

Chairman MORGAN. Well, I wonder if something was wrong with the great body, the House of Representatives on August 23, 1960, when the Bogotá resolution passed the House on a voice vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I didn't suggest that was anything wrong with the House at the time it took that action. What I am suggesting is that if there was nothing wrong then, there is nothing wrong now in taking similar action now. If we do want to make a commitment, we can authorize it before the President goes down and makes the commitment. If an authorization doesn't stand the test of whether we should approve of such a big commitment over so long a period, it would have been a mistake to have offered it, but it seems to me this is the orthodox and appropriate way for us to proceed.

Mr. SELDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I didn't realize I had the floor, but I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Alabama.

Chairman MORGAN. This is Mr. Farbstein's time.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I will yield.

Mr. SELDEN. Is the gentleman from New Jersey suggesting we put a special fund authorization in the resolution, although as he has pointed out, it may be several years before we know how much will be needed as far as the integration fund is concerned?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman is seriously asking me the question, I think he has answered it. I think it is obvious that Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities with respect to an honest evaluation of a program of that substance.

My belief is that if we had an authorization there would be a rejection now of any decision as to whether to commit ourselves—to the extent which the administration may be planning to do next month in Punta del Este—to a program that will not be established until 1969.

I think it is wrong for Congress to go along with that kind of an operation. I think it is right, entirely right that we support in generous, even fulsome terms our longstanding and intimate relationships with Latin America, and our desire to continue to provide substantial financial assistance to help them with their problems, including economic integration. However, I think a resolution should not go beyond that. If it simply said that we cooperate with our President in his going down to Punta del Este, I would have introduced the resolution, but when you look at this resolution it doesn't do any such thing, and it does a far more dangerous thing. It invades the prerogatives of the Congress to take a look at a matter of this substance at a time when we would have sufficient evidence for us to be able to evaluate it.

Mr. SELDEN. I disagree with the gentleman. As I read the resolution, it simply does not authorize or appropriate funds, and Congress will have an opportunity to look at these programs before they authorize or appropriate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But the gentleman couldn't possibly be contending that the specific and open admission on the part of the Secretary of State and the Ambassador this morning, and the special message to the Congress by the President of the United States, are not going to commit this country to a course of action which will be ratified, if this resolution should be passed, by Congress. When the bills become due as long as 5 years down the road we will be under a moral obligation, at least, to pay those bills.