

lief, not only for cotton, but for other fibers"; and

Whereas, on October 26, 1964, President Johnson when speaking of the Administration's textile program stated:

"When this Administration took office serious difficulties confronted this industry . . . It was determined to find answers . . . We know the job can be done. We must now focus on the remaining weak spots and implement the rest of our program . . .

"I am convinced that our program for textiles is in the best interests of all America. I intend to pursue it to a successful conclusion."

Whereas, the nation's textile trade policy necessarily embraces both the textile fibers and the products made therefrom, and this policy has been partially implemented by the imposition of import quotas on raw and processed cotton fiber, and by domestic subsidies for wool production; and

Whereas, the Congress has under consideration legislation designed to establish an equitable quantity of imports of man-made fibers and man-made fiber, woolen and silk textile products cosponsored by 62 Senators and 139 Representatives; and

Whereas, to date effective steps have not been accomplished by our Government to equitably control access to the United States market by foreign suppliers of textile fibers and products made therefrom and the need to do so is all the more apparent in light of the conclusion of the Kennedy Round tariff cutting negotiations and their impact in particular upon the textile areas in the Appalachian region, which is the object of special attention by the Federal Government as well as the respective state governments;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Southern Governors' Conference requests the Congress to enact the pending textile legislation, and the Administration to fully implement its textile program by establishing arrangements to equitably control access to the United States market by foreign suppliers of man-made fibers and textile products made of wool, silk, and man-made fibers and to administer those existing arrangements covering cotton textile products so that the best interests of our national economy and security, and the welfare of labor and management and the consuming public may best be served; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the members of Congress, and to William M. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

CHEMICALS

Whereas, the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations will seriously and adversely affect the domestic chemical industry, which includes many firms with plants and offices in States which are members of this Conference; and

Whereas, the implementation of the Agreement Relating Principally to Chemicals, Supplementary to the Geneva (1967) Protocol, including the repeal of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation, would have additional serious and adverse effect on the domestic chemical industry and on its operations in said States and the workers and communities in which they are located; and

Whereas, the proposed foreign tariff reduction which would be gained as a result of implementation of said Supplementary Agreement will not offer any significant opportunity to increase chemical export sales;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Southern Governors' Conference that the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, including the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and

each member of the Congress, be advised that the Southern Governors' Conference:

(1) firmly opposes implementation, by legislation or otherwise, of said Supplementary Agreement, including the repeal of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation, and

(2) urges that the Congress of the United States conduct a thorough study to determine the effects of the multilateral tariff reductions in the Kennedy Round upon the worldwide competitive position of the domestic chemical industry and the U.S. balance of payments before any further trade negotiations are undertaken by the U.S. government; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the members of Congress, and to William M. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

LET UNCLE SAM DO IT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to see that among all the journalistic bleeding hearts in this country, who wept so effusively over the recent rat race in this Chamber, one newspaper, the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier, had the discernment to put the issue in its proper perspective. I commend the Courier's excellent editorial to the attention of House Members—and particularly those who have, once more, rushed to the wailing wall to throw away another \$40 million of the taxpayers' money:

BOTHERED BY RATS? CALL IN UNCLE SAM

The U.S. House has reversed itself and voted a two-year appropriation of \$40 million which may be used for the control of rats in some of the big cities.

Opponents of the bill during the early rejection of the program had been crucified in a most vicious manner. They had been pictured in some cartoons in eastern publication as standing by joking while rats gnawed on little babies.

The real issue, of course, was whether another categorical appropriation establishing a new federal rat control bureaucracy was necessary and desirable. Opponents took the logical position that if people could be trained to put their garbage in a closed container and if poison could be put in crevices out of the reach of children and pets, any city in the country could operate its own rat control program.

Iowa, because of the storage of grain, undoubtedly has far more rats than any metropolitan city. But Iowa farmers consider rats their own problem and they do not think a new federal bureaucracy should be created to kill rats for them.

The rat control bill is an excellent example of the way the politician is unable to withstand pressures for additional spending. Fortunately, however, the new measure which passed the House is not a categorical grant program but an addition to an appropriation for general health programs. Thus, if officials discover that all of the \$40 million is not needed to kill rats, it can be used for some other worthwhile health purpose.

But the public has no just cause to complain about this type of nonsensical federal spending. Very few voters write to their congressman because they don't want something. They write in vast numbers only when they want some additional benefit from the federal government under the illusion that it is free. This is what happened on rats.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON HAS ASKED ME TO FIGHT ON FOR A STRONG TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL, INCLUDING FULL COVERAGE OF REVOLVING CREDIT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of what happened yesterday morning in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Banking and Currency Committee when we began consideration of H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, I want to advise the House of the fundamental issue in controversy on this legislation.

It is the question of whether the department stores, the big chainstores, and others using the device of revolving credit should be required, along with every other vendor of credit—I repeat, along with every other business which extends consumer credit—to express the costs of their credit on an annual percentage rate. In the case of the department stores and others using revolving credit, this percentage rate would usually have to be expressed as 18 percent—a figure so high, and one which would come as such a shock to customers unaware that 1½ percent a month is 18 percent a year, that the firms using revolving credit know very well the rate would make them look very bad.

That is the issue on which my subcommittee is now divided 6 to 6. There are other issues on which we are similarly divided in this bill, but the revolving credit issue is undoubtedly the one which prompted the opponents of H.R. 11601 to take advantage of the absence of one Member yesterday to force adjournment of our executive session.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to know that the President of the United States told me—not once, but at least three times—last Friday, when I was at the White House for a consumer conference, that he wanted me to fight on for a strong bill, including provisions for requiring all consumer credit to be expressed on an annual percentage rate basis. This includes revolving charge.

Many stories have come back to me implying that the administration is not really very concerned about the revolving charge issue and would be quite willing to settle for the Senate-passed bill on truth in lending, which exempts revolving charge from an annual percentage rate requirement. These stories do not square with what the President told me, what Betty Furness told me, what Under Secretary of the Treasury Barr told me, and what everyone else in the administration who has any responsibility for administration activity on behalf of the legislation has told me. So I am going to fight on for inclusion of revolving charge—I am going to keep up this fight.

It is good to know that in this effort I also have the expressed and, I believe, sincere support of the bankers, the furniture, appliance, hardware, and other

stores not using revolving charge, the automobile dealers, the credit unions, and all of those firms and organizations engaged in consumer credit transactions other than revolving charge who have advised my subcommittee that the exemption for revolving charge in S. 5 as it passed the Senate constitutes a bitterly unfair discrimination against them when they compete with the department stores or big mail order chains on credit transactions.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ASKS THE CONGRESS TO JOIN THE PEOPLE OF SOUTHEAST ASIA IN A NEW ERA OF DEVELOPMENT

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America, once a nation isolated from others by two great oceans, is today a nation deeply involved in the peace of the world.

Where the first half of the 20th century witnessed our commitments to the nations of Europe, to help preserve Western civilization, culture, and enterprise, in the 1950's and 1960's we have become a nation deeply interested in the future, development, and security of the new and old countries of Asia.

Therefore, the important message which President Johnson sent to the Congress Tuesday on the future of the Asian Development Bank, is a strong commitment to intelligent economic and social progress for the nations of Southeast Asia.

The President has asked the Congress to make a pledge—a pledge of \$200 million for special projects sponsored by the Bank over the next 4 years.

Our pledge will be a minority pledge, and will only be honored when the other members of the Asian Development Bank subscribe their contributions. No funds will be needed out of this year's budget. In addition, whatever our contribution, it will be available only for the purchase of U.S. goods and services for use in Asia.

This Nation has always believed in self-help by other nations. We have always been willing to make substantial contributions to international funds if there was agreement from friends and allies to equal or go beyond the American contribution. We have always stressed the need for the development of a sound internal structure in Asian nations—schools, highways, a balanced economy with jobs, industrial development, and so forth. Now we have an opportunity to make a solid contribution to Asian development through a regional organization which is basically an Asian innovation.

I congratulate President Johnson for never losing sight of basic social and economic development for Asia, even while American troops are giving their lives to maintain security and independence for one small Asian nation.

Make no mistake about it. The peoples of Southeast Asia know that the war in Vietnam is not just a war for the freedom of one small, struggling country. It is a war for the freedom and independence of all Southeast Asian countries.

The people of Southeast Asia welcome the American commitment to the Asian Development Bank.

The Congress of the United States, will, in my opinion, keep faith with those millions of struggling people by approving President Johnson's request for a new pledge of \$200 million in special funds for the Asian Development Bank.

Today's Washington Post carried a very sensible editorial concerning this proposal, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

A CHANCE TO RECOUP

With dismal inconsistency, the Congress this year has gone down the line for whatever is needed in Vietnam while taking every opportunity to scuttle a foreign aid program which is intended, in no small part, to forestall future "Vietnams" in Asia and elsewhere in the world. It is probably too late now to repair the damage done to foreign aid this year. But there is still an opportunity for Congress to restore some degree of elementary logic in its approach to the underdeveloped world. It can do so by giving early and favorable consideration to yesterday's welcome proposal by President Johnson for a \$200 million United States contribution to new Special Funds planned for the Asian Development Bank.

The ADB, to begin with, is a sensible institution, established at our urging, but with genuine Asian effort and initiative. Our share of the capital is a modest 20 percent, the same as Japan's. Management is in Asian hands, where it belongs. The ADB is also a sound institution. Like the venerable and respected World Bank, its standards for projects promise to be high; its insistence on responsible self-help by recipients promises to be strict; its terms for loans from its regular \$1 billion capital promise to be business-like.

But also like the World Bank, which has a more lenient-lending offshoot called the International Development Association, the ADB needs money for longer-term loans at lower interest rates to cover the needs of its members for projects such as roads and schools which do not yield a rapid return on investment. These are the needs which the Special Funds are designed to meet and the American contribution of \$200 million, to be spread over four years, is a minority share of the total to be raised, as well as a relatively modest sum.

Senator Fulbright has promised early Senate hearings and passage this year is in order on several counts. For one, the ADB reflects not only a praiseworthy Asian initiative but an encouraging trend towards an Asian sense of regional responsibility, measurable in a wide range of mutual "self-help" measures taken recently by various groups of Asian nations in the fields of education, health, transportation, and economic development. Progress in harnessing Southeast Asia's Mekong River basin is a striking example.

The ADB and its Special Funds also mark a useful step towards "multilateralization" of foreign aid, which puts a premium on collective, cooperative undertakings rather than strictly bilateral assistance with all the political complications it entails. Significantly, in his message to Congress yesterday, the President cited the ADB Special Funds as "an example of multilateral assistance that we fervently hope will be followed increasingly in the years ahead in Asia and throughout the developing world."

Finally, as the President also observed:

"Lasting peace in Asia requires much more than resistance to armed aggression. Peace will come to stay when despair gives way to hope, when insurrection gives way to peaceful opportunity . . ."

There is little logic in a policy of resisting aggression in one small Asian land at whatever cost while denying what is urgently needed to counter the despair and hunger and poverty which feed the fires of insurrection in nearly all the rest of Asia and in a very significant part of the rest of the world.

DEFENSIVE DRIVING IS A FULL-TIME JOB

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, you all know of my longstanding interest in traffic safety and my efforts to find ways to reduce the slaughter on our Nation's streets and highways. This interest goes back 12 years when I sponsored a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Traffic Safety.

Just last year, as a result of extensive hearings my committee reported, and the Congress passed, the Motor Vehicle Safety Standards Act of 1966. The hearings underscored what we already knew—mechanical failure contribute to only a small percentage of traffic accidents; it is still the "nut behind the wheel" who is the chief offender.

Much has been said and written about driver attitudes and the need for increased driver education programs. I would like to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the September Message Register, a newspaper for telephone employees in the State of Maryland. The article, written by Col. Robert J. Lally, the superintendent of the Maryland State Police, is entitled "Defensive Driving is a Full-Time Job".

He emphasizes the need for the "selfish approach" when a driver gets into an automobile, "selfish from the standpoint that each driver sets up an effective defense" against all the hazards of modern driving.

Chief Lally's words are particularly important because of his 30 years' experience in law enforcement, first with the FBI and then as chief of the Baltimore County Police Bureau.

Under unanimous consent I place the text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

DEFENSIVE DRIVING IS A FULL-TIME JOB (By Col. Robert J. Lally)

In 1899 the first motor vehicle death was recorded when Mr. H. H. Bliss, upon stepping from a trolley car in New York City, turned to assist a woman alighting from the same car and was struck and killed by an electric cab.

Thus, unwittingly, man had unleashed a massive and progressive means of human extermination and destruction of property perhaps second in potential only to the atom bomb.

During its relatively short existence, the automobile has taken the lives of over one and one-half million people. This figure becomes all the more shocking when one considers that all armed conflicts from the Rev-