

with regard to public buildings and their implications with respect to the vitality of the institutions which use them for their purposes.

In discussing an institution "clothed from the outset with convenience and dignity," he remarks: "The outer door, in bronze and glass," which is quite a specific description of the entrance of the New Senate Office Building, "is placed centrally in a symmetrical facade. Polished shoes glide silently over shining rubber to the glittering and silent elevator."

This was the issue the Senator from Illinois was much concerned about—polished rubber tile. This is all in "Parkinson's Law."

Then he talks about the receptions, and so on, and says:

"From behind closed doors will come the subdued noise of an ordered activity."

We had a problem with respect to the louvers in the doors. It seems as though this ordered activity was too noisy for the people in the halls.

"A minute later and you are ankle deep in the director's carpet."

This was objected to by the Senator from Illinois.

He says that this is supposed to indicate an organization or institution really alive and functioning, but that this is not correct.

"In point of fact you will have discovered nothing of the kind. It is now known that a perfection of planned layout is achieved only by institutions on the point of collapse."

I hope this does not apply to the U.S. Senate. To the extent that Mr. Parkinson's law applies—and it seems to have been proved correct on the record of history—I think we need to be concerned. He says further:

"During a period of exciting discovery or progress there is no time to plan the perfect headquarters. The time for that comes later, when all the important work has been done. Perfection, we know, is finality; and finality is death."

This may be an overstatement, but he does go to the record of history and makes a point with respect the Parliament buildings in London. He had this to say in that regard:

It represents, beyond question, a magnificent piece of planning, aptly designed for debate and yet provided with ample space for everything else—for committee meetings, for quiet study, for refreshment, and [on its terrace] for tea."

We have not gone that far yet.

"It has everything a legislator could possibly desire, all incorporated in a building of immense dignity and comfort. It should date—but this we now hardly dare assume—from a period when parliamentary rule was at its height. But once again the dates fail to fit into this pattern. The original House, where Pitt and Fox were matched in oratory, was accidentally destroyed by fire in 1834. It would appear to have been as famed for its inconvenience as for its lofty standard of debate. The present structure was begun in 1840, partly occupied in 1852, but incomplete when its architect died in 1860. It finally assumed its present appearance in about 1868. Now, by what we can no longer regard as coincidence, the decline of Parliament can be traced without much dispute, to the Reform Act of 1867."

That is 1 year before the completion of the building:

"It was in the following year that all initiative in legislation passed from Parliament to be vested in the Cabinet. The prestige attached to the letters "M.P." began sharply to decline and thence forward the most that could be said is that "a role, though a humble one, was left for private members." The great days were over."

Mr. President, I suggest that Members of the Senate and members of the Committee on Public Works give some thought to this matter. We have had a great rash of building on Capitol Hill. It is my opinion that the construction of the New Senate Office Building is a sign of a decline of the Senate. We have more room for public relations people and more room for service to our constituents. In fact, almost every office has become a kind of separate political headquarters, not simply for those who are running for the Presidency but also for those who are trying to do their jobs.

The House of Representatives was to be the branch of the people. It was hoped the House would be representative of the people. It was thought there might be some party discipline and unity. The House of Representatives is now constructing another office building.

I thought the least we could do, to establish some line of responsibility, was to have one office building reserved for Democrats and the other for Republicans. We have two office buildings for the Senate, yet that may not be enough. Perhaps we will need a third or a fourth, to give a proper distinction.