

Chairman MORGAN. The time has expired?

Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. MAILLIARD. May I defer my questioning, Mr. Chairman, until I find out more about what is going on?

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I welcome you before the committee. I would like to say also that I approve very much of one statement you made today. I agree with you that the United States should be proud of its constructive role in helping to insure that these early foundations of progress in Latin America will endure.

My questions are certainly not aimed at sabotaging what we have been doing, and what I think we will continue to do. I say that as a preliminary, because I am very much disturbed about the nature of the resolution which you are asking us to accept.

You have suggested that the reason we should act is to show that Congress—I am not sure I quote you accurately—that Congress supports the principle of cooperation with our Latin American neighbors.

Well, I don't suppose anyone would argue that we would be unwilling to support that principle. If it were just that, there would be no problem at all, but the practical matter is that you seem to be involving us in something that looks suspiciously like what the President said he was going to ask of Congress only the day before yesterday in a special message. He said that we should and I quote:

I believe we should pledge increased financial assistance in the years ahead.

He goes on to say:

The fundamental principle which has guided us in the past—demonstrated need and self-help—will continue to shape our actions in the future.

Then, with emphasis, he says:

I recommend—

And I can understand the President recommending, but how Congress does it and to whom I still don't know. The President says:

I recommend that Congress approve a commitment to increase our aid by up to \$1.5 billion or about \$300 million per year over the next 5 years.

Well, as I understand it, this really isn't considered a commitment because it is not an authorization.

I was asked by somebody who attended the hearing yesterday, when Secretary Rusk spoke, whether as an alternative to this resolution I would favor an authorization of a certain dollar figure over and above what we have already approved for the Alliance for Progress.

Yesterday I hedged in my answer, but my answer today is that I feel if we are to accept the long-range implications of what the President is clearly asking and what the Secretary of State is clearly asking, we should come up with an honest authorization for a long term ahead.

This resolution as now worded is just going to get us in trouble. All you are doing basically is—you are saying this in one way or another, the Secretary and yourself—you are saying you want an indication of congressional support for whatever the President is going to pledge at Punta del Este next month.