ill afford to squander professional skills which are, at best, in short supply.

In addition to the items mentioned here—cooperation in recruiting, and in training, interchange of personnel, the development of uniform pay scales, transferability of pension rights, etc., there are a number of other Federal programs that could, with a little effort, be geared in to serve the needs of State and local as well as Federal employees, such as—for instance—the credit union program and savings and loan program.

Each unit of government would still retain control over its own employees—as it should, in a Federal system—but employees of smaller units would not be deprived of benefits which could readily be made available to them.

Although the Federal administrator has a basic stake in upgrading the quality and effectiveness of State and local personnel operations in counterpart agencies, the Federal Government has shown a remarkable restraint in its dealings with State and local governments on personnel matters. Little Federal pressure has been exerted, even in those States which fail to provide a healthy atmosphere of public employment.

The most important contribution that the Congress could make, however, would be the enactment of a broad measure to improve the quality of the State and local personnel operation, and to authorize and encourage intergovernmental cooperation in public personnel administration.

Basic in such a measure would be a blanket requirement for a merit system applicable to all State and local employees charged with administrative responsibilities in connection with Federal grant-in-aid programs, as has been required by law in the public health and welfare programs since 1939. This would extend merit system coverage to the highway program and to the host of new grant-in-aid programs created by recent congressional action.

If anyone feels that such a requirement is unnecessary or undesirable, he need do no more than take a close look at the two largest and most costly programs. Here, indeed, is a study in contracts. The public health and welfare programs which function under merit system provisions, have been administered with a high degree of competence and efficiency. These have had no scandals—certainly no major ones.

The interstate highway program, without merit system coverage, has not fared anything like as well. In fact, an examination of the hearings held by the Blatnik Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works reveals the details of an appalling number of indiscretions and irregularities on the part of State highway officers and employees, not in just a few States, but in many.

The conclusion is inescapable that the interstate highway program has suffered severely from deficiencies in the character and professional competence of many persons associated with it.

As has been shown, such legislation as exists, designed to authorize and encourage intergovernmental cooperation in the public personnel field, has been enacted on a piecemeal basis, with each provision having a very limited application. What is needed at this point is to encourage and authorize by the declaration of an affirmative policy, the development of cooperative relationships in the whole public personnel field between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the State and local governments on the other.

The better impulses of officials to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness in administration, through cooperative relationships with State and local authorities should not be frustrated by the absence of appropriate permissive legislation.

The drafting of the proposed legislation could be started by gathering together the provisions of existing law dealing with this problem. The next step would be to arrange these provisions in some logical manner as a step toward development of a broad statute of general application. Such an act might be called: "An act to authorize and encourage cooperative relations in public personnel administration."

The resulting draft should be examined from the point of view of adequacy of coverage seeking to discover omissions and inadequacies needing to be corrected, with a view to making generally applicable throughout government the kind of cooperative authorizations heretofore adopted to cover a problem involving interrelationships with respect to a single department or agency. Presumably, the U.S. Civil Service Commission would be the proper enforcing agency for such legislation.

It should not be necessary to approach the Congress for special legislation every time a Federal department or agency wants to improve its performance through more effective personnel relations with the State and local units with which its program responsibilities are shared. Where it is possible, federally created barriers should be eliminated; where this is not possible, procedures for circumventing them should be developed, if some of the currently pressing problems in the personnel field are to be solved.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON CALLS FOR TRUTH IN LENDING IN ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, consumers in this Nation can take strong encouragement from President Johnson's Economic Report to the Congress. The President said:

> The consumer must have access to clear, unambiguous information about products and services for sale.

This information, the President wrote, will enable the consumer "to reward with his patronage the most efficient producers and distributors, who offer the best value or the lowest price."

The need and right of the consumer to have this "clear, unambiguous information" about what he buys applies no less to the purchase of credit than to the purchase of goods.

The President pointed out:

> Confusing practices in disclosing credit rates and the cost of financing have made it difficult for consumers to shop for the best buy in credit.

Repeated hearings since 1960 on my truth-in-lending bill, before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency, have shown this time and again.

In his consumer message to the Congress in 1964, President Johnson firmly stated the policy of his administration in the protection of consumers. He told the Congress:

> The antiquated legal doctrine, let the buyer beware, should be superseded by the doctrine, let the seller make full disclosure.

Ethical businessmen who extend credit, as well as consumers, will welcome the President's strong reiteration last week of his wish to protect them through uniform disclosure legislation rather than regulation of credit rates. They should be reassured that the policy of the administration is to encourage competition in the marketplace, the basic principle of our economic system, and so to encourage business while helping consumers to make intelligent choices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the President's statement in the Economic Report on "Consumer Protection" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION

I have already asked for the cooperation of business and labor in preserving the stability of costs and prices. But the consumer also has a responsibility for holding the price line.

To fulfill his responsibility, the consumer must have access to clear, unambiguous information about products and services available for sale. This will enable him to reward with his patronage the most efficient producers and distributors, who offer the best value or the lowest price.

We should wait no longer to eliminate misleading and deceptive packaging and labeling practices which cause consumer confusion. The fair packaging and labeling bill should be enacted.

While the growth of consumer credit has contributed to our rising standard of living, confusing practices in disclosing credit rates and the cost of financing have made it difficult for consumers to shop for the best buy in credit.

Truth-in-lending legislation would provide consumers the necessary information, by requiring a clear statement of the cost of credit and the annual rate of interest.

Our legislation protecting the public from harmful drugs and cosmetics should be strengthened. I shall propose legislation for this purpose.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure has been engaged in investigating the investigative techniques of the Internal Revenue Service.

We have received considerable criticism from some of the higher officials of this Service—possibly because of the thoroughness and vigor of our study.

If there should be any doubt where the rank-and-file IRS employee stands on this matter, please take a look at the following editorial from the recent Bulletin of the 12th District of NAIRE—National Association of Internal Revenue Employees—which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC OFFICE IS A PUBLIC TRUST

"Eavesdropping, or such as to listen under walls or windows, or the eaves of a house, to harken after discourse, and thereupon to frame slanderous and mischievous tales, are a common nuisance and are punishable at the court-leet; or are indictable at the sessions, and punishable by finding sureties for their good behavior." Blackstone (4 Commentaries ch. 13 sec. 5(6)).

The article by Senator LONG which was printed in the November 20, 1965, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, is reprinted here for several reasons.

In the first place, the article concerns itself primarily with the Internal Revenue Service. Accordingly, as employees of IRS, most of us