur when the Democrats were responding to President Eisenhower's suggestion in 1960. There is no political advantage that I can see to be gained out of asking questions. Perhaps as a legislator I am unduly suspicious, or like to ask questions about the executive branch, but it seems to me appropriate for a legislator to ask questions.

At a very minimum, the colloquy between the gentleman from Ohio and the Secretary has certainly brought out that a strong moral commitment will result if we vote for this resolution, to support authorizations and appropriations to carry out the language of this resolution. It isn't worded as an authorization. I would be happier if it were an authorization and did require affirmative action, if new action is needed. This is simply a moral commitment, that Congress recom-