

Mr. MARGOLIUS. Being a native-born Washingtonian, I would have to agree with you about the Rayburn Building, but how it came to pass, I do not know.

Mr. JACOBS. They say a camel is an example of something done by a committee.

Mr. MARGOLIUS. I would say I have not analyzed the details of the bill per se, section by section, but there is a phase of this bill that is significant to a policeman. If I may expound just a moment—

Mr. JACOBS. I wish you would.

Mr. SISK. Would the gentleman yield for a clarifying question here? I lost the connection here about the Rayburn Building.

Mr. JACOBS. I will be glad to respond to my colleague.

A statement made in response to a question here indicated it was the thought of many police officers that the professionalism—I presume that means the efficiency and reliability of operations, the carrying out of plans—generally the professionalism of the Police Department would be upgraded if we in Congress controlled the police forces of the District of Columbia.

I am saying we built the Rayburn Building as a group.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has brought it up, and you have agreed with him. What is wrong with the Rayburn Building?

Mr. JACOBS. First, the ceiling is three times higher than it needs to be.

In the second place, it is too big.

In the third place, it is too ornate.

In the fourth place, which brings up the next point of whether it would lower the overhead of the Police Department, it cost at least two, maybe three times as much as was planned.

The fact of the matter is that the Congress does a fairly good job in legislating, but our past record of being executives by implementation through committee action has not been too good, and that is a conspicuous example.

That balustrade across the street on the Cannon Building is another conspicuous example.

I am trying to respond to the question of the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. I have great respect and admiration for my good friend from Indiana, and he knows this. I am one who happens to support the Rayburn Building and I believe we did a good job and built a good building, and as a resident in that building, I think it is an excellent facility and was much needed. I just want to say I disagree with my friend that that is an example of poor Congressional management.

With that, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. JACOBS. I will not respond further. There is an honest difference, and my colleague from California has an entirely honest mind.

Mr. MARGOLIUS. When I said something about the Rayburn Building, I meant I do not happen to agree with the architecture. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. WHITENER. If I may comment, in law school, we did not have any courses in architecture. I do not know where you went to law school.