

Mr. DERWINSKI. I will yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The resolution Mr. Dillon supported has very little resemblance to the one we are now considering. That was an authorization of an additional \$500 million for the Alliance for Progress.

Chairman MORGAN. In 1960 it was recognized that a new administration was coming in and it was deliberately stated that they were not going to request a single dime until the following year.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hate to argue with my chairman, but to me there is a fundamental difference between an authorization resolution, which is a promise, a commitment, to consider the advisability of making appropriations, and a quasi-commitment such as is being asked of us with this kind of language.

Chairman MORGAN. Under Secretary Dillon pledged \$20 billion at Punta del Este.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, suppose this President pledged a figure of \$20 billion, would we be displeased or pleased?

If we were committed to accept whatever the President was going to say before he went down, because he came and told us what he was going to make in the way of a pledge or commitment, we would have had our mouths shut. Perhaps because Secretary Dillon got in hot water there is now an honest effort on the part of this administration to indicate quite clearly what kind of pledges they are planning to make this time. I sympathize strongly with the President in his desire to get congressional support beforehand, and their understanding of what he is going to do.

However, this involves making a commitment on the part of Congress long before anything has developed, for instance, with respect to a specific need for money in an integration fund. I do not think we should commit ourselves in the way in which it is being asked of us, nor do I think this is similar in any way to the resolution that was submitted before the conference in 1960.

Chairman MORGAN. The gentleman will remember that the resolution in 1960 carried an original amount of \$700 million. There was \$500 million for which no appropriation was to be requested at that time plus \$100 million for the contingency fund, and \$100 million for earthquake relief for Chile. The contingency fund was eliminated on the House floor because the Appropriations Committee under a previous authorization had already appropriated the \$100 million which was needed. None of the \$500 million which was specified in the resolution that the Under Secretary of State took with him to Bogotá was appropriated at that time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It was committed in the sense that we developed an authorization. The chairman is simply pointing out the danger of the procedure actually used in 1960, the unwisdom of responding with such speed to a request of such a size without sufficient consideration by this committee or by Congress. This is the very reason I think we should go slower, not more quickly, with respect to a resolution that can't be even roughly compared with what we did at that time.

Mr. SELDEN. Will the chairman yield?