

whose circumstances cannot be foreseen—of agreements which are yet to be negotiated.

We do not have to grasp either horn of this dilemma. There is a middle way—a simple resolution approving the objective of Latin American integration, of multilateral financing of projects contributing to it and of arms control. We will thereby have expressed our disposition to consider sympathetically proposals leading to the achievement of these objectives. But we will have kept our options open depending on the nature of the proposals presented to us and the circumstances prevailing in the world at the time.

Most important, we will have preserved the integrity of Congress as an independent branch of the Government.

## EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, March 16, 1967]

## U.S. AID PROPOSAL DISAPPOINTS LATIN

MONTEVIDEO, March 15.—President Johnson's proposal for a \$1.5 billion increase in U.S. aid for Latin America was described by Latin diplomats today as "absolutely insufficient" and "a pittance."

Delegates preparing for the April Inter-American summit conference expressed their disappointment after calculating that the projected increase, to be spread over 5 years, would amount to only \$300 million a year in additional aid.

U.S. assistance to Latin America now is said to total about \$1 billion a year.

When word of the Johnson proposal was received here yesterday, a formal meeting of representatives of the United States and 17 other hemisphere countries was cancelled.

Delegates from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Uruguay, and Guatemala then met in the Brazilian Embassy. They were described by one diplomat as "indignant and disappointed."

U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Lincoln Gordon, Johnson's personal representative, said he had heard rumors that some Latin nations were planning to boycott the April 12-14 summit at Punta del Este, a seashore resort near here.

However, one of Gordon's aides, Samuel Eaton, said the division between the United States and the Latin countries was merely "a matter of clarification" and that "everything will be much better understood" after Gordon's meetings with representatives of the disgruntled countries.

Secretary of State Rusk told Congress yesterday that most of the proposed aid increase would go to improve agriculture and education. But he said some would be used to facilitate creation of a Latin American common market, a project warmly supported by President Johnson.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## S. RES. 94

A resolution to support certain objectives of United States policy with respect to Latin America

Whereas it has been a historic policy of the United States to work in close harmony with the other American Republics to promote the well-being and enhance the security of the hemisphere: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate welcomes the meeting of chiefs of state of the members of the Organization of American States to be held in Punta del Este, Uruguay, April 12 to 14, 1967, and that the President be advised of the sense of the Senate that this Government, by constitutional process, should pursue the following objectives:

(1) The economic integration of Latin America;

(2) The further development of multilateral financing of projects which would contribute to economic integration, particularly with the participation of other free world countries;

(3) Non-discriminatory measures for the expansion of trade within Latin America and between Latin America and other areas of the world;

(4) Renewed efforts to mobilize private resources inside and outside the hemisphere to further the economic development of Latin America; and

(5) Regional arms control and disarmament measures.

Sec. 2. It is the further sense of the Senate that the United States Congress should give sympathetic consideration to ways and means of implementing any agreements which may be reached at Punta del Este for the achievement of these objectives.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. First, let me compliment the junior Senator from Arkansas on an excellent statement. I think it is significant that in the speech he has said, in substance, that he does not want Congress to be a rubber stamp and does not want to short circuit the legislative process, but to follow the usual procedure, and not to operate on the basis of crises.

I want to demonstrate the difficulty we would be facing if we were to act on this proposal in the fashion we are asked to proceed. I hold in my hand what is called Senate Joint Resolution 53. Let me say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that at this moment I do not understand whether this is the resolution which was recommended by the administration or not. I have attempted to ascertain from the clerks whether this is the recommended resolution, and they cannot tell me. This demonstrates the folly of trying to follow the procedure we are asked to follow.

I understand the Senator bases his statement, first, on the fact that this is not the proper way to proceed or do business in Congress; second, on the matter of substance, because it shortcircuits the normal procedures in relation to committing the resources of the United States and calls for a substantial increase in the commitment of the resources of this Nation, to be delegated specifically to Latin America. I understand the Senator does not in any way want to pass judgment on the merits of what is being proposed.

Am I correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the principal purpose. It seems to me the timing of the request and the way in which it is presented make it most difficult to justify it. As the Senator well knows, next week we have a supplemental bill scheduled. The committee has the space treaty pending before it. The Easter

recess has been announced. There will be very little opportunity for hearings on this proposal in the normal course of action or procedure. The President or the other executive officials whose business this is normally make whatever agreements they feel are in the national interest. Those agreements are returned to us, and we then consider them without any great pressure, and under the normal circumstances. We have experts in the field and we consider the matter in the deliberative way which I thought was the purpose of Congress considering it, without committing us in advance.

If we pass this proposal quickly, which they apparently expect us to do, we certainly will not have such an opportunity.

Mr. HARTKE. Would the Senator call this a precommitment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Apparently. The resolution, together with the message which accompanied it, seems to indicate that. The message does mention the \$1.5 billion, which I mentioned, and which has already raised considerable opposition from people in Latin America, as reported in the press.

Mr. HARTKE. As I understand the Senator, there is an indication that the Latin Americans consider the amount specified to be a mere pittance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As reported in the press.

Mr. HARTKE. We could find ourselves in the rather ridiculous position of having endorsed a pittance, and have it said, after the conference is held, that by such action the Congress has, in effect, insulted the Latin American nations by not attempting to do more and that we were able to do more.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has resulted in reactions already. It would be much better to proceed to the conference, have deliberate conversations, and try to have a mutual agreement, in which they and we would undertake certain things. The President would make agreements, subject to Congress' approval, in the usual way. They would understand that. It would come back and be justified. It seems to me introducing this kind of procedure is not the proper way to present these matters.

As I have said, I think in a sense it goes very far toward nullifying the independence of judgment that this body is supposed to exercise. I must say, it may be that other things that have happened have contributed to my apprehension about this procedure; but there seems to be a general attitude that if Congress cannot be relied upon to supply money for some activities, a way will be found to get around Congress, and circumvent the usual congressional function.

Recently, in connection with the well-publicized case of the National Students Association, the excuse was advanced by those defending the support of that organization by the CIA that "Well, we could not have gotten the money from Congress, therefore we did it in this way, covertly, so that Congress would not know about it."

To me, this is a subversion of the congressional process. If they could not get the money from Congress, why did they

\*\*\* cf. NSA BOOK for full text