

Y4
Ap 6/2:
L52/
964

1033

8814
HP 6/2
L52
964

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

GOVERNMENT

Storage

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 6868

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1964, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

KSU LIBRARIES



A11500 698679



CONTENTS

Page

THE HISTORY OF THE

REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FROM 1776 TO 1863

BY

JOHN F. JOHNSON

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

HEARINGS
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
H.R. 6868
MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1964, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1963

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California

Chairman HAYDEN, Arizona, Ex Officio

THOMAS J. SCOTT, *Clerk*

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1963

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m., pursuant to call, in room 1223, New Senate Office Building, Hon. A. S. Mike Monroney (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Monroney, Bartlett, Hayden, and Saltonstall.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

STATEMENTS OF JAMES L. HARRISON, PUBLIC PRINTER; HARRY D. MEROLD, DEPUTY PUBLIC PRINTER; FELIX E. CRISTOFANE, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER; HARRY J. HUMPHREY, DEPUTY COMPTROLLER; CARPER W. BUCKLEY, SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS; WILLIAM H. ADDISON, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS; AND MERRILL C. GLEASON, BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

AMOUNT REQUESTED

Senator MONRONEY. The Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations begins its hearings this afternoon on the budget estimates for fiscal year 1964.

We begin with the budget request for the Government Printing Office.

The first request is for \$18,200,000 for printing and binding, consisting of \$14 million estimated to be necessary for fiscal year 1964, and \$4,200,000 representing a deficiency for the fiscal year 1962.

Please proceed, Mr. Harrison, and make it clear how this deficiency situation has developed.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very pleased to have this opportunity of being here and to discuss with you some of the accomplishments, plans, and needs of the Government Printing Office.

The printing industry is undergoing a technological revolution, and we at the GPO are trying to keep abreast of the rapid changes in methods and machinery by choosing the best available equipment for replacement purposes.

MODERNIZATION OF PLANT

We have recently installed in our pressroom two web-fed offset presses, two radically new wraparound letterpresses, and a high-speed embossing press. A completely automatic machine for the production of notebooks is now in production in the bindery.

These are but a few of the many new machines that we are using to increase production through modernization. All proposed new equipment is carefully studied and evaluated to insure a recovery of costs within a reasonably short period of time. This is handled by a committee composed of top-level officials of the Office.

Continuing emphasis is being directed toward a program to preserve, by means of safe storage, electronic tape programs, manuals, personnel records, systems, rates, and other vital records, to the extent that printing services for the Government could be continued with a minimum of delay were the present facilities destroyed. Much of this material is being microfilmed for compact storage.

We are constantly seeking ways to produce printing for the Government more economically and more efficiently. With this in mind, we have established during the past year, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, an electronic research program.

We are presently engaged in evaluating and investigating the numerous electronic devices related to the printing industry which are becoming available, especially those which actuate typesetting machines by means of electronic tape. Some are being tested by actual production.

RESTRICTION ON APPRENTICE SCHOOL

Our apprentice school is functioning well with the maximum of 200 students enrolled, as provided by law. It is my hope that this restriction will be removed by legislation during the present session of Congress, thereby allowing us to train journeymen in a number more closely related to our needs.

Senator HAYDEN. What would be a suitable number?

Mr. HARRISON. Senator, it varies. We would much rather see the limit removed and let us have an apprentice class to more nearly meet our needs.

Senator MONRONEY. The fact that you would no longer have the maximum limit of 200, because in some years you might want to go to 300 or 400, does not mean that you have to guarantee their positions as journeyman printers when they finish their apprenticeship. They can go out with their union card and work any place?

Mr. HARRISON. They can, Senator; but we lose about 265 journeymen a year, and under this law we can only train 40, which means that we have to get the rest of the journeymen we need from industry. We proselyte from sunrise to sunset nearly every day to try to get good journeymen in our Office.

Senator MONRONEY. The 200 is not 200 a year, but it is for a 5-year period?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. And you could adequately fill a great many more positions?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir. I do not believe we would ever train all that we need, but we would like to train enough to more nearly meet our needs.

Even when we get journeymen from outside, we have to spend time training them before they are really capable of doing a good day's production, because our work is so different.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Chairman?

You may proceed.

SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. HARRISON. Because much of our work is of a hazardous nature, the Government Printing Office stresses a vigorous safety program. This has resulted in a lower frequency rate of lost-time accidents than last year, and a lower rate than that of the Government as a whole.

Indicative of our desire to work in close association with those who generate Government printing is the course we present in editorial planning for printing production. This course is for Federal employees engaged in writing, editing, or closely related work, and is designed to familiarize them with the preparation of copy and with printing processes, type use, and design techniques. This has brought about a better and more economical working relationship with these employees.

DIVISION OF TYPOGRAPHY AND DESIGN

In order to render greater service to the departments and agencies, we have recently enlarged our Division of Typography and Design. We are now prepared to offer advice and guidance in creative art work, special layout, and editorial preparation.

This has resulted in closer cooperation in fitting specifications to our facilities, and is producing savings both to our customers and to the Office.

FUNDS SITUATION

The revolving fund accounting system which was installed in the Government Printing Office during fiscal year 1954, through the efforts of this committee, has proved very satisfactory. Since that time, the Office has returned to the Treasury various sums totaling \$13 million.

During the past 2 years, however, a great increase in our production has put us in a precarious position in regard to available funds. The heavy volume of printing has resulted in more cash being tied up in work in process, materials inventories, and in accounts receivable.

PAPER INVENTORIES

Also affecting our cash position is the increase in paper inventories, made with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, to meet possible future emergencies.

This paper will, of course, be used for Government printing, but it represents an unusual investment of funds which reduces our available cash. Because of these various reasons, we find it necessary to request a working capital appropriation of \$11 million, for which we have submitted more detailed justifications for your information.

TOTAL WORKLOAD

During fiscal year 1962, our total workload, as measured by orders from the Congress and the departments, increased by 9,500, or approximately 10 percent over the preceding year. In the first 8 months of the present fiscal year, orders are running 2 percent more than in the same period of last year.

As of February 28, 1963, there were 6,776 full-time employees on the rolls. There were also 385 part-time employees working under the Office of the Superintendent of Documents and the Disbursing Officer.

INCREASE DUE TO INCREASING WORKLOAD

The justifications that have been prepared for fiscal year 1964 show a slight increase over last year. This is due primarily to an increasing volume of work as reflected in the requirements for fiscal year 1962. I will be pleased to submit these justifications for the record, or, if you prefer, I will read them item by item.

Senator MONRONEY. I think we will put the justification in the record at this point, if there is no objection.

(The justification referred to follows:)

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION ESTIMATES FOR CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING, FISCAL YEAR 1964

The estimates for congressional printing and binding are to provide funds with which to pay for the cost of printing and binding required for the use of Congress; for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register, and for printing and binding supplements to the Code of Federal Regulations.

Funds to cover the cost of the printing and binding needs of the various executive departments and independent establishments are not included in this appropriation but are provided for in the appropriation acts for the several departments and establishments. Thus the Government Printing Office bills the various agencies for the services performed.

The total amount estimated for congressional printing and binding for the fiscal year 1964 is \$18,200,000; \$14 million is estimated to provide for printing and binding work for Congress for the fiscal year 1964 and \$4,200,000 is required to reimburse the 1963 appropriation for charges incurred during prior fiscal years which are paid out of the 1963 appropriation, as authorized by law (Public Law 87-730, 87th Cong.) which states that the appropriation "shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years." This provision of law recognizes that there can be no effective means to determine in advance the volume of congressional printing which the Government Printing Office is called upon to produce.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1962 is \$13,400,000 of which \$10 million is for the estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1962, and \$3,400,000 is for obligations incurred in excess of 1960 appropriations. The total amount of expenditures and obligations incurred for the fiscal year 1962 amounted to \$14,200,000, thus leaving \$4,200,000 to be paid out of the 1963 appropriation.

The appropriation for congressional printing and binding for the fiscal year 1963 is \$15,200,000 including \$1,700,000 to cover a deficit incurred in the fiscal year 1961.

The following statement has been prepared showing:

1. Fiscal year 1962 expenditures billed through February 28, 1963.
2. Estimated outstanding obligations for fiscal year 1962, as of February 28, 1963.
3. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1962.
4. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1963.
5. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1964.
6. Estimated deficiency for fiscal year 1962.
7. Total estimated requirements for fiscal year 1964.

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

Statement of expenditures for fiscal year 1962 billed through Feb. 28, 1963; estimated outstanding fiscal year 1962 obligations as of Feb. 28, 1963; estimated expenditures for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, estimated deficiency for fiscal year 1962; total estimated requirements for fiscal year 1964

	Expenditures 1962—billed through Feb. 28, 1963 (1)	Estimated outstanding obligations 1962—as of Feb. 28, 1963 (2)	Estimated expenditures, 1962 (3)	Estimated expenditures, 1963 (4)	Estimated expenditures, 1964 (5)	Estimated deficiency, 1962 (6)	Total estimated requirements, 1964 \$ (7)
1. Congressional Record	\$2,757,704	\$79,000	\$2,827,704	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000	\$1,030,000	\$3,730,000
2. Miscellaneous publications	1,499,870	407,643	1,907,513	1,785,000	2,000,000	555,000	2,555,000
3. Miscellaneous printing and binding	1,542,534	11,253	1,553,787	1,320,000	1,540,000	500,000	2,040,000
4. Publications for international exchange	137,222	27,491	164,713	140,000	175,000	65,000	240,000
5. Franked envelopes and document franks	389,884	—	389,884	320,000	375,000	160,000	535,000
6. House and Senate calendars	618,969	—	618,969	730,000	550,000	120,000	670,000
7. Bills, resolutions, and amendments	1,102,046	—	1,102,046	1,130,000	1,200,000	200,000	1,400,000
8. Committee reports	607,049	—	607,049	600,000	600,000	160,000	760,000
9. Documents	482,599	25,794	508,393	380,000	500,000	210,000	710,000
10. Hearings	3,281,715	144,784	3,426,499	3,255,000	3,200,000	1,060,000	4,260,000
11. Federal Register, U.S. Government Organization Manual and Public Papers of the Presidents	729,737	—	729,737	785,000	778,000	105,000	883,000
12. Supplements to Code of Federal Regulations	360,644	3,000	363,644	355,000	385,000	35,000	417,000
Total	13,510,033	689,967	14,200,000	\$ 13,500,000	14,000,000	4,200,000	18,200,000

1 \$13,400,000 appropriated (Public Law 87-130, 87th Cong.) to cover \$3,400,000 estimated deficiency for fiscal year 1960 and \$10,000,000 estimated expenditure for fiscal year 1962. In addition to the \$10,000,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1962 obligations, there is a \$4,200,000 estimated deficit which is included in the fiscal year 1964 estimated requirements.

2 \$15,200,000 appropriated (Public Law 87-730, 87th Cong.) to cover \$4,700,000 estimated deficiency for fiscal year 1961 and \$13,500,000 estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1963.

The requirements under each item for the fiscal year 1964 are set forth briefly in the order named. All fiscal year 1962 figures in the following items are based on work billed through February 28, 1963.

1. *Congressional Record*.—The proceedings of the Senate and House of Representatives are printed daily in the Congressional Record. Approximately 40,700 copies are printed daily and distributed as provided by law, and are charged to the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress. There also are printed daily about 6,600 additional copies which are delivered and charged to Government departments on requisitions and to the Superintendent of Documents for sale to subscribers. After the close of each session, the daily proceedings are consolidated, indexed, and about 1,750 copies printed as the bound edition of the Record. The total cost to Congress of printing the daily edition and index of the Congressional Record in the fiscal year 1962 was \$2,257,704 for 30,089 pages of the daily edition and 1,505 pages of the index. The bound edition which was ordered in the fiscal year 1962 has been partially billed in the amount of \$500,000. It is estimated that \$70,000 will be required to complete this edition. This will bring the total estimated requirements for this item to \$2,827,704 for the fiscal year 1962. The estimate submitted for the fiscal year 1963 was \$2,700,000 for approximately 30,000 pages. It is estimated there will be 30,000 pages in the fiscal year 1964 and the cost will be \$2,700,000.

2. *Miscellaneous publications*.—This item includes printed matter such as the Congressional Directory, Senate and House Journals, memorial addresses, nominations, United States Code and Supplements, and publications not carrying a document or report number, such as laws, treaties, committee prints, and similar publications.

The expenditures for miscellaneous publications for the fiscal year 1962 were \$1,499,870 for 4,051,607 copies, making 71,247 pages and included all work billed through February 28, 1963. It has been estimated that the incompleting orders will amount to \$407,643. This will bring the requirements for this item to \$1,907,513 for the fiscal year 1962. The amount estimated for the fiscal year 1963 was \$1,785,000 for approximately 105,000 pages. It is estimated that \$2 million will be required in the fiscal year 1964 for approximately 100,000 pages.

3. *Miscellaneous printing and binding*.—This item includes letterheads, envelopes, blank paper, copy paper, notices, tags, labels, payrolls, blank books, stenographic notebooks, tablets, wall calendars, miscellaneous blank forms, and binding for both Houses.

The expenditures through February 28, 1963, for miscellaneous printing and binding amounted to \$1,542,544 for the fiscal year 1962 for 69,782,768 separate pieces. Incompleted orders estimated at \$11,255 will increase this item to \$1,553,799 for the fiscal year 1962. The estimate for the fiscal year 1963 was \$1,320,000 for approximately 55 million pieces. The estimate for the fiscal year 1964 is \$1,540,000 for about 70 million pieces.

4. *Publications for international exchange and the Library of Congress*.—As provided by law, the Library of Congress is supplied with not to exceed 150 copies of Government publications, including the daily and bound editions of the Congressional Record and certain other congressional publications of which not to exceed 125 copies shall be for distribution through the Smithsonian Institution, to such governments as may agree to send similar publications of their governments to the United States.

The charges through February 28, 1963, for these publications for the fiscal year 1962 orders amounted to \$137,222 for 1,151,878 copies. It has been estimated that \$27,491 will be required for the remaining outstanding orders resulting in an estimated requirement of \$164,713 for the fiscal year 1962. The estimate for the fiscal year 1963 was \$140,000 for 1,100,000 copies. It is estimated that \$175,000 will be needed for about 1,400,000 copies in the fiscal year 1964.

5. *Franked envelopes and document franks*.—Franked envelopes for mailing speeches and documents are furnished to Senators and Representatives, who are also furnished with franks for mailing documents, printed singly or in sheets with perforations at the option of the Member.

The expenditures for franked envelopes and document franks in the fiscal year 1962 amounted to \$389,884 for 86,485,150 envelopes and 4,183,150 franks. It was estimated that \$320,000 would be required in the fiscal year 1963 to print approximately 60 million envelopes and 4 million franks. It is estimated that \$375,000 will be needed in the fiscal year 1964 for approximately 80 million envelopes and 4 million franks.

6. *House and Senate committee calendars*.—This heading covers the printing of all House and Senate committee calendars which list the action of the various

committees on pending and completed legislation. The House and Senate business calendars are also included in this item.

The expenditures for all House and Senate committee and business calendars for the fiscal year 1962 were \$618,999 for 63,262 pages. The estimate for the cost of these calendars in the fiscal year 1963 was \$730,000 for approximately 65,000 pages. It is estimated that \$550,000 will be required in the fiscal year 1964 for approximately 50,000 pages.

7. *Bills, resolutions, and amendments.*—This heading covers the printing of bills, resolutions, and amendments in all forms, including the prints as introduced, referred, reported, and as finally passed.

The expenditures through February 28, 1963, for bills, resolutions, and amendments in the fiscal year 1962 amounted to \$1,102,046 for 99,621 pages. The estimate submitted for the fiscal year 1963 was \$1,130,000 for about 110,000 pages. The estimate for the fiscal year 1964 is \$1,200,000 for approximately 115,000 pages.

8. *Committee reports.*—This item covers printed reports of congressional committees on pending legislation.

The expenditures through February 28, 1963, for printing committee reports ordered in the fiscal year 1962 were \$607,049 for 31,201 pages. It was estimated that \$600,000 would be needed for approximately 35,000 pages in the fiscal year 1963. It is estimated that \$600,000 will be needed for about 30,000 pages in the fiscal year 1964.

9. *Documents.*—This heading includes all classes of Senate and House documents ordered printed by Congress which carry a congressional number, such as annual reports, engineers' reports, special reports made by Government departments in response to resolutions, supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations, etc.

The expenditures through February 28, 1963, for House and Senate documents ordered in the fiscal year 1962 amounted to \$482,599 for 22,140 pages. It has been estimated that \$508,393 will be required for this item, including \$25,794 for the incompleting orders for the fiscal year 1962. The estimate for the fiscal year 1963 was \$380,000 for about 16,000 pages. The estimate for the fiscal year 1964 is \$500,000 for about 20,000 pages.

10. *Hearings.*—This item covers all hearings before congressional committees.

The expenditures for hearings in the fiscal year 1962 through February 28, 1963, were \$3,281,715 for 189,669 pages. Outstanding orders have been estimated at \$144,784, resulting in a total requirement of \$3,426,499 for this class of work for the fiscal year 1962. The estimate for the fiscal year 1963 was \$3,255,000 for approximately 210,000 pages. The estimate for the fiscal year 1964 is \$3,200,000 for about 200,000 pages.

11. *Federal Register, including the U.S. Government Organization Manual and the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States.*—The Archivist of the United States and the Public Printer are charged with the printing and distribution, in a serial publication titled "Federal Register," of documents authorized to be published under the act of July 26, 1935, and the act of June 11, 1946. Funds to cover the cost of printing this publication are provided for in the appropriation for congressional printing and binding. The National Archives and Records Service has been authorized (13 F.R. 5935; 1 CFR pt. 31) to handle the U.S. Government Organization Manual as a special edition of the Federal Register. On November 6, 1957, the National Archives and Records Service was authorized (22 F.R. 8895; 1 CFR pt. 32) to begin printing as a special edition of the Federal Register the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States starting with the calendar year 1957 and specified calendar years prior to 1957 as authorized by the Administration Committee of the Federal Register. The cost of printing the U.S. Government Organization Manual and the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States is charged to the cost of printing the Federal Register (sec. 6, 49 Stat. 501; 44 U.S.C. 306).

The expenditures for the Federal Register, the U.S. Government Organization Manual, and the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States for all work ordered in the fiscal year 1962 amounted to \$729,757 for 16,444 pages, including \$22,276 for 767 pages of the U.S. Government Organization Manual and \$19,695 for 615 pages of the Public Papers of the Presidents. It was estimated that \$785,000 would be sufficient to cover the cost of approximately 15,000 pages of the Federal Register and for printing the U.S. Government Organization Manual and the Public Papers of the Presidents in the fiscal year 1963. It is estimated that \$778,000 will be required in the fiscal year 1964 for printing an estimated 15,000 pages of the Federal Register and for printing the U.S. Government Organization

Manual and the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States as supplemental editions of the Federal Register.

12. *Supplements to Code of Federal Regulations.*—The cost of printing the Supplements to the Code of Federal Regulations amounted to \$360,644 for 23,936 pages ordered in the fiscal year 1962. Additional requirements estimated at \$3,000 will bring the total for this class of work to \$363,644 for fiscal year 1962. It was estimated that \$355,000 would be sufficient for printing 25,250 pages of the supplements during the fiscal year 1963. It is estimated that \$382,000 will be required to print 25,500 pages of the supplements during the fiscal year 1964.

Average cost per unit of printing and binding chargeable to the congressional appropriation

	1964 estimate
1. Congressional Record.....per page..	\$90. 00
2. Miscellaneous publications.....do.....	20. 00
3. Miscellaneous printing and binding.....per 1,000..	22. 00
4. Publications for international exchange.....per copy..	. 125
5. Speech and document envelopes.....per 1,000..	4. 50
Document franks.....do.....	3. 50
6. Calendars.....per page..	11. 00
7. Bills, resolutions, and amendments.....do.....	10. 50
8. Committee reports.....do.....	20. 00
9. Documents.....do.....	25. 00
10. Hearings.....do.....	16. 00
11. Federal Register (not including U.S. Government Manual and Public Papers of the Presidents).....per page..	46. 00
12. Supplement to Code of Federal Regulations.....do.....	15. 00

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

Billings for work ordered in fiscal year as of Feb. 28, 1963

Fiscal year:	Amount	Fiscal year—Con.	Amount
1954.....	\$9, 840, 403. 69	1959.....	\$11, 544, 689. 14
1955.....	9, 083, 413. 32	1960.....	13, 072, 944. 37
1956.....	10, 321, 066. 01	1961.....	11, 508, 847. 45
1957.....	10, 076, 161. 84	1962.....	13, 510, 032. 18
1958.....	11, 391, 400. 67	1963 (8 months) ..	6, 452, 249. 37

NOTE.—With the inception of the revolving fund accounting system in fiscal year 1954, all billings for each fiscal year are based on the orders received during the respective fiscal year.

Employees on roll

Fiscal year	As of 1—	Number	Fiscal year	As of 1—	Number
1954.....	Jan. 1, 1954	7, 148	1959.....	Feb. 28, 1959	6, 513
1955.....	June 1, 1955	6, 803	1960.....	Feb. 29, 1960	6, 547
1956.....	Apr. 1, 1956	6, 687	1961.....	Feb. 28, 1961	6, 614
1957.....	Mar. 15, 1957	6, 490	1962.....	Feb. 28, 1962	6, 887
1958.....	Mar. 31, 1958	6, 432	1963.....	Feb. 28, 1963	7, 161

¹ Based on information developed annually for hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Requisitions and print orders received

Fiscal year:	Number	Fiscal year—Con.	Number
1954.....	83, 639	1959.....	99, 293
1955.....	94, 018	1960.....	100, 162
1956.....	92, 904	1961.....	99, 340
1957.....	95, 279	1962.....	108, 840
1958.....	92, 671	1963 (8 months) ..	71, 025

Total billings, including all field work

Fiscal year:	Amount	Fiscal year—Con.	Amount
1954-----	\$71,280,536.48	1959-----	\$90,728,052.47
1955-----	77,261,053.75	1960-----	95,644,677.72
1956-----	82,453,884.66	1961-----	96,058,298.76
1957-----	93,641,307.04	1962-----	120,262,670.56
1958-----	87,166,185.77	1963 (8 months)---	86,635,995.53

Total gross expenditures (including sales of publications)

Fiscal year:	Amount	Fiscal year—Con.	Amount
1954-----	\$91,846,000	1960-----	\$103,192,000
1955-----	84,027,000	1961-----	96,262,000
1956-----	87,182,000	1962-----	122,674,000
1957-----	88,132,000	1963 (estimated)---	123,837,000
1958-----	89,871,000	1964 (estimated)---	123,789,000
1959-----	95,866,000		

Value of outside purchases based on billings

Fiscal year:	Amount	Fiscal year—Con.	Amount
1954-----	\$18,273,329.08	1959-----	\$27,229,082.72
1955-----	20,343,177.66	1960-----	30,166,932.70
1956-----	21,420,761.04	1961-----	31,728,996.74
1957-----	25,476,038.24	1962-----	40,928,891.79
1958-----	27,962,333.00	1963 (8 months)---	31,860,152.84

INCREASE IN WORKING CAPITAL—GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING
FUND

Appropriation to increase the Government Printing Office revolving fund----- \$11,000,000

This appropriation is requested in order to finance the increased volume of Government printing and binding, and to provide for essential printing services during a national emergency.

1. The Joint Committee on Printing has approved plans to increase our paper inventories by 25 million pounds, and increase our carton inventories by 375,000 cartons. These supplies would be available in the event of a national emergency. Accordingly, we have increased our paper inventories by 10 million pounds, valued at \$1,500,000. We estimate the value of additional procurement of paper and cartons to be approximately \$2,250,000. [The cost of acquiring 25 million pounds of paper (and 375,000 cartons) is estimated to be \$0.13333 per pound, plus 12½ percent materials handling expenses (\$0.01667 per pound).¹ This is based upon current market valuations of common paper stocks. The materials handling charge includes the labor, warehousing, and related costs necessary to maintain the paper in good condition.]

2. On February 1, 1954, \$5 million of the Government Printing Office revolving fund capital was returned to the Treasury. An additional \$8 million was returned to the Treasury from operations in 1955 and 1956. Circumstances were such that these amounts were considered excessive to the needs of our operations.

3. On June 30, 1957, cash on hand amounted to \$11,516,381, accounts receivable were \$6,725,096 and inventories were \$19,262,494. Total liabilities amounted to \$9,004,710. On February 28, 1963, cash on hand amounted to \$2,276,806, accounts receivable were \$9,775,945, and inventories were \$33,458,103. Total liabilities amounted to \$13,825,893. During this time we have experienced a heavy increase in the volume of our business. We invest in labor, materials, and services based upon Government orders for printing and binding. We collect from the departments and agencies after the work is completed and billed. As the volume of business (orders) increases, our investment in labor, materials, and services increases. The amount of financing required to meet these initial investments, and sustain higher receivable and inventory balances increases accordingly.

¹ (\$0.13333 plus \$0.01667 equals \$0.15 per lb.; 25,000,000 lb. by \$0.15 per lbs. equals \$3,750,000.)

4. In order to provide the revolving fund with the working capital necessary to finance the increased volume of printing and binding operations, an increase of \$11 million is recommended, as follows:

To finance emergency procurement:

Paper and envelopes.....	\$3, 750, 000
Materials and supplies.....	500, 000

Total.....	4, 250, 000
------------	-------------

To provide funds necessary to finance the increased volume of business.....	6, 750, 000
---	-------------

Total.....	11, 000, 000
------------	--------------

5. If the Office accumulates a surplus of cash in the future, we expect to return it to the Treasury. This has been our practice in the past (see item 2).

FUNDS NECESSARY TO FINANCE THE INCREASED VOLUME OF BUSINESS AND FOR EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS

From the inception of the revolving fund accounting system in July 1953 to October 18, 1956, the Government Printing Office returned \$13 million to the Treasury which was considered at that time to be in excess of the needs of the Office. Table 1 below indicates the increases in our current assets and liabilities and the decrease in our cash account since the last return of cash to the Treasury. With the increased volume of business during the past 2 years from \$98 million for fiscal year 1961 to \$122,500,000 in fiscal year 1962 and an estimated \$133 million for fiscal year 1963, it was necessary to convert our cash into other current assets as indicated in the following table:

TABLE 1

Item No.	Account or explanation	June 30, 1957	Feb. 28, 1963	1957 increase (decrease)	Turnover period (time to convert to cash)	Cash required
1	Cash.....	\$11, 516, 000	\$2, 277, 000	(\$9, 239, 000)	Daily operations.	\$4, 179, 000
2	Receivables.....	6, 725, 000	9, 776, 000	3, 051, 000	1 month.....	254, 000
3	Work in process and finished work.	12, 328, 000	24, 437, 000	12, 109, 000	2 months.....	2, 018, 000
4	Paper and materials.....	6, 934, 000	9, 021, 000	2, 086, 000	4 months.....	147, 000
5	Other current assets.....	242, 000	433, 000	191, 000	-----	-----
	Total.....	37, 746, 000	45, 944, 000	8, 198, 000	-----	-----
6	Accounts payable.....	2, 365, 000	4, 191, 000	1, 826, 000	1 month.....	152, 000
7	Other current liabilities.....	3, 958, 000	7, 027, 000	3, 069, 000	-----	-----
	Total.....	6, 323, 000	11, 218, 000	4, 895, 000	-----	-----
8	Change in working capital.....	31, 423, 000	34, 726, 000	3, 303, 000	-----	-----
9	Funds required to finance increased volume of business.....					6, 750, 000
10	Increase in paper inventory authorized by Joint Committee on Printing, 25,000,000 by \$0.15.					3, 750, 000
11	Increase of materials and supplies inventory (inventory Feb. 28, 1963, \$1,885,327 less inventory Oct. 31, 1958, \$1,362,910 equals \$522,417).					500, 000
	Total requirement to finance increased volume of business and for emergency requirements.					11, 000, 000

The request for \$6,750,000 (item 9) shown in the above tabulation is based on the following:

The increases indicated for receivables, work in process and finished work, and paper and materials, as well as the increase in our accounts payable, were used to determine the requirements for additional cash. We have determined the turnover period required for financing these items and have used this turnover period basis to determine the cash requirements for each of the items as follows:

1. *Receivables (item 2).*—The turnover basis for the increase in receivables of \$3,051,000 averages 1 month. We, therefore, divided the \$3,051,000 by 12 to arrive at the \$254,000 amount for this item.

2. *Work in process and finished work (item 3).*—The turnover period for work in process and finished work averages 2 months. We, therefore, divided the \$12,109,000 amount by 6 and arrived at the \$2,018,000 amount required for this item.

3. *Paper and materials (item 4).*—The paper and materials inventory increased \$2,086,000. As we have included \$1,500,000 of this amount in our paper and envelopes justification for the \$3,750,000 amount (item 10), we have deducted the \$1,500,000 from the \$2,086,000 increase. This leaves \$586,000. Using the quarterly turnover period, we divided the amount of \$586,000 by 4 to develop the \$147,000 cash requirement.

4. *Other current assets (item 5).*—The other current asset items amounting to \$191,000 will be financed out of our regular operations and we are not requesting additional cash for these items.

5. *Accounts payable (item 6).*—The increase in accounts payable of \$1,826,000 has caused some difficulty in keeping payments to our contractors on a current basis. The turnover period for this item is 1 month. We, therefore, divided the \$1,826,000 increase of accounts payable by 12 to arrive at the \$152,000 cash requirement.

6. *Other current liabilities (item 7).*—This item includes accrued expenses such as payrolls, tax deductions, employee contributions and liability for funds collected in advance from customers which can be financed through our regular operations. Therefore, no cash is being requested for this item.

7. *Daily cash requirements (item 1).*—As indicated in table 1, the four items (items 2, 3, 4, 6) amount to \$2,571,000. The remaining \$4,179,000 of the \$6,750,000 item is necessary to meet our current daily cash requirements of about \$538,000. Our experience has indicated that we need a 12-working-day supply of cash to operate efficiently. Therefore, 12 times the \$538,000 amount equals \$6,456,000 which is needed to meet our day-to-day obligations. At the time of this study we had \$2,277,000 in our cash account. Therefore, we deducted the \$2,277,000 from the \$6,456,000 to arrive at our current requirements for our day-to-day operations of \$4,179,000.

8. *Paper, materials and supplies, emergency requirements (items 10, 11).*—In order to finance inventories of paper and envelopes, materials and supplies for use in case of an emergency, we believe the minimum requirements for increasing these inventories to be valued at \$4,250,000. The Joint Committee on Printing has authorized the plans for increasing the paper and envelope inventory by 25 million pounds valued at \$3,750,000 (25 million pounds $\times$ \$0.15 per pound). The increase in the materials and supplies inventory of \$500,000 is also necessary for emergency use in connection with the use of paper.

TOTAL BUSINESS FOR 1963

Senator HAYDEN. What is the total amount of your business a year?

Mr. HARRISON. Last year, Senator, it reached approximately \$123 million. The present forecast for this year is between \$133 and \$137 million.

That is a jump in 2 years from \$97 million, which has increased our whole operation expenses. It increases the raw material investment. It increases the value of work in process. It increases our accounts receivable.

So that the money which is in our cash revolving fund is now squeezed very closely, when we have to meet a payroll every 2 weeks of nearly \$2 million. We need a 12-working-day capital to operate a business of that size, and we do not have it.

We have about 3 days, or 4 days working capital now, and that is too close for a business the size of ours.

DEFICIT IN OPERATIONS

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

I have been looking at these figures. You run a deficit. For instance, this year you are asking us to take care of a deficit of \$4,200,000 for the fiscal year 1962, and in 1963 you had this other figure, and so on.

Does it take 2 years to get your bills out and to know what your deficit is for any one year?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, generally, Senator, because we have so much work still in process at the end of the year, and by the time the work is completed, for instance, the Congressional Record, we never get our bound copies of the Congressional Record out until the following year. So we cannot make a final billing on that until it is completed and our costs are actually known.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Of course, as you know, Mr. Harrison, the whole argument this year is to keep our expenses down as low as we can.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

FUNDING TO ABOLISH DEFICIT

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now you are asking us to provide a budget for this year of \$14 million, which is \$500,000 up from last year, but you are asking us to put in addition to that \$4,200,000 for a deficit in 1962.

Now, why is it not much better, where you know you are running these deficits, that we appropriate more money, so that for 1964 you would hope you would operate within it, and not run a deficit?

Mr. HARRISON. In 1964, Senator, we hope we are doing that. The difficulty we have, of course, is knowing in advance how much printed material Congress is going to need. We tried that for a long time, and it just never seems to run out even.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Why did you run such a big deficit for 1962?

Mr. HARRISON. Because our business was so much more than we had anticipated.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And it was more than in 1963?

Mr. HARRISON. In 1963, we do not know.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You do not know at all?

Mr. HARRISON. We do not know for fiscal 1963 yet. We feel that the amount that was appropriated last year for fiscal 1963 will cover the cost of this year.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But it was \$700,000 under what you spent in 1962?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right, sir.

Historically speaking, this is a year that should cost less, and we have no other basis upon which to estimate this in advance, because we do not know how much printing Congress is going to need.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So what you are telling us is that if we appropriate \$14 million this year, that ought to cover, without any deficit, your estimated expenditures for 1964?

Mr. HARRISON. Unless the unsuspected happens, and Congress stays in session continuously next year, which hardly is likely.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Is \$14 million going to be enough?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe so. The year starts July 1, and runs until the following June 30.

ESTIMATED INCREASE DUE TO LONG TERMS

Senator SALTONSTALL. Assume Congress ran until the middle of November. How much would that increase your estimates?

Mr. HARRISON. I wish there was some way we could look into the crystal ball and tell. But the only thing we can do is to make an educated guess, and this, in our opinion, will cover us in fiscal 1964, \$14 million.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And our only answer, if we have to explain why you are running this big deficit in 1962, is that you had a lot of work that you did not expect?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right, sir. It was an exceedingly heavy session.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In the legislative process?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. This is only legislative. This thing that we are talking about now covers legislative entirely.

Senator MONRONEY. That is the \$14 million?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. But the \$14 million represents a portion of the \$123 million worth of printing business that you did last year, or will do this year, and the \$133 to \$137 million that you expect to do next year?

Mr. HARRISON. It is the 1964 fiscal year that I am referring to; yes, sir.

DECREASE IN EMPLOYEES

Senator BARTLETT. I am curious as to why the number of employees in 1954 was higher than for several years thereafter. I am reading from a table you supplied.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, in 1954, and for the few years previous to that, we were in a pretty general wartime status. World War II and the Korean war had come along, so that the need was for more employees.

Then, too, a modernization program, which started about that time, enabled the Office to operate with fewer employees, because of modernized equipment.

Of course, our business now having increased the way it has, even with our modern equipment, we are now back to about 7,100 employees.

Senator BARTLETT. You now have about the same number you had in 1954.

Mr. HARRISON. In 1954 we were doing about a \$75 million volume of business with 7,148 employees, and in 1963 we estimate approximately \$133 million with about the same number of employees.

INCREASE IN PRODUCTIVITY

Senator BARTLETT. The productivity has increased notably during that period.

Mr. HARRISON. And there has been a slight increase in cost, but there has been a tremendous increase in volume.

PERSONNEL INCREASE REQUEST

Senator MONRONEY. Are you not asking for 264 more persons for 1963?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes in the Office of the Superintendent of Documents. Under the law we are authorized to employ enough personnel

to do the work that we have to do in the operation of the plant. There is no limit, except for our apprentices.

Senator MONRONEY. This figure, then, that I have, for 1963, as of the 28th of February, of 7,161, would be including the Superintendent of Documents and your own as well?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir. Of course, it is all a part of the Government Printing Office.

ORIGIN OF 1962 DEFICIT

Senator MONRONEY. I do not think you have quite explained to us exactly where the \$4,200,000 deficiency for 1962 occurred.

I have the tables here, but I do not think it is clear exactly where the major part of that deficit rests.

Mr. CRISTOFANE. Under the law enacted a few years back, in view of the fact that it was impossible to determine in advance the amount for congressional printing and binding, it was determined that the current appropriation would be made available to pay for deficits incurred in prior years, and this \$4,200,000 is desired to pay for obligations that were incurred as deficits in the prior year for congressional printing and binding.

Senator MONRONEY. You never have cleared it up?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. This should clear it up.

Senator MONRONEY. This is a replenishment, then, of the revolving fund?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. And beginning this current year, with \$14 million, we believe that it will be sufficient to take care of the fiscal year without having to get an additional appropriation to repay part of a prior year.

Senator MONRONEY. But this is, then, the accumulation of a number of withdrawals from the revolving fund, because of not knowing exactly what the Congress was going to require?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. Expenses for congressional printing and binding that could not have been determined in advance, and were not included in the prior appropriation.

LIST OF DEFICITS BY YEARS

Senator MONRONEY. Would you submit for the record the deficits that were run from 1954, by years?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. I would appreciate that.

(The list of deficits referred to follows:)

TABLE 1.—*Deficits of appropriations for congressional printing and binding, fiscal years 1954-63*

Fiscal year:	Amount	Fiscal year—Continued	Amount
1954.....	0	1959.....	\$1,700,000
1955.....	\$700,000	1960.....	3,400,000
1956.....	1,700,000	1961.....	1,700,000
1957.....	900,000	1962.....	4,200,000
1958.....	1,500,000	1963.....	0

QUESTION OF PROFIT ON OPERATIONS

Senator MONRONEY. You refer in your statement, Mr. Harrison, on page 3, to the fact that \$13 million in various sums has been returned to the Treasury. Was this a \$13 million profit on your operations?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, all except \$5 million; \$5 million was paid return of capital out of the revolving fund.

Senator MONRONEY. So it would represent a net gain to the Government, in the operation, of \$8 million. In other words, the \$5 million—

Mr. HARRISON. Actually, Senator, it was cash that the Public Printer at that time felt was more than he needed to operate his business. And under the revolving fund, he turned this back to the Treasury.

Senator MONRONEY. It was unnecessary to carry it forward on his books, so it does not necessarily represent a profit over what the printing cost you?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right. He felt it was more than he needed. Now our business has grown so that we realize now, after the fact, that it was a mistake, and we do desperately need a portion of this money back in our revolving fund, not to spend, but to give us a cushion on which to operate.

METHOD OF ASCERTAINING OPERATION AT COST

Senator MONRONEY. Do you estimate costs and then place a markup on your charges to other Government agencies?

Mr. HARRISON. We are supposed to operate at cost, under the law.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, now, would the cost be the exact cost of the paper and the time and the printing and machinery and all, or do you figure a contingency in there to take care of the general shift in estimates?

Mr. HARRISON. We never, of course, try to operate at a loss. We attempt to bill at as near cost as we can. Even in a business of \$120 million, 1 percent over or under would give you a million-and-a-half-dollar profit or loss, so there is very little leeway in our operation.

Senator MONRONEY. You have virtually \$110 million of sales to other Government agencies, do you not?

Mr. HARRISON. Other than Congress, you mean?

Senator MONRONEY. Yes; \$14 million to Congress, roughly, and \$123 million last year to Government agencies?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. So you have a production of \$110 million.

Now, in order to be on the safe side, you like to come out with income of that much or more from the Government departments, do you not?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. And do you figure you break even on that business for the last year?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. We lost a little money one year. In 1961 we lacked \$809,000 of breaking even. But that is the only year since 1954 that we have had a deficit.

Senator MONRONEY. You have had slight surpluses?

Mr. HARRISON. We have had surpluses of \$3 million, \$2 million, \$1 million—

SHORT RECORD OF SURPLUSES

Senator MONRONEY. Would you put that in the record from the time of the establishment of the revolving fund? In 1954, I think you said.

Mr. HARRISON. We would be glad to.
(The information referred to follows:)

TABLE 2.—*Profits and losses from printing and binding operations, Government Printing Office revolving fund, fiscal year 1954 through Apr. 30 of fiscal year 1963*

Fiscal year:	Net profit or loss (—)	Fiscal year—Continued	Net profit or loss (—)
1954-----	\$3, 483, 727	1960-----	\$1, 264, 135
1955-----	3, 156, 673	1961-----	—809, 188
1956-----	3, 203, 201	1962-----	2, 326, 531
1957-----	2, 971, 901	1963 through Apr. 30,	
1958-----	975, 037	1963-----	1, 393, 420
1959-----	1, 218, 169		

AMOUNT FOR REVOLVING FUND

Senator SALTONSTALL. Might I ask a question on that subject?

Mr. Harrison, I note you are requesting, this year, \$11 million for this revolving fund about which the chairman has been talking. Now, that came in in a special message from the President after the budget was submitted.

Now, you say that you need a bigger revolving fund than you have. My question is this: What would happen if we knocked out that \$11 million?

RESULT OF DENIAL OF FUNDS

Mr. HARRISON. It would mean one of two things, Senator: We would have to then say to the Departments of the Government, "Gentlemen, we are sorry, but we cannot handle any more printing from you than we are presently handling."

This would mean that the Departments would then go to the Joint Committee on Printing with requests for printing equipment for themselves on the basis that the GPO could not supply their needs as required by section 111 of title 44. Such a move would add considerably to the cost of Government printing. In addition to that, we would have to bill in advance for work in process, which the law allows, but which would not be an economical operation.

It would mean two times the work in billing. We would have to bill during process of the work, and at the end of it we would have to figure our costs and rebill.

It would not enable us to buy the 25 million pounds of paper authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing for emergency requirements and material and supplies necessary for use of this paper. It would also create an allaround inefficient operation, owing to a lack of sufficient cash for operations.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And you say you have a 3-day working capital now?

Mr. HARRISON. Just about; yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And this \$11 million would give you a 12-day working capital?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir; including \$4,250,000 to be used for the purchase of the paper for emergency requirements as authorized

by the Joint Committee on Printing, and for supplies necessary in connection with the use of this paper, as well as \$2,571,000 to finance increases in receivables, work in process, and finished work inventories and accounts payable.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So the purpose of this \$11 million, from this year's appropriation, would be to increase your working capital from 3 to 12 days?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right, sir. It would give us sufficient cash in our working capital for all operations.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And that is its purpose?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir. And this is spelled out in the supporting statements which are included with my opening statement, which boils it right down to how much it takes us to operate, and it gives that amount of money.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that if we wanted to cut it down to 7 days, instead of 12 days, what we would do is to cut out some of this?

Mr. HARRISON. We would have to. And in meeting the payroll and paying our bills, we must have a certain amount of money in an operation this big.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRISON. And it is our feeling, if you will pardon me, that I am afraid a commercial company would shudder if they had to operate a \$130 million business with only our present supply of cash.

METHOD OF WAGE DETERMINATION

Senator MONRONEY. How are the wages set for the employees of the Government Printing Office?

Mr. HARRISON. The administrative wages are set by the Public Printer on a comparable basis to those established by the Classification Act under authority of the Kiess Act.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be a very small percentage, would it not, of your payroll? I mean in numbers?

Mr. HARRISON. No, it would be a fair percentage; between 15 and 20 percent.

The other wages are set under the Kiess Act, which directs for journeymen that the Public Printer shall meet with his employees once a year at a conference to discuss wages, and then will make them an offer, which, if they accept, is forwarded to the congressional Joint Committee on Printing for their approval or rejection, as the case may be.

USE OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE

Senator MONRONEY. Roughly that follows fairly close to the blue collar worker formula, does it not?

Mr. HARRISON. Pretty generally. Actually, the way we have done it for a number of years is on a weighted average. The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides us with a weighted average of that trade in the 25 largest cities by population, and we offer our journeymen, then, that weighted average salary.

Senator MONRONEY. When you increase wages, do you pass the increase on immediately to other Government agencies?

Mr. HARRISON. No, only if we need to, to recover costs.

Senator MONRONEY. Would you not have to do that, generally, if you have but very little profit?

BILLING PRICE OF PRINTING

Mr. HARRISON. From 1954, Senator, until 1961, there was no increase in our billing price of printing.

Senator MONRONEY. You recovered costs, in other words, by more efficiency and modernization?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right. Since then, we have had to increase rates, because there comes a time when you no longer can absorb it all. You finally are faced with either increasing your prices or reducing your wages.

Senator MONRONEY. I know commercial printers and magazine publishers and others have told us a great deal about the doubling of their costs.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes.

DELAY IN IMPLEMENTING GAO AUDIT

Senator MONRONEY. What has delayed the implementation of the recommendation of the General Accounting Office, in 1961, regarding the three accounting systems then maintained by GPO? The General Accounting Office recommended they be integrated?

That is on page 6 of the GAO audit.

Mr. CRISTOFANE. That has been worked out with the General Accounting Office, and that is being implemented at the present time.

Senator MONRONEY. It will be implemented, then, sometime this year, so you will have only one auditing system for the whole Printing Office? Is that correct?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. Yes, sir.

USE OF REQUESTED INCREASE IN WORKING CAPITAL

Senator MONRONEY. The \$11 million that you are requesting is an increase in your working capital for the revolving fund, and that will not result in any expenditure, but will be reflected in an increase in assets, or in the capital, you might say?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. And probably if deficits do not occur, or if they are promptly picked up, this \$11 million will continue to be available from now on—just the additional length of time because of the volume of business, that you have to have more operating days, capital ahead in the revolving fund?

Mr. HARRISON. An example: A few years ago our accounts receivable would not run higher than \$5 million. Now it runs as high as \$12 million. It is all good. It is just a matter of getting it in. And that increases our cash outflow terrifically.

Senator MONRONEY. It is all from Government departments, of course?

Mr. HARRISON. All from Government departments.

PRESENT STATUS OF REVOLVING FUND

Senator MONRONEY. What is the extent of the revolving fund at the present time? How much?

Mr. HARRISON. The total value? About \$133 million.

Now, that is not our cash.

Senator MONRONEY. No; I am talking about the revolving fund, that we are adding this \$11 million to.

Mr. HARRISON. You mean our working capital fund? The paid-in capital amounts to \$31 million.

Senator MONRONEY. Are we talking about the same thing? This is the money to which the \$11 million you are asking for will be added?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. The amount that the \$11 million will be added to will be the cash we have on hand, and the amount we had on hand as of February 28, 1963, was only \$2,277,000.

RECEPTION OF REQUEST FOR REVOLVING FUND INCREASE

Mr. HARRISON. And that fluctuates with the accounts receivable, of course, and if we had a payroll, following along, there would be \$2 million to come out of that to pay the payroll.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you know if there is concurrence in your request to increase the revolving fund? Did the General Accounting Office concur in this request to increase the working cash capital we are talking about?

Mr. CRISTOFANE. I do not know. We did not ask them formally.

The General Accounting Office has an audit representative in the Government Printing Office, and it was discussed with him informally but we have never asked formally.

Senator MONRONEY. That is a business decision, probably, that Congress has to make.

If you only have roughly \$2 million or \$3 million, and your payroll would be most of that, then you would have to replenish the cash portion of your revolving fund. That does not mean that you do not have an adequate revolving fund on hand, because your accounts receivable, when they are paid, are good.

Mr. HARRISON. That is right. And in addition if our accounts payable were all paid at this time—it would cause a deficit of over \$2 million in cash.

BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Senator MONRONEY. The budget submitted by the President recommends \$3,758,000 for an additional amount for acquisition of site and construction of an annex for the Government Printing Office. As I recall, you received \$6,450,000 for this purpose last year. What is the story with respect to this request?

REQUEST FOR DELETION OF FUNDS

Mr. HARRISON. Since becoming Public Printer, Mr. Chairman, so many things have developed that it makes us desire to have this \$3,758,000 struck from the bill this year. We need time to thoroughly review our building needs and come back to you at a time when we can determine more definitely what our requirements are.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, to leave the \$6,450,000 appropriated stand, but hold in abeyance the request from the budget of \$3,758,000, striking it from the bill this year?

Mr. HARRISON. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. What is the story behind this?

Of course, we are glad this year to save any dollars we possibly can.

HISTORY OF BUILDING REQUEST

Mr. HARRISON. The original \$6,450,000 was voted for a four story building, with the understanding that we would go on up an additional four floors to alleviate the space problem that we had. We were in the process of doing that when this bill was put in for the additional \$3,758,000, for the other four floors.

The National Capital Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia urged that we not consider eight floors, that it would not be in keeping with the plans for the area around the Government Printing Office.

They would allocate land to spread out, but they did not want us to go up. And then we instituted an additional study as to what we did need in the way of spreading out, and we have uncovered many costs in our present method of handling material vertically, which we think requires a great deal of thought and study before we spend any of this money at all.

We do not believe that what was asked for 6 years ago is now the answer.

SAVINGS TURNED OVER TO GSA

Senator MONRONEY. Since this is a very tight year, why not apply that \$6,450,000 on your \$11 million request?

Mr. HARRISON. That money has already been turned over to the General Services Administration, as was directed in the bill which appropriated the money, and this was appropriated strictly to build on this particular plot, and not anywhere else.

Senator MONRONEY. But you do not intend to build on a particular lot?

Mr. HARRISON. We are not sure yet.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO FREE FUNDS

Senator MONRONEY. But you are talking about the vertical costs, and other things that may make it advisable to have a completely new site.

I was just thinking about the impact on the Federal budget, and if we could get that \$6,450,000 back, that would go a long way toward the \$11 million cash requested for your revolving fund.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, I am not a lawyer, but the law having been enacted for a specific purpose, it would seem to me that a new law would be required to free the money.

Senator MONRONEY. I will bet our attorneys could find out how to free it. The committee will investigate that.

Mr. HARRISON. Senator, we hope that before this session of Congress is over, we will have completed the study and will be able to move toward this building, either where we are or some place else, so that this money will be needed, I think, before this fiscal year ends, or certainly by the next fiscal year.

PROVISIONS OF BUILDING AUTHORIZATION

Senator MONRONEY. I wonder if we are doing right by rushing this matter. It takes a little study. In looking at the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act 1963, Public Law 87-730:

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the act approved October 4, 1961, Public Law 87-373, \$6,450,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available until transfer of administrative or general services.

You say it has been transferred to General Services. I think we could have it transferred back.

Mr. HARRISON. But the law specifies how this money shall be used, and it was so enacted, to purchase and build on a specified tract of ground.

Senator MONRONEY. That is the authorizing legislation, apparently, the act approved October 4, 1961.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. The committee will give special attention to that.

EVALUATING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

And I do not know whether you are far enough along to know exactly whether this is the course we should follow or not. I note that you state that you are investigating and still evaluating the numerous electronic devices related to the printing industry which are becoming available.

Specifically, are you familiar with the use of electronic computers to operate linecasting machines more economically, as is being done, I understand, by some newspapers in Oklahoma?

Mr. HARRISON. We know about that, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, I do not think you have been able to justify a computer system. I think you have the tape system, but linecasting computers, I understand, have been installed in very few places.

Mr. HARRISON. We have two 1401 computers, and we handle many operations with them. We prepare the payroll and checks with them, keep our time records and costs with them.

Senator MONRONEY. I am talking about typesetting.

Mr. HARRISON. We have linofilm keyboard units installed and justowriters. We have the International Business Machine 1401 computers, two of them. We have the only linofilm output converter which converts magnetic tape to paper punched tape, and we are getting a converter that will take it from paper tape to magnetic tape.

This is all in the process of study and trial. It is in the future. What we are asking here, in our revolving fund, in my opinion would have no bearing on what we are doing on this.

Senator MONRONEY. I am talking about the new building. In other words, if there are going to be a lot of electronic developments in printing, the type of plant you would require would be different from that which had the normal linotype and stereotype and other old-fashioned equipment. Offset printing, for example.

OFFSET PRINTING

Are you doing much on offset?

Mr. HARRISON. Fifty percent of our work is offset. And we have much of the latest equipment. We have web-fed offset presses. I do not believe there is a plant in the country that has more modern equipment.

We do not have our plant completely modernized. We have a lot of old equipment that we are still using. But we are certainly keeping up with the industry.

Senator MONRONEY. And 50 percent of the production. That would be 50 percent, roughly, of the \$123 million, for this year, in offset?

Mr. HARRISON. And the rest in letterpress.

Senator MONRONEY. You are completely in linotype, or hot metal, are you not?

Mr. HARRISON. And much of it is run offset. The Record, of course, is printed on high-speed rotary letterpresses.

Senator MONRONEY. You feel there are some chances of reducing the costs of our printing for Government and for Congress, and we are as fully automated as we can go in the Printing Office?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir; at the present time. But we feel it is not going to be done tomorrow or the next day. It will be a process of trial and error before any of these new processes are perfected.

MACHINERY AND MANPOWER PROBLEMS

Senator MONRONEY. Are we to assume the installation of more sophisticated printing machinery will not reduce your manpower problems?

Mr. HARRISON. I feel this way, Senator: that if tomorrow I could tell our customers that we could reduce the cost of their printing by 50 percent, it would mean one thing. It would mean an influx of orders, and order increase, of a hundred percent, because in every department, there is material laying around that should be printed.

Millions of dollars have been spent in research to acquire this information. It ought to be made available to the public. But the money is not available to print it at current prices. If we could reduce our prices, we could give them a lot more printing for the same amount of dollars.

I do not believe that it would mean a great decrease in our personnel.

AGENCY PRINTING PLANTS

Senator MONRONEY. Do you not have a great many of these Government agencies with printing equipment squirreled away someplace in the back rooms?

Mr. HARRISON. There are 339 Government operated printing plants throughout the world operated by other Government agencies. All of these operate under the approval and sanction and control of the Joint Committee on Printing.

I was staff director there for a dozen years, and I found that these plants fill a very necessary place in the Government's program of printing.

Senator MONRONEY. What would be the estimate of these plants in their output, compared with that which they purchase from you?

Mr. HARRISON. I would say they produce about as much as we do.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, about as much again is being printed?

Mr. HARRISON. I think so. The Printing Office does \$133 million; and I believe that the other plants, combined, will do about that much.

Senator MONRONEY. What is the nature of most of this?

Mr. HARRISON. To provide printing that is needed day by day, almost hour by hour. These plants are small plants, most of them. The large ones are specialized plants such as the Navy Hydrographic Office, the Army Map Service, and the Air Force Aeronautical Chart Service. The other plants print general day-to-day requirements of the departments. They are scattered all over the world.

EDITORIAL PLANNING COURSE

Senator MONRONEY. Your mention of the editorial planning courses which are offered to employees of other Government agencies was most interesting. Do such courses include instruction on how to present facts more clearly, more briefly, and such? Do you know of any concerted effort to upgrade the readability of Government publications?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir; we do. We are constantly attempting to upgrade the readability. Our Typography and Design Division has been enlarged, and, as I said in my statement, is now available to advise Government departments on how best to present the material to us, what our capabilities are, and in the long run to help us give a finished product that is far better than it would have been otherwise.

Senator MONRONEY. Moving on: Are you going to testify for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Buckley has a statement on that, Senator.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

STATEMENT OF CARPER BUCKLEY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to present to you our best estimate of the resources that will be required to carry out during fiscal year 1964 the functions with which the Office of the Superintendent of Documents is charged by law.

For convenience in presentation, we have separated into two categories the total additional amount of \$654,350 over our 1963 appropriation that is requested. Of this total increase, \$277,584 will be used for the established programs of sale, cataloging, and public distribution of U.S. Government publications. The remaining \$376,766 will be used in implementing the provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-579), enacted on August 9, 1962. Under this law, there is provided for a significant expansion of the depository function, both in the number of libraries and in publications to be distributed to them.

Looking to the future in our revenue-producing function of selling Government publications, we confidently expect that earnings for return to the U.S. Treasury from this operation will reach \$5,800,000 for the current year and \$6 million in fiscal 1964. Even with the cost of the new depository law and the nominal increases which the additional volume of our other operations will make necessary, the earnings that we expect to realize for fiscal 1964 will again exceed the entire amount of our appropriation, just as they did in 1962 and will again in the year now coming to a close.

We appreciate the help which we have received from this committee in the past and assure you that we shall continue to provide the services required of our Office to the best of our ability.

STATEMENT SUPPORTING 1964 ESTIMATE FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE
OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

The separate appropriation for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents provides funds for the performance of the functions with which our Office is charged by law.

The total appropriation requested for fiscal year 1964 shows an increase of \$654,350 over that for 1963; \$277,584 of that amount is to cover estimated increases in the established programs of the Office; the sale of Government publications, issuance of publications catalogs and indexes, and public distribution of certain publications authorized by Members of Congress and other Government agencies. The remaining \$376,766 of the requested increase is to provide necessary resources to enable us to carry out the provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962, enacted on August 9, 1962.

Under the provisions of the new depository act, the number of depository libraries can be approximately doubled. There are now 619, with another 70 tentatively designated, to which we must begin to distribute publications as soon as resources are made available to us. Furthermore, the new law also gives to the Superintendent of Documents the function of securing from other U.S. Government agencies and distributing to depository libraries, in addition to the publications produced by the Government Printing Office, those produced by the other agencies in departmental and field printing plants.

Finally, the new law relieves the depository libraries of the postage cost of mailing publications to them which they have borne heretofore, and this must henceforth be paid from our appropriation.

In fiscal year 1962, there were earnings for return to the U.S. Treasury from the sale of Government publications by the Superintendent of Documents which amounted to \$5,770,101.03 as compared with our total appropriation for that year of \$4,724,000. Sales for the current year to date indicate that we shall realize earnings of \$5,800,000, which will again exceed the amount of our current appropriation. The growth in the sale of Government publications which has continued steadily from year-to-year, promises to reach \$11,700,000 in 1964, with earnings of \$6 million. This amount would still exceed the amount of our total requested appropriation for 1964, including the cost of implementing provisions of the new depository law.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Superintendent of Documents

Appropriation estimate 1964.....		\$5, 417, 880
Appropriation enacted 1963.....	\$4, 683, 600	
Proposed salary supplemental 1963.....	79, 930	
Total, enacted and proposed 1963.....	4, 763, 530	
1964 increase over 1963.....		654, 350

	1963 estimate	1964 estimate	Increase
11 Personnel compensation.....	\$2, 988, 225	\$3, 284, 042	\$295, 817
12 Personnel benefits.....	179, 235	199, 968	20, 733
21 Travel and transportation of persons.....	1, 500	1, 500	-----
22 Transportation of things.....	1, 600	2, 300	700
23 Rent, communications, and utilities.....	70, 500	183, 800	113, 300
24 Printing and reproduction.....	844, 000	960, 000	116, 000
25 Other services.....	96, 000	111, 000	15, 000
26 Supplies and materials.....	349, 370	386, 170	36, 800
31 Equipment.....	33, 100	89, 100	56, 000
Contingency fund.....	200, 000	200, 000	-----
Total, estimate.....	4, 763, 530	5, 417, 880	654, 350

Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1963.....	\$3, 316, 889
Estimated obligations for April, May, and June 1963.....	1, 246, 641
Estimated total obligations for fiscal year 1963.....	4, 563, 530
Reserve for contingencies.....	200, 000
Appropriation, fiscal year 1963.....	4, 763, 530

Of the total increase requested for fiscal year 1964, \$277,584 is requested to cover the cost of estimated growth in the established programs with which the Superintendent of Documents has been charged by law for many years; \$376,766 of the increased amount is requested to cover the additional costs of a substantially enlarged Federal depository library program provided for by Public Law 579 of the 87th Congress, passed on August 9, 1962.

Increases applicable to established programs and to the new depository program are listed separately in each object classification shown below.

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
11 Personnel compensation.....	\$2, 988, 225	\$3, 284, 042	\$295, 817

For established programs:

1. Regular within-grades and hourly increase for employees..... \$53, 021
2. New positions:
 - 6 GS-3 order processors..... 22, 560
 - 3 GS-3 clerk-typists..... 11, 280
 - 3 skilled laborers at \$1.88..... 11, 731
3. Amount for 2 days above 52-week base..... 17, 900

Total for established programs..... 116, 492

The new positions requested would be required to process sales which we estimate will amount to \$11,700,000 in fiscal 1964, resulting in earnings for return to the Treasury in the amount of \$6 million.

New Federal depository library program:

1. New positions:
 - 1 GS-7 librarian..... 5, 355
 - 1 GS-7 clerk-supervisor..... 5, 355
 - 3 GS-6 depository technicians..... 14, 490
 - 1 GS-5 clerk..... 4, 345
 - 1 GS-4 correspondence clerk..... 4, 040
 - 3 GS-3 clerk-typists..... 11, 280
 - 15 skilled laborers, at \$1.99..... 62, 088

Total new depository program..... 106, 953

The above positions are requested to handle the estimated increase in work volume which will result from the implementation of the provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962. The main features of this act that would require the use of additional personnel are: (1) The requirement for incorporating in the depository distribution program the publications which are printed by the various Government departments and agencies in their own printing plants. In this area alone, we estimate that the volume of this material will equal the volume currently being mailed to depository libraries. Also, the inclusion of this material would require contact on almost a daily basis with the various Government departments and agencies.

(2) The additional depository libraries provided for by this act.

Pay Raise Act of 1962 for all programs..... 72, 372

Total increase for personnel compensation..... 295, 817

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
12 Personnel benefits.....	\$179, 235	\$199, 968	\$20, 733

For required contributions to retirement fund, insurance, and employee health benefits:

Total for established programs.....	\$7,316
Total for new depository library program.....	8,713
Additional retirement contributions resulting from the salary increases provided during fiscal 1964 by the Federal Pay Raise Act of 1962 covering all programs.....	4,704
Total.....	20,733

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
21 Travel and transportation of persons.....	\$1,500	\$1,500	None

We anticipate that the same amount requested for travel and transportation of persons in fiscal 1964 will be sufficient to meet the travel expenses incidental to the operations of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, which include the statutory requirement of inspection by the Superintendent of Documents of the condition of depository libraries, which now number 619, with an additional 70 awaiting completion of designation under the new depository law.

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
22 Transportation of things.....	\$1,600	\$2,300	\$700

For increased costs of transporting sales publications ordered by members of Congress for local delivery and also deliveries to branch bookstores.

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
23 Rent, communications, and utilities.....	\$70,500	\$183,800	\$113,300

Funds in this object classification are used principally for payment of postage to the Post Office Department for necessary official correspondence, but also cover charges for telephone and telegraph services, and for heat, light, and power. The increase requested in this category is to cover additional postage payments to the Post Office Department and to cover increased costs of heat, light, and power, itemized as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS

For established programs:

1. To cover postage costs and payments to Post Office for handling official mail..... \$10,000

New depository program:

1. For payment to Post Office of postage costs for depository mailings: 704 libraries, at \$94.08 each (GPO printed material); 704 libraries, at \$47.04 each (non-GPO printed material), total..... 99,300
2. For postage costs of official correspondence for new depository program..... 1,000

Rent and utility services:

1. To cover increased costs of heat, light and power (including air-conditioning)..... 3,000

Total, increase for rent, communications, and utilities..... 113,300

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
24 Printing and reproduction.....	\$844,000	\$960,000	\$116,000

No appropriation is required for the printing of publications offered for sale by the Office of the Superintendent of Documents as the cost of these publications is paid from sales receipts. We are, however, charged by law with the function of furnishing free of charge upon request one copy of every Government publication not confidential in nature, to each of the designated Federal depository libraries throughout the United States. Another statute requires us to compile and issue catalogs and indexes covering other Government publications. The total increase requested in this category is to cover costs of supplying the publications printed at the Government Printing Office to the additional depository libraries that may be designated under the provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962. As of March 28, more than 60 additional depository libraries have been designated under the provisions of the aforementioned act, to be effective at such time as additional funds are provided, and we estimate this number will be increased to 100 by the beginning of fiscal 1964. The details of additional costs are as follows:

New depository program:

1. For printing cost of depository copies for 100 additional libraries under new program, at \$1,160 per library..... \$116,000

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
25 Other services.....	\$96,000	\$111,000	\$15,000

These funds cover repairs to office and plant, fixtures and equipment, maintenance of electrical trucks, alterations to work areas, and cleaning of work areas and maintaining of restrooms. The increase requested is itemized as follows:

For established programs:

1. To cover increasing costs of repairs to equipment and service calls. \$2,000
2. To cover increasing costs of cleaning work areas and maintaining restrooms..... 10,000

New depository program:

1. For physical layout changes for expanded activity due to new program..... 3,000

Total, additional for repairs and alterations..... 15,000

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
26 Supplies and materials.....	\$349,370	\$386,170	\$36,800

These funds cover the cost of wrapping paper, cardboard, envelopes, shipping bags, cartons, mailing tubes, adhesive tape, cord, glue, and also general office supplies, necessary in the mailing of more than 178 million publications which must be performed each year by the Office of the Superintendent of Documents to the public which purchases Government publications, to depository libraries, and for Members of Congress and other Government agencies as requested. The total increase requested is to cover additional cost as itemized below:

For established programs:

1. To cover the additional costs of mailing supplies that will be required to cover an estimated sales volume in fiscal year 1964, amounting to \$11,700,000..... \$20,000

New depository program:

1. Office supplies..... 900
2. Additional mailing supplies required for mailing depository publications to an estimated 100 additional depository libraries.. 15,900

Total, additional for supplies and materials..... 36,800

Object	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
31 Equipment.....	\$33,100	\$89,100	\$56,000

In the performance of the operations required of this Office, a variety of items of equipment and labor-saving devices must be employed, such as mailing and inserting machines, high-speed addressing machines, lift trucks, stencil cutters, tying machines, typewriters, adding machines, pneumatic tube and automatic conveyor system equipment, bookkeeping machines, tape and labeling machines, etc. The additional funds requested to cover increased costs are itemized below:

To cover increased costs of the purchase of mechanical devices necessary in the distribution of more than 178,000,000 publications each year.....	\$31,000
New depository program: Costs of purchasing file and stencil cabinets distributing bins, power truck, adding machines, labeling and sealing machines.....	25,000
Total equipment.....	56,000

	Estimate, 1963	Estimate, 1964	Increase
Reserve for contingencies.....	\$200,000	\$200,000	None

As of this time, it appears that it may not be necessary to use the current reserve provided to meet the expenses of workload increases that could not be anticipated or provided for by normal budgetary adjustments. As all of our functions are of such nature that we have no control over the volume of work we will be required to perform, the inclusion in our appropriation of this reserve provides a much-needed flexibility for insuring that critical work programs will not be delayed. We are requesting inclusion of the same amount, \$200,000, which would be used only to meet an emergency situation and only with the approval of the Public Printer.

INCOME AND EXPENSE STATEMENT, SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

Sale of publications

	1961 actual	1962 actual	1963 estimated	1964 estimated
Income: Sales.....	\$9,359,938	\$10,901,646	\$11,300,000	\$11,700,000
Deduct:				
Cost of publications purchased for resale.....	3,552,539	4,155,780	4,417,000	4,547,000
Cost of postage for sales copies mailed.....	631,246	702,570	776,000	796,000
Reserve for unsalable publications.....	307,739	357,502	414,000	464,000
Total.....	4,491,524	5,215,852	5,607,000	5,807,000
Gross earnings.....	4,868,414	5,685,794	5,693,000	5,893,000
Other income:				
Gift publications—These are surplus copies furnished by other Government departments and agencies which must be recorded separately and not included in the value of publications purchased.....	179,959	48,805	55,000	55,000
Unclaimed balances of prepaid deposit accounts remaining after a period of 10 years.....	8,206	4,448	20,000	20,000
Transfer of coupons—Unredeemed public document coupons sold for the purchase of Government publications.....	28,661	31,054	32,000	32,000
Adjusted gross earnings ¹	5,085,240	5,770,101	5,800,000	6,000,000
Expenditure from appropriated funds:				
Salaries.....	1,912,978	2,029,312	2,126,546	2,294,255
Mailing supplies.....	103,773	123,856	114,208	121,688
Office supplies.....	27,262	31,120	31,768	31,768
Price lists and circulars.....	243,919	311,188	345,000	345,000
Communications.....	38,066	44,730	47,071	50,071
Heat, light, and power.....	10,053	12,601	12,830	12,996
Delivery services.....	1,431	2,037	2,100	2,300
Repairs and alterations.....	28,758	33,232	33,000	33,212
Sanitation.....	34,274	44,150	44,544	44,764
Insurance, retirement contributions and health benefits.....	113,322	113,744	128,630	139,433
Equipment.....	5,286	44,464	28,367	36,898
Total expenditures ²	2,519,122	2,790,434	2,914,064	3,112,385
Net earnings.....	2,566,118	2,979,667	2,885,936	2,887,615

¹ This amount is turned into the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

² This is the amount of the annual appropriation required to operate the sales program.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the general statement, which is very brief, and the statement supporting the estimates, have been submitted for the record. If agreeable, I can mention very briefly, to summarize, that this is a separate appropriation, which covers the four functions with which the Office of the Superintendent of Documents is charged by law. In addition to the distribution that you mentioned, it also includes the cataloging and indexing of publications. Under distribution, of particular importance this year is the distribution of publications to the depository libraries, an expanded program which has been brought about by the enactment of Public Law 87-579, on August 9, 1962.

NEW DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

Senator MONRONEY. Would you explain for the record just how many new depository libraries this created?

I know I was permitted to name one more college, and if it was shared equally by all the Senators, it would make a hundred. I did not know whether the House Members added any or not.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, Senator. There was permitted an additional designation in each congressional district, up to two, so under the

revised law, there can be two representative designations in each congressional district.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, there can be two. But before that, could there be one?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. So you have one extra?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right. And you have one extra senatorial.

Senator MONRONEY. So you have 435 House and 100 Senate, if all were designated and used?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, sir.

CONTENTS OF DEPOSITORIES

Senator MONRONEY. Are all publications issued by the Government deposited?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Heretofore, before the enactment of the new law, publications printed by the Government Printing Office were made available to the depositories, totaling between 5 and 6 million last year.

Senator MONRONEY. The 5 or 6 million individual publications. Is that right?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Five to six million copies of publications, to the existing depositories, under the old law.

Senator MONRONEY. All right. Then this is not additions. This is circulation?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Now, under the provisions of the new law, the newly designated libraries will continue to receive the output of the publications produced by the Government Printing Office, but in addition, we would be required to secure from these departmental and field printing plants that you were discussing a moment ago, the publications that they produce, and bring them into the system.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, supposing these libraries do not want all that stuff? The earlier testimony was that this covered a type of document which was short term, brief, and not nearly as important as would be produced by the Government Printing Office.

How do you separate them?

Mr. BUCKLEY. The libraries, under the law, must make a selection, and they must make this from broad general categories, which we would offer to them.

We have done that for years in the case of the Government Printing Office-produced material. One of the big problems in the implementation of the new law will be to separate this field and departmental printing into categories which would enable the depositories to make this selection.

Senator MONRONEY. You may proceed.

Mr. BUCKLEY. For convenience, we have presented, Senator, the total additional amount of \$654,350, which we are requesting in our appropriations, into two categories.

SALE, CATALOGING, AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

The first amounts to \$277,584, which would be used for the established programs of sale, cataloging, and public distribution, and the

remaining sum of \$376,766, we have estimated would be required for implementing the provisions of the new depository law.

In the first category, and looking to the future, the only revenue-producing function that we have is that of the public sale of Government publications. We estimate that during the current year that is going to result in earnings for return to the Treasury of \$5,800,000, at least, and we are looking forward in the year ahead, fiscal year 1964, to that going up to at least \$6 million.

Senator MONRONEY. If it reaches \$6 million, it would more than cover your costs of distribution. Is that right?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right, sir. And that is going to be true during the current year, and it was true last year, when the return was \$5,770,000.

Senator MONRONEY. I notice you are going to handle according to your statement, the increase which you are asking for, amounting to \$653,000, roughly, of which \$277,000 were used for the regular sales program and the other for the implementation of the Library Depository Act of \$376,000.

NEW PERSONNEL

Now, most of this \$376,000 I believe will be a matter of personnel. Are you asking for 37 new positions, in this budget?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, sir; and 25 of those new positions would be for implementing the provisions of the depository law.

Senator MONRONEY. What grade positions will most of these be?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They are mostly skilled laborers and clerk-typists, Senator, with one librarian, three depository technicians, and one correspondence clerk.

Senator MONRONEY. With these additions, is there any way, after you have your mailing lists and your distributive lists to some degree automated, that these 25 then would not be needed?

I mean, after all, you are servicing with a great many publications, but you are servicing only 535 new subscribers.

PERSONNEL IN CONTACT WITH AGENCIES

Mr. BUCKLEY. Well, one important item, which we have never been faced with before, will be the necessity for having a certain number of these new employees in almost constant contact with the Government agencies that are initiating this field and departmental material, in an effort not only to work out the original breakdowns but also to work with them and facilitate the obtaining of the material, in order that we may distribute it to the libraries.

Senator MONRONEY. But as I understand it, this is rather low-grade material. If you are going to have people working to generate more of it, so that we can send out more, that perhaps is not wanted or needed, then we would not only be wasting money on publication, but on personnel services.

As I understand, it is generally low-grade material.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That has been our feeling, Senator. The librarians are insistent that there is a percentage of this material that would be of great value to the depository libraries.

The question comes, again, of identifying that percentage, first.

LETTER ON WASTE IN DEPOSITORY LIBRARY

Senator MONRONEY. Here is what disturbs me: With reference to the depository library distribution program, the committee has received a letter from an individual who states he works in a depository library, and there is a good deal of waste. He charges that cartons of Government publications are unopened, that some are never used, and many of the documents are kept in inaccessible places.

To read directly from the letter, it says:

There is one Federal program with which I am personally familiar where Government funds are certainly being wasted, namely, the depository library distribution program for which over \$1 million is being requested next year. As one who has actually worked in depository libraries, I can tell you about some conditions which an on-the-spot investigation would show.

1. Cartons of Government documents are sometimes left unopened (for months) and gather dust in inaccessible basement areas.

2. Some periodical subscriptions are never used but since they come free of charge under the depository program, the libraries don't bother to notify the Government to stop sending them.

3. Although the Government documents are supposed to be readily available to the general public, many of them are kept in inaccessible places.

Many of such problems would be eliminated if the libraries were required to pay a nominal amount (no matter how little) for the publications * * *.

He mentions this as a suggestion.

In other words, I do not know why we should be asked to give additional personnel to try and build up a circulation for what appears to be low-grade data that is not worthy of being processed by the Government Printing Office.

LIBRARIES GET ONLY REQUESTED MATERIAL

Mr. HARRISON. Senator, let me speak on that for just a moment, if I may.

The law which directs us to make available to libraries such publications as are printed in the field, that the libraries may want, is something that under the law we are supposed to do.

Now, the best way to do that is to have somebody receive this information, analyze it, and send out to the libraries, in rather broad form, a description of the publications that are available. Then let the libraries make their choice.

I see no other way that this can be done. Then the libraries only get the material if the résumé indicates to them that this is something they need.

But in order for us to make this résumé, we must have some additional clerical help.

Senator MONRONEY. The question comes: Are we trying to promote some stuff that probably could be called "junk mail"?

DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO LAW

Mr. HARRISON. Well, here is a bill that says that we are to make these publications available insofar as possible.

We appeared before the Joint Committee on the Library and discussed this at great length. We indicated to them that we felt that much of the material that is produced in the field is not the type needed or wanted by the libraries.

The libraries insist there is material that is needed, that the public has a right to know about.

Now, we are willing to add this to our distribution in the Superintendent of Documents Office, provided we are allowed sufficient money to hire the clerical help to make the résumé of these publications which the departments send to us. There is no other way that I know that this bill can be followed.

GAO AUDIT REPORT

Senator MONRONEY. What is worrying this committee, Mr. Harrison, is that on page 3 of the GAO's report, it states:

The Government Printing Office officials estimate that the Depositary Library Act of 1962 could ultimately increase the Federal Government's cost of this program by about \$2½ million annually, and the Government Printing Office's portion of the increased cost would be about \$1½ million a year, of which \$200,000 would be for postage costs to send publications to the depositary libraries.

Now, regarding this GAO audit, do you still see an ultimate increase in the cost of this program to about \$2½ million a year?

Mr. HARRISON. I can see that it is possible; yes, sir.

Mr. BUCKLEY. We certainly feel that would be a reasonable estimate; yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Would that be an effective or necessary upgrading of what the Government has to offer, or a pressure to get in the hands of the citizens additional Government publications?

In other words, I do not think we should be going into the business of promoting inferior, substandard, or unnecessary types of interoffice memorandums or communications and things of that kind, that may be run off on some automatic printing machines or photolith or some of these other cheap apparatuses.

Mr. HARRISON. We do not believe we would get that type of thing in this program.

NEED FOR CLERICAL FORCES

Senator MONRONEY. How would you support it? You say you have to send it all out.

Mr. HARRISON. This is why this item was put in the bill, so that we could get a clerical force to work with the departments, to determine from the departments, "What do you have in the way of publications that the libraries may use?"

Somebody must make a résumé. Somebody must advise the libraries, if this bill is to be carried out, what is in these publications and give them the opportunity to either request them or reject them.

ALLOCATION OF REQUESTED PERSONNEL

Senator MONRONEY. And you need, in order to carry that out, 37 additional positions?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Twenty-five are attributable to this program, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. Why the other 12, then? Are your sales picking up in your selling of Government documents?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; they are constantly increasing. They are running about 5 percent ahead of the comparable period last year,

we are looking forward to doing an increased business in the next 2 years, and we have to have nominal increases in the object classifications pertaining to the volume of work.

Mr. HARRISON. We are anticipating \$6 million earnings from sales in fiscal 1964, which is an increase over this past year, and we will need some additional people to handle just the routine distribution.

PRESENT SALES FORCE

Senator MONRONEY. How many positions do you have at present in the Sales Division?

Mr. BUCKLEY. 408, at the present time.

Senator MONRONEY. 408 in the Sales Division? Is that correct?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, sir.

TOTAL SALES, 1963

Senator MONRONEY. And what did you tell me the total amount of sales were, of Government documents?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Last year the total sales were a little over \$10,900,000 of which the earnings returned to the Treasury were \$5,770,000.

Senator MONRONEY. Say that again; \$10,900,000 was the amount earned?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That was the total sales, Senator, and the earnings were \$5,770,000.

Senator MONRONEY. Where did the rest of the money go?

Mr. BUCKLEY. We used the money to purchase publications from the Government Printing Office, to be placed on sale, and also for postage.

Senator MONRONEY. Then if you sold—actually, this is good news, I would say—if you sold \$10,900,000 in documents, then the Government was reimbursed actually for the printing costs or the production of these documents, as well as for their distribution.

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS APPROPRIATION EARNED

Mr. BUCKLEY. And furthermore, Senator, the \$5,770,000 earned for return to the Treasury more than covered the cost of the whole "Superintendent of Documents" appropriation.

Senator MONRONEY. I see. So you took care of the mailing and the production of the documents, and still had a slight profit. In other words, it was not a deficit operation at either end?

Mr. BUCKLEY. No, sir; and we are not anticipating it, either in the current year or in the forthcoming year of 1964.

Senator MONRONEY. I see. Thank you, sir.

Thank you very much, Mr. Harrison. I have no further questions.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

STATEMENTS OF J. GEORGE STEWART, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL; MARIO E. CAMPIOLI, ASSISTANT ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL; CHARLES A. HENLOCK, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER; PHILIP L. ROOF, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT; WALTER L. RUBEL, COORDINATING ENGINEER; THOMAS F. CLANCY, SUPERVISING ENGINEER, CAPITOL BUILDING; J. LEWEY CARAWAY, SUPERINTENDENT, SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS; AND CHARLES A. DURKIN, ASSISTANT TO ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

AMOUNT REQUESTED

Senator MONRONEY. The committee will proceed to the consideration of the appropriations requested by the Architect of the Capitol. The appropriations for the current fiscal year total \$18,601,900, and the sum requested for fiscal year 1964 is in the amount of \$34,343,500, an increase of \$15,741,600.

I will insert in the record at this point page 11 of the justifications, which gives a summary of where this increase is requested.

(Page 11 of justifications follows:)

Comparative summary of appropriation and appropriation estimates

Architect of the Capitol	Appropriations for 1963			1964 estimate of appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1964 estimates over 1963
	Regular annual act	Supplemental appropriation Act, 1963	Total appropriation		
Salaries, Office of Architect of the Capitol	\$363,000		\$363,000	\$496,000	+\$133,000
Contingent expenses	50,000		50,000	50,000	
Capitol Buildings	1,282,000	\$14,250	1,296,250	1,437,000	+140,750
Extension of the Capitol	500,000	300,000	800,000	1,000,000	+200,000
Capitol Grounds	435,000		435,000	496,000	+61,000
Senate Office Buildings	2,235,000	16,150	2,251,150	2,945,000	+693,850
Legislative garage	63,000		63,000	50,500	-12,500
House Office Buildings	1,703,000	19,000	1,722,000	1,928,000	+206,000
Acquisition of property, construction and equipment, additional House Office Building	8,500,000		8,500,000	10,000,000	+11,500,000
Capitol powerplant	2,052,000		2,052,000	2,230,000	+178,000
Library buildings and grounds:					
Structural and mechanical care	844,500		844,500	3,522,000	+2,677,500
Furniture and furnishings	225,000		225,000	189,000	-36,000
Total, appropriations and estimates	18,252,500	349,400	18,601,900	34,343,500	+15,741,600

¹ Includes \$3,500,000 budget amendment.

SALARIES, OFFICE OF ARCHITECT

Senator MONRONEY. The first appropriation line item is for "Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol," where the appropriation requested is \$496,000, an increase of \$133,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Pages 12 through 18 of the justifications detail the reasons for this increase.

(Pp. 12 through 18 of justifications follow:)

Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol

1963 appropriation in annual act----- \$363, 000

Additions:

Within-grade salary advancements and other changes authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended-----	8, 295
Wage-rate increase and within-grade promotion authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Cong., for wage-board employees-----	706
Overtime and holiday pay increased by \$11,000 to meet increased pay costs under this allotment resulting from base pay increases under the Classification Act and the proposed addition of 14 positions-----	11, 000
Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$2,200 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year-----	2, 200
Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962, Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962-----	19, 096
14 additional positions, explained as follows-----	83, 303

It is requested that funds be granted for 14 additional positions for the fiscal year 1964 on the central professional, administrative, fiscal, and clerical staff of the Architect of the Capitol. These positions are for the most part already occupied by competent employees working in the office on a temporary basis and paid from various construction funds available.

The increase in the permanent staff is justified by the broadened and expanded duties and responsibilities of the Architect which have occurred over the past several years or which are now imminent. The major projects or activities contributing to this increase in workload are the following:

Completion and occupancy of the New Senate Office Building, including the new subway system from the Capitol to both the Old and New Senate Office Buildings.

Completion and occupancy of the extension of the east central front of the Capitol.

Completion of the changes and improvements, Capitol Power Plant project, under which the electrical systems in all buildings have been modernized and expanded and new distribution systems have been provided.

Placing the Senate restaurants under the jurisdiction of the Architect.

Expansion of both the Senate and House restaurant facilities in the Capitol and the office buildings

Establishment of a Safety Department in the Office of the Architect.

Establishment of a photographic laboratory and negative drawing file system.

Development of a research, art reference, and information service within the Architect's staff to meet the needs of the Congress, other Government agencies, museums, art galleries, educational institutions, students, and the general public. This work relates primarily to the Capitol and other buildings on Capitol Hill, their history, art, architecture, construction, and use.

All these additional duties and responsibilities placed upon the Architect have resulted and will continue to result in a much greater workload in the central office. The 14 additional positions are required to meet that workload.

In 1957, before occupancy of the New Senate Office Building, there were 1,068 employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect, including 36 in the central office.

Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol—Continued

In the 1964 estimates, all positions under the Architect total 1,562, including 59 in the central office. Upon occupancy of the Rayburn House Office Building next year, our estimate for the Architect's payroll in all buildings and activities is approximately 1,800 positions—including 45 positions we are already allowed and the 14 additional positions we are asking to be allowed on the central staff.

This results in an overall increase in personnel from 1957 to 1964 of some 732 positions, or 69 percent. If the committee grants the 14 additional employees requested, employees in the central office will have increased from 36 in 1957 to 59 in 1964—23 positions—or approximately 64 percent.

However, I should point out that 11 (or about one-half) of the 23 additional employees granted or requested from 1957 through 1964 are assigned to specialty functions having no direct bearing on our overall building and grounds maintenance functions. The specialty functions include establishment of a Safety Department; advances in technology resulting in addition of electronic equipment requiring employment of an electronic technician; and emphasis upon the research, art reference, and information services made available.

I assure the committee that we have given very careful study to our personnel requirements and are recommending only those positions which are considered absolutely necessary, or I might say "urgent," for the satisfactory performance of my obligations to the Congress. Except for perhaps 1 or 2 cases, we can foresee no further need for additional personnel in the central office for several years to come.

A list of the positions required, together with a brief indication of duties, follows. Complete duty statements are available and will be filed with the committee.

Assistant coordinating engineer, GS-13 at \$11,170 per annum: This employee serves as the assistant to the coordinating engineer who acts as adviser to the Architect of the Capitol in matters of design, construction, operation, and maintenance projects, involving the application of mechanical and electrical principles, methods and procedures, and who has general direction of the Electrical, Elevator, Air Conditioning, Subway Transportation, and Contracts-Specifications Divisions.

Assistant Head, Contract Division, GS-11 at \$8,424 per annum: Acts as assistant to the Head of this Division and will be responsible for duties involved in preparation and administration of contractual agreements between the Architect of the Capitol and private concerns relating to general maintenance, repairs, alterations, improvements, reconstruction, supply, and new construction.

Secretary to the Architect, GS-11 at \$8,424 per annum: This employee acts as secretary and assistant to the Architect of the Capitol and will continue, in addition, to serve as secretary to the House Office Building Commission as required (the Commission has no staff).

Photographic assistant, GS-9 at \$6,675 per annum: This employee is in charge of the photographic work for the Office, consisting of still and scientific photography, and photographic laboratory processing. His work includes photographing the art and artistic details in the Capitol which are used in various publications of the Congress and which are made available to the public through loan of our negatives to the Library of Congress where the public may purchase prints for a nominal sum. He supervises several assistants who make progress photos on the various construction projects.

Salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol—Continued

Secretary to the Assistant Architect, GS-7 at \$5,554 per annum: This young lady acts as secretary to the Assistant Architect of the Capitol.

Secretary to the coordinating engineer, GS-7 at \$5,554 per annum: This young lady acts as secretary to the coordinating engineer.

Clerk, photodrawing file and reference room, GS-7 at \$5,554 per annum: This clerk performs a variety of duties in acquiring, cataloging, maintaining, and lending photographs and drawings of the various construction activities, works of art, historical renderings, and ceremonies.

Secretary, Contract Division, GS-6 at \$5,054 per annum: This employee acts as secretary to the Head of the Contracts Division and also performs general clerical work relating to contract administration.

Accounting clerk, GS-5 at \$4,576 per annum: This clerk serves as an accounting clerk in the Architect's Accounting, Bookkeeping, Auditing, and Vouchering Department.

Wage and classification analyst, GS-5 at \$4,576 per annum: This employee serves as a junior analyst in the Wage and Classification Division through which proper duty statements and grades are established for all the Architect's blue-collar and administrative personnel.

Purchasing clerk, GS-5 at \$4,576 per annum: This employee acts as a clerk in the central purchasing office of the Architect, which office is responsible for procurement of materials, equipment, and services required for the maintenance, repair, and major alterations for the buildings under the control of the Architect.

Clerk, GS-5 at \$4,576 per annum: This clerk serves as an assistant in the Art Reference, Research and Information Division, under the direction of Mrs. Lillian R. Kessel.

Clerk-receptionist, GS-4 at \$4,118 per annum: This clerk is located in the large room adjacent to the Architect's Office, which serves as a reception room, a typing pool, and a purchasing department. She will perform a variety of duties involved in all these operations and will act as receptionist during the absence of the regular receptionist.

Messenger-driver, W-04 at \$4,472 per annum: This employee augments the present permanent force performing messenger service for the office; also performing certain filing duties, and operating multilith and other office machines.

Payment to employees' health benefits fund, increased from \$2,300 to \$2,700.....	\$400
--	-------

This increase results from the proposed addition of 14 positions and is to cover the cost of Government contribution to employees' health benefits fund required by Public Law 86-382, 86th Cong.

Payment to employees' life insurance fund, increased from \$500 to \$1,200.....	700
---	-----

This increase results from the proposed addition of 14 positions and is to cover the cost of Government contribution to employees' life insurance fund required by Public Law 598, 83d Cong.

Contribution to retirement fund, increased from \$20,000 to \$27,300.....	7,300
---	-------

This increase results from increase in base pay costs and from the proposed addition of 14 positions and is to cover the cost of Government contribution to the retirement fund required by Public Law 854, 84th Cong.

Total additions.....	+ 133,000
----------------------	-----------

Total estimate for 1964.....	496,000
------------------------------	---------

Senator MONRONEY. Mr. Stewart, you may proceed to explain why you need these additional positions and these additional funds.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, may I first introduce members of my staff who are here with me, who may be able to develop some finer points during the hearings, on which they are specially qualified.

Mr. Henlock, my administrative officer; Mr. Roof, my executive assistant; Mr. Campioli, Assistant Architect of the Capitol; Mr. Clancy, Supervising Engineer of the Capitol; Mr. Durkin, who is an assistant to Mr. Henlock; Mr. Rubel, my coordinating engineer; and Mr. Caraway, who is Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings.

NEW PERSONNEL REQUESTED

There are 14 additional positions that we are asking for, and it is requested that funds be granted for the 14 additional positions for the fiscal year 1964 on the central professional, administrative, fiscal, and clerical staff of the Architect.

These positions are for the most part already occupied by competent employees working in the office on a temporary basis, and paid from various construction funds available.

INCREASED WORKLOAD

The increase in the permanent staff is justified by the broadened and expanded duties and responsibilities of the Architect, which have occurred over the past several years, or which are now imminent.

The major projects or activities contributing to this increase in the workload are as follows:

Completion and occupancy of the New Senate Office Building, including the new subway system from the Capitol to both the Old and the New Senate Office Buildings.

Senator MONRONEY. Wait a minute, now.

This has been done for at least a year, and I do not know any further work that we require on the subway system from the Capitol to these two buildings. That transition to the rubber tires, and all, has been accomplished. The terminal buildings have been finished.

Mr. HENLOCK. This is a case, Senator, where the buildings are now being maintained and occupied. The effect of such occupancy is now affecting the workload on our central office staff.

CHANGE IN FINANCING REQUESTED

Senator MONRONEY. That was all done through the past fiscal year. We were fully occupying that building.

Mr. HENLOCK. Now we are asking for a change of financing with respect to 14 positions on our central office staff.

Senator MONRONEY. You mean these people have all been carried on some other payroll, and that payroll has run out?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEWART. We would like to transfer them and put them on the regular salaries payroll.

DUTIES OF TRANSFERRED STAFF

Senator MONRONEY. What do these people do? Clerical staff, administrative, fiscal?

Mr. HENLOCK. Starting on page 15, we give a list of duties, Senator.

Mr. STEWART. We have an assistant coordinating engineer, who assists Mr. Rubel. He acts as advisor to the Architect of the Capitol in matters of design, construction, operation, and maintenance projects, involving the application of mechanical and electrical principles, methods, and procedures, and he has general direction of the electrical, elevator, air conditioning, subway, transportation and contracts and specifications divisions.

Senator MONRONEY. Those are the duties of the coordinating engineer. Now you are asking for an assisting coordinating engineer. Is that right?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir. The volume of present workload necessitates such a request.

Senator MONRONEY. How many coordinating engineers did we have when we had the one building?

Mr. HENLOCK. We only had Mr. Rubel until the past 2 years, since which time we have been carrying an assistant.

INCREASE IN ENGINEERING DUTIES

Senator MONRONEY. You had one engineer for one building. Now you will have an engineer and an assistant for two buildings?

Mr. HENLOCK. Senator, that is not only the effect of the Senate Office Building. It is the effect of the workload of all those projects that we listed on page 13.

We have had not only the New Senate Office Building completed and occupied. We have had the extension to the Capitol, with its increased effect on operations in the Capitol. We have completed a \$17 million program of improvements at the Capitol Power Plant, which has resulted in increased operation and maintenance.

In the meantime, Congress has placed the Senate restaurant under the Architect, which has increased the administrative burden.

Our House and Senate restaurant facilities have both been increased and enlarged in the Office Buildings and the Capitol.

Your committee authorized a Safety Department to be established under the Architect a year or two ago. A photographic laboratory has been established. And our research art references and information department to serve Congress and the libraries and the public has also increased and had an effect on the overall central staff work.

PRESENT STATUS OF PERSONNEL

Senator MONRONEY. You see, in 1957, before occupancy of the New Senate Office Building, there were 1,068 employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect, including 36 in the central office. In 1964, all positions under the Architect totaled 1,562, including 59 in the central office.

Mr. HENLOCK. That includes these 14 who have been carried on construction payrolls in the interim.

Senator MONRONEY. And you had 36 in the central office before the occupancy?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. We are not concerned with the Rayburn Office Building here?

Mr. HENLOCK. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Will that add to the load? Are you going to get some more positions in the management staff out of the House side?

Mr. HENLOCK. All of the management staff that we are asking for is included in the 14 positions on the central office staff. Any future requests will be for the maintenance and operation staff for the Rayburn Building.

Senator MONRONEY. What I am talking about now: These 14 additional positions that are being asked for—do they take care of the New Senate Office Building and the Rayburn Office Building and the New East Front of the Capitol? Is that correct?

Mr. HENLOCK. That is correct.

DISTRIBUTION OF REQUESTED INCREASE

Senator MONRONEY. That comes to \$83,000 of the increase. I notice that you have within-grade salary advancements on account of the Classification Act, wage board actions, overtime and holiday pay, and all that. Where does the rest of this money come from? This does not add up to much over \$40,000. Where do you get the \$363,000 in these items?

Mr. HENLOCK. The \$363,000 is the amount allowed for 1963, Senator. The items making up the increase of \$133,000 asked for 1964 are detailed on pages 12 to 18 of the justification.

Mr. ROOF. There are some small items near the end of the justification.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, all were figured in on these extra personnel?

Mr. STEWART. That is right. They all were included. We have the payment to the employees' health benefits fund, the employees' life insurance fund, overtime, and contributions to the retirement fund. Everything that is needed is in this appropriation request.

PAY ACT COSTS

Senator MONRONEY. I wish you would explain the last line of page 18, then.

Mr. STEWART. This increase results from the base pay costs and from the proposed addition of 14 positions, and it is to cover the cost of Government contributions to the retirement fund.

Mr. HENLOCK. In other words, if you allow us the 14 new positions, we will need \$7,300, which includes also the rise in cost in retirement that results from the last Pay Act, where white collar pay was increased.

Senator MONRONEY. On page 12, there are the 14 additional positions.

Mr. HENLOCK. That is the base pay; \$83,303 is the base pay.

Senator MONRONEY. Then why do we not put the pay we are going to pay them?

Mr. HENLOCK. All costs combined for the 14 positions amount to \$99,270, Senator. I have a statement here which gives a complete

detail of all personnel costs under the 1964 estimate, which I would like to present to you for your information.

Senator MONRONEY. Then we have \$99,000. Then you have the within-grade salary advancements and other changes authorized by the Classification Act, \$8,295. Wage rate increase and within-grade promotion authorized by public law, for wage board employees, and so on. Overtime, and holiday pay, \$11,000. Regular pay, above 52-week base, \$2,200. Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved October 11, 1962, \$19,096.

SOURCES OF INCREASES

Now, all of those are pay increases. Then we come to this lump sum item, which adds apparently to these other figures, there, of \$133,000. And you state:

This increase results from an increase in base pay cost and from the proposed addition of 14 positions, and is to cover the cost of Government contributions to the retirement fund required by Public Law 854, 54th Congress.

Mr. ROOF. That language refers to the item of \$7,300 immediately above, Senator—not to the \$133,000 total.

Senator MONRONEY. The \$133,000 then refers to the increase above the 1963 Appropriation Act?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Which does include the major portion of the \$133,000 increase, the movement of these 14 employees at \$99,000 from the construction rolls into the permanent employment under the Capitol Architect? Is that right?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. On these wage increases, the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, in section 1007, directed that the cost of the increases be absorbed to the fullest extent possible. Have you followed the intent of this act in figuring the pay increase costs?

ABSORPTION OF PORTION OF PAY RAISE COST

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir, we have.

Mr. HENLOCK. We absorbed \$12,000 of the Salary Reform Act cost under our appropriations, and in addition, we absorbed \$93,650 of wage board costs.

Senator MONRONEY. How much?

Mr. HENLOCK. \$93,650, and \$11,900 to be exact. In other words, \$100,000 of the total costs for these wage and salary items were absorbed.

Senator MONRONEY. That was for fiscal 1963?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes sir. Now we are absorbing \$81,000 of wage board costs for 1964, and the same \$12,000 in the pay increases under the Salary Reform Act.

Senator MONRONEY. You are doing that by fewer employees?

Mr. HENLOCK. We are doing it through delays in filling vacancies, turnover, and similar lapse savings.

Senator MONRONEY. So you are fulfilling to this extent, about \$93,000?

Mr. HENLOCK. Which is about 60 percent of the total cost of the two bills.

Senator MONRONEY. With regard to the table in the budget, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol had 31 employees in the fiscal year 1962, 34 employees in fiscal 1963, and you have requested 49 employees for fiscal 1964, an increase of 14 employees.

I think that has been fully covered. I would like to put this table showing these jobs in the record at this point.

(The table referred to follows:)

CENTRAL OFFICE POSITIONS CARRIED ON CONSTRUCTION PAYROLLS

<i>Position</i>	<i>Source from which presently paid</i>			
Assistant to the coordinating engineer...	Structural and mechanical care, library buildings and grounds (no year account).			
Assistant head, Contract Division.....	Changes and improvements, Capitol Power Plant.			
Secretary to the Architect.....	Additional	House	Office	Building
Photographic assistant.....	Additional	House	Office	Building
Secretary to Assistant Architect.....	Additional	Senate	Office	Building
Secretary to coordinating engineer.....	Changes and improvements, Capitol Power Plant.			
Clerk, photo-drawing file and reference room.	Extension of the Capitol project.			
Secretary, Contract Division.....	Additional	House	Office	Building
Clerk, Historical Division.....	Additional	House	Office	Building
Wage and classification analyst.....	Vacancy.			
Accounting clerk.....	Additional	House	Office	Building
Purchasing clerk.....	Extension of the Capitol project.			
Clerk-receptionist.....	Additional	House	Office	Building
Messenger-driver.....	Additional	House	Office	Building

EMPLOYEE TRANSFER FROM CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Senator MONRONEY. These appropriations from which these employees are being paid as of now are construction fund appropriations. Is that correct?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes; here is a list of them.

Senator MONRONEY. That is until June 30, then they will be transferred.

Why were these employees not transferred before this? I can understand why the Rayburn employees, or that part of the workload, has not been taken up, because the building is not finished and occupied yet, but when the building is occupied, it seems like people in your office would be transferred to the regular funds requested for their employment and authorization of that employment.

REASON FOR DELAY IN TRANSFER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, if you recall, we had several large construction projects going on at one time. We had the completion of the Senate projects, the new building and the subway system, and immediately after that came the extension of the east front of the Capitol, and then next came the Rayburn Building.

We have carried these employees on those construction rolls until we have reached a point where at least a majority of the work under those construction projects is completed.

We are in a better position today than we were 3 years ago to say whom we need to retain and in what capacity.

PERMANENT EMPLOYEES FROM TEMPORARY POSITIONS

It always has been a practice in the Architect's Office during a large construction program to supplement the central office staff with temporary employees paid from construction funds, and as the construction projects begin to come to a close, to retain some of these capable employees on the central staff, in connection with the maintenance of the new facility.

In essence, that is what we are recommending that you permit us to do in this case. I believe if you look over the list in the justifications, you will agree that these positions are of the categories normally required for carrying on the duties of this office.

All employees whom we intend retaining under this appropriation request have in effect already performed the trial period of service in a highly satisfactory manner and are required in the regular operations of the central office to meet the additional workload as outlined in the detailed justifications.

ASSISTANT COORDINATING ENGINEER

Senator MONRONEY. Most of this may be required but, in some cases, it seems to me that you are stretching things a bit far when you ask for the addition of a secretary to the coordinating engineer because of changes and improvements in the Capitol power system.

Mr. STEWART. May I ask Mr. Rubel to explain that item? He is here, and he can tell you of the need for this position.

Mr. RUBEL. My secretary, who has been with me for several years, has been carried on the Capitol powerplant improvements program appropriation.

Senator MONRONEY. She has been carried on the construction payroll, according to this.

Mr. RUBEL. Yes, sir, that is a construction job.

Senator MONRONEY. How long has it been going on?

Mr. RUBEL. The project itself has been in progress since 1950. Not the same individual has served as secretary during this period.

Senator MONRONEY. But this office has been charged to construction funds—or your secretary—since 1950?

Mr. RUBEL. The present secretary, for about 5 years, since about 1958.

CHANGES IN POWERPLANT

Senator MONRONEY. In the changes in the powerplant, one of the changes was that they stopped generating power. Was that not one of the principal purposes of the change? We buy our power now, and we do not generate it, as I understand it.

Mr. HENLOCK. You gave us \$17 million. We had to rebuild our steam heating plant, and we had to enlarge our refrigeration plant.

We had to rebuild our steam refrigeration and distribution systems extending over 2 or 3 miles of the city to the different buildings. We had to convert all of our buildings on the Hill to 60-cycle alternating current.

It was a tremendous program.

CHANGEOVER FROM DIRECT CURRENT

Senator MONRONEY. Some of this was direct current, was it not?

Mr. HENLOCK. Direct current and 25 cycle. All of it has been converted to modern 60-cycle alternating current under the program just completed.

Senator MONRONEY. It is all through, now. We have no further charges, no further costs on that?

Mr. STEWART. Except the maintenance of the plant and the purchase of the energy.

MESSINGER-DRIVER POSITION

Senator MONRONEY. And was the messenger-driver required in the construction of the additional House Office Building?

Mr. STEWART. Senator, it was wise to have that messenger-driver on our payrolls for this reason: We have many, many errands to run, that is, to the various departments, especially to the Treasury.

Mr. Henlock or Mr. Roof can tell you more about what is required of that messenger.

Mr. Roof. He is a messenger on our central staff, Senator, and does the same type of work the other messengers do. They go to the Treasury to pick up checks and so forth. They deliver papers all over the city. They take certain items for test purposes over to the Bureau of Standards and places like that. They operate our multi-graph and multilith machines. They ran off this hearing that you have here before you on our multilith machine. It is more than just messenger-type work.

Senator MONRONEY. I do not object to the fact that you require them, but it seems to me that some of this purely clerical type should be charged to the Architect's Office and be authorized by the Congress, and not charged to the construction program.

I think in the future Congress ought to take a much closer look at the permanent personnel. Anybody that has been a secretary since 1950 I think should be authorized by the Congress, and funds appropriated to the Architect's Office, rather than having those funds drawn out of construction costs.

The same thing would be true in several other categories, here. And I think you should come to Congress and ask for these jobs, to be regularized in your establishment, rather than having requested 14 jobs because the construction payrolls now are running out.

Mr. HENLOCK. There is only a small nucleus of personnel, Senator, that we have asked to be retained.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Salaries

	1962 actual		1963 estimate		1964 estimate	
	Num- ber	Total salary	Num- ber	Total salary	Num- ber	Total salary
Grades and ranges:						
Special positions at rates equal to or in excess of \$12,845:						
Architect.....	1	\$20,700	1	\$20,700	1	\$20,700
Assistant architect.....	1	19,000	1	19,000	1	19,000
Second assistant architect.....	1	17,500	1	17,500	1	17,500
Coordinating engineer.....	1	15,576	1	16,350	1	16,666
Administrative officer.....	1	15,576	1	16,350	1	16,666
Executive assistant.....	1	15,576	1	16,350	1	16,666
GS-13. \$11,150 to \$14,070.....	5	54,539	7	80,352	8	94,910
GS-12. \$9,475 to \$11,995.....	2	18,960	1	9,485	1	9,797
GS-11. \$8,045 to \$10,165.....	2	16,682	1	9,110	4	34,008
GS-10. \$7,290 to \$9,495.....	1	7,176	1	8,029	1	8,029
GS-9. \$6,675 to \$8,700.....			2	13,354	4	27,641
GS-8. \$6,090 to \$7,935.....	1	6,552	1	7,134	1	7,134
GS-7. \$5,540 to \$7,205.....	6	32,864	5	28,705	6	34,410
GS-6. \$5,035 to \$6,565.....	2	10,359	2	11,273	3	16,494
GS-5. \$4,565 to \$6,005.....	4	17,722	4	19,114	9	42,411
GS-4. \$4,110 to \$5,370.....	3	12,376	3	12,500	3	12,646
Ungraded positions at hourly rates equiv- alent to less than \$12,845.....	1	6,896	2	14,000	3	19,191
Total permanent.....	33	288,054	35	319,306	49	413,869
Deduct—						
Lapses.....	2	11,243	1	6,074		
Net decrease due to lower pay scales for part of year.....				2,532		
Add net increase due to higher pay scales for part of year.....						6,231
Net permanent (average number, net salary).....	31	276,811	34	310,700	49	420,100
Other personnel compensation:						
Regular pay above 52-week base.....		1,000		1,000		3,200
Overtime and holiday pay.....		31,982		30,500		41,500
Total personnel compensation.....		309,793		342,200		464,800

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Senator MONRONEY. The next item is a request for \$50,000 for "Contingent expenses," the same amount as the appropriation for fiscal year 1963.

Please place in the record an up-to-date table showing how the funds were expended in 1963 and how much is unobligated.

(The table and justification follow:)

Contingent expenses, Architect of the Capitol, 1963

Purpose	Allotted	Expended	Obligated	To be obligated	Total estimated expended and ob- ligated	Balance
Changes in elevator panels and renum- bering rooms in the Capitol.....	\$15,500	\$3,150	\$22	-----	\$3,172	\$12,328
Construction of waiting room in legisla- tive garage for chauffeurs of official cars of House and Senate.....	2,000	859	-----	\$400	1,259	741
Renovating old dynamo area, House ter- race, Capitol Building, for use as central file room, paint shop, and electric shop for Architect's force.....	30,000	5,148	7,348	17,504	30,000	-----
Improving lighting in Senate parking lots in squares 724 and 725.....	2,500	-----	-----	2,500	2,500	-----
Total.....	50,000	9,157	7,370	20,404	36,931	13,069

Contingent expenses

1963 appropriation in annual act.....	\$50,000
Total estimate for 1964.....	50,000

Contingent expenses, \$50,000

This is the same amount as allowed for 1963. This is an item allowed for the first time, in the fiscal year 1956, and is required in order to facilitate the work performed by the Architect of the Capitol in behalf of the Congress. Its purpose is to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under the care of the Architect.

As stated in previous hearings, it is considered desirable as problems arise in connection with the needs of the Congress that there be available, annually, a limited fund upon which the Architect may draw to employ necessary assistance and to incur such other expenses as may be necessary to make surveys and studies required to ascertain facts, solutions, and estimates of cost to meet such problems.

As also stated in previous hearings, it is likewise considered desirable, when the work of committees and commissions of the Congress might be expedited, such as by the extension of a rostrum, rearrangement of lighting, erection of a partition, installation of a public address system, or emergency repairs to mechanical equipment, that the Architect of the Capitol be in a position to meet these conditions promptly, without waiting the delays necessarily incident to the securing of a supplemental appropriation for items costing only a few thousand dollars.

During the fiscal year 1963, allocations totaling \$20,000 have been made against this fund, of which \$18,000 has been for work in connection with renumbering of all rooms in the Capitol Building, including changing elevator panels, approved by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and \$2,000 has been provided for the construction of an additional room in the legislative garage to improve facilities for the chauffeurs of official Senate and House cars and other attendants in the garage, also approved by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, out of the \$50,000, you have obligated or expended \$36,931, leaving a balance of \$13,069. Is that right?

Mr. STEWART. That is right, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Does that \$13,000 revert to the Treasury?

Mr. HENLOCK. It does.

Senator MONRONEY. And the new \$50,000 would be provided?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir.

ITEMS UNDER CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Senator MONRONEY. I note the total expenditures for changes in elevator panels and renumbering rooms in the Capitol—expended, \$3,172. And construction of the waiting room in legislative garage, \$1,259.

Renovating old dynamo area, House terrace, Capitol Building, for use as central file room, paint shop, and electric shop for Architect's force, \$30,000.

Improving lighting in Senate parking lots, \$2,500.

That is all out of these contingent expenses?

Mr. HENLOCK. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. I might add that all of these obligations, out of the contingent fund, are approved either by Senator Hayden, who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Senate side, or by the Speaker of the House on the House side.

Senator MONRONEY. These are for items of small nature, and not requiring a line item in the appropriation because it is uncertain and indefinite whether they occur?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

Senator MONRONEY. The next item is "Capitol buildings," where you are requesting an appropriation of \$1,437,000, an increase of \$140,750 over the current year appropriation.

I will include in the record pages 26 through 33 of the justifications. (The pages referred to follow:)

Capitol buildings

1963 appropriation in annual act.....	\$1, 282, 000
Pay supplemental in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.....	14, 250

Total appropriations, 1963.....	1, 296, 250
---------------------------------	-------------

Deductions:

Maintenance, air-conditioning system, decreased from \$42,000 to \$14,800, due to dropping of 2 nonrecurring items allowed for 1963; \$18,000 to paint air-conditioning equipment on the House and Senate sides of the Capitol, and \$9,200 for replacement of 3 central air-conditioning units serving the House and Senate documents rooms and the House Press Gallery.....	-27, 200
---	----------

Base for 1964.....	1, 269, 050
--------------------	-------------

Additions:

Personnel compensation:

Wage-rate increases authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Cong.....	20, 409
---	---------

Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Cong., 109 laborers and mechanics on the Capitol Buildings roll are compensated on a wage board, prevailing-rate basis. Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

An increase of \$16,479 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for these wage board positions as a result of a general survey of Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington metropolitan area, conducted during the past year. The new rates went into effect Dec. 9, 1962, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Cong. This increase is necessary in order that the Capitol Buildings Wage Board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.

An increase of \$3,930 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions falling due in that year, authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage board system, for employees compensated under that act.

Within-grade promotions authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for employees compensated under that act.....	2, 250
---	--------

Overtime and holiday pay increased by \$3,000 to meet increased pay costs under that allotment resulting from base pay increases under Public Law 763 and Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962.....	3, 000
--	--------

Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$2,200 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year.....	2, 200
--	--------

Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962, "Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962".....	15, 315
--	---------

2 additional positions: 1 elevator mechanic, wage board, 11 at \$6,136 per annum; 1 elevator mechanic, wage board, 9 at \$5,616 per annum; 6-month period, fiscal year 1964.....	5, 876
--	--------

Capitol buildings—Continued

Three automatic elevators, 2 escalators and 1 passenger hydraulic elevator are being installed in the west side of the House wing of the Capitol to serve Members, staff, and other individuals using the new subway being constructed between the Rayburn House Office Building and the House wing of the Capitol. With the addition of these units, it is requested that two additional elevator mechanics be added to the Capitol Building maintenance force. The elevators are due for completion by next January.

At present, a force of 3 elevator foremen and 6 elevator mechanics is carried on the Capitol Buildings payroll. In addition to the daily routine care of the 30 elevator units in the Capitol, the present force performs the work of special testing, inspecting and recabling of all elevator units, totaling 127 units, in all the buildings under the Architect.

Under the present setup, 1 foreman and 2 mechanics are required for full-time duty at the Capitol. The other 6 men work as a group and their time is consumed in making periodic tests, general inspections, major adjustments, biannual cable inspections, and heavy repair work on the 127 elevator units located in 10 separate buildings under the Architect.

In the interest of safety to the Congressmen, employees, and the public who use these elevator units daily, the maintenance force should be increased by the addition of two mechanics in order to provide an adequate staff.

Contribution to retirement fund increased from \$45,000 to \$48,000-----	\$3, 000
--	----------

This increase results from increase in basic pay rates and is required to cover the cost of Government contribution to retirement fund authorized by Public Law 854, 84th Cong.

Payment to employees' compensation fund increased from \$1,800 to \$5,800-----	4, 000
--	--------

This item represents an increase of \$4,000 over the amount allowed for 1963 and is requested to cover the cost of the Government's payment to employees' compensation fund, required by sec. 209 of Public Law 86-767, which provides that each agency shall include in its annual budget estimates a request for an appropriation in an amount equal to the amount paid from the employees' compensation fund for compensation benefits to employees of the agency during the preceding fiscal year on account of service-connected injury or death.

Annual painting increased from \$32,000 to \$56,500-----	24, 500
--	---------

For 1963, \$32,000 was allowed. For 1964, \$56,500 is requested, an increase of \$24,500. The usual annual amount of \$32,000 provides for the painting normally required for the proper preservation and appearance of committee rooms, offices, corridors, restaurants, and other spaces in the Capitol.

An increase of \$11,530 is requested to paint all of the corridors in the basement of the Senate and House wings and the terrace corridors, extending from the Old House subway to the Old Senate subway, last painted in the fiscal year 1957.

Capitol buildings—Continued

An increase of \$10,320 is requested to paint the walls and ceilings in the House document room and the Senate library located on the attic floor in the old section of the Capitol, also last painted in the fiscal year 1957. All of the steelwork in these locations was fireproofed during the past year and now requires painting.

An increase of \$2,650 is requested to paint the public corridors in the east front extension. These corridors in the fiscal year 1964 will have been in use by the public for 3 years, and it is recommended that they be painted again next year.

General annual repairs and alterations increased from \$30,000 to \$32,000-----

\$2, 000

An increase of \$1,000 is requested to extend the existing bronze handrails on the east and west grand stairways in the House wing, principal floor, the full length of these stairways. At present, these handrails terminate halfway between the half-space landing and the principal floor. In using these marble stairways, should anyone lose his balance, there is no handrail on the lower half of the stairway to grip to prevent a fall, which can result in an injury and a claim against the Government under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This improvement is recommended in the interest of the public safety.

An increase of \$1,000 is requested to clean and reoxidize 4 pairs of bronze and glass panel doors and 2 ornamental bronze doors which are becoming tarnished with use. 2 of the bronze and glass panel doors are located in the east front extension at the street level entrance to the main lobby on that floor, and 2 are located in the Capitol Extension at the principal floor entrance to the main lobby and rotunda on that floor. The 2 ornamental bronze doors are located on the principal floor and lead from the main lobby on that floor to the House and Senate wings.

Maintenance and repair, lighting system, grounds, increased from \$10,500 to \$13,000-----

2, 500

An increase of \$2,500 is requested under this allotment to meet increased costs of maintenance and electrical supplies and parts. No increase has been provided under this allotment for the past 5 years.

Repairs, works of art, increased from \$5,000 to \$12,100-----

7, 100

An annual amount of \$5,000 has been allowed for the past several years to restore and repair the Brumidi decorations on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol. It is requested that this amount be increased to \$10,000 for 1964, in order that more extensive work may be done, the need for which has become more apparent with the installation of improved illumination which has revealed numerous hairline cracks in the plaster which should be cut out, repointed, and re-decorated.

An increase of \$2,100 is requested to clean, tone, and highlight the sculptured figures and ornamentation on the 3 bronze doors at the east entrances to the Capitol, principal floor. The Columbus door at the east front entrance to the rotunda was modeled by Randolph Rogers and cast in Munich, Germany. This door was originally installed in Statuary Hall at the entrance to the House connection in 1863. In 1871, it was moved to the old east front entrance to the rotunda, and in 1961 it was placed in its present location.

Capitol buildings—Continued

The 2 bronze doors at the principal floor entrances to the Senate and House wings were modeled by Thomas Crawford and were cast in Massachusetts. The Senate door was installed in 1868 and the House door in 1905.

These 3 entrances to the Capitol are subject to heavy traffic and as many as 20,000 persons pass through these doors daily during the tourist season. Constant use of these doors and touching and other contact with their surface cause them to tarnish. For their proper care and preservation, it is proposed that they be treated annually, cleaned, toned down, and the sculptured figures highlighted and treated with a coating of copal and beeswax.

Roof repairs and replacements, nonrecurring item----- \$49, 800

A nonrecurring amount of \$49,800 is requested for 1964 to replace 3 sections of the copper roof located over Statuary Hall and the Senate Law Library. These sections of roof were last renewed in 1901. They have been repaired as found necessary during the past 62 years, but have now reached the point of deterioration where repairs will no longer suffice to keep rain and snow water from seeping into the building. During the past year over 200 holes and cracks have been repaired in the section over Statuary Hall and approximately 75 holes have been soldered in the section of the roof over the Senate Law Library. Upon close examination, it is evident that more cracks in the copper sections are developing.

For the proper preservation of the building and especially to avoid costly damage to the ornamental ceiling over Statuary Hall, it is urgent that these deteriorated sections of roof be replaced in the fiscal year 1964 with new 16-ounce flat-seam copper roofing.

Exhibit wall and floor cases, crypt, nonrecurring item----- 26, 000

At present, there are several old exhibit cases in the crypt. Under the funds requested for 1964, it is proposed to remove these cases and to install in the crypt 6 floor cases at a cost of \$3,000 each and 16 wall cases at a cost of \$500 each, of appropriate design and service.

The old cases now in the crypt were formerly located in the Library of Congress and are very heavy and bulky and of the late Victorian period. They are completely out of character with the Greek Revival architecture of the crypt and utilize valuable aisle space. There are also located in the crypt the model of the Capitol and the sculptured group of the 3 suffragettes.

The program of improved illumination in the Capitol is scheduled to commence in this area in the near future. When completed, the improved lighting will accentuate the obsolence and crudity of the existing exhibit cases.

Even the use of these cases has, however, demonstrated the suitability of the crypt as an exhibit area. The interest shown by visitors to exhibited items emphasizes the need for a proper exhibit.

As in the past, it is proposed to exhibit photographs, drawings, and other symbols relating to the progress and growth of the Capitol Building and Grounds. The Architect of the Capitol has in his possession many interesting, rare, and valuable drawings prepared during the early growth of the Capitol; also, photographs of the Capitol taken when photography was in its infancy, showing the building prior to the addition of the Senate and House wings. These and other items, when exhibited in the past, have served to arrest the attention of visitors and to cause them to express much interest.

Capitol buildings—Continued

The six floor cases, proposed to be purchased, would be double-faced cases, with wood exterior, sloped counter vision panels, with metal-framed glazed sections.

The 16 wall cases, proposed to be purchased, would each consist of a single glazed panel with wood frame, and the surface for mounting the exhibits would be lined either with cork or a soft wood material covered with muslin or monks cloth.

Total additions..... +\$167,950

Total estimate for 1964..... 1,437,000

Senator MONRONEY. Please explain the need for these increased funds.

Mr. STEWART. For wage board increases, we are asking \$20,409. Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Congress, 109 laborers and mechanics on the Capitol buildings roll are compensated on a wage board prevailing-rate basis.

Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time, as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

Senator MONRONEY. Wait a minute.

This would come out, then, partly from new funds, totaling \$20,409, but you have \$81,000 that you pick up from reversions, through payroll, not used, for implementing these increases?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir. The \$81,000 covers all of our appropriations—not just the Capitol Building.

INCREASED WAGE RATES

Mr. STEWART. An increase of \$16,479 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for these wage board positions as a result of a general survey of Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington metropolitan area, conducted during the past year.

The new rates went into effect December 9, 1962, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Congress. This increase is necessary in order that the Capitol Buildings Wage Board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.

WITHIN-GRADE PROMOTIONS

An increase of \$3,930 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions falling due in that year, authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage board system, for employees compensated under that act.

Within-grade promotions authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for employees compensated under that act—\$2,250.

OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY PAY

Overtime and holiday pay increased by \$3,000 to meet increased pay costs under that allotment resulting from base pay increases under Public Law 763 and Public Law 87-793, approved October 11, 1962—\$3,000.

Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$2,200 to cover 2 additional days, instead of the usual 1 additional day, above the 52-week base—next year being leap year—\$2,200.

Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved October 11, 1962, Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962—\$15,315.

ADDITIONAL POSITIONS

Two additional positions: One elevator mechanic, Wage Board 11 at \$6,136 per annum, and one elevator mechanic, Wage Board 9 at \$5,616 per annum, for a 6 months' period, fiscal year 1964—\$5,876.

NEW ELEVATOR UNITS

Three automatic elevators, two escalators, and one passenger hydraulic elevator are being installed in the west side of the House wing of the Capitol to serve Members, staff, and other individuals using the new subway being constructed between the Rayburn House Office Building and the House wing of the Capitol.

With the addition of these units, it is requested that two additional elevator mechanics be added to the Capitol Building maintenance force. The elevators are due for completion by next January.

PERSONNEL FOR ELEVATOR MAINTENANCE

At present, a force of three elevator foremen and six elevator mechanics is carried on the Capitol Buildings payroll. In addition to the daily routine care of the 30 elevator units in the Capitol, the present force performs the work of special testing, inspecting, and recabling of all elevator units, totaling 127 units, in all the buildings under the Architect.

Senator MONRONEY. That includes your House and Senate Office Buildings as well?

Mr. STEWART. That is right. And the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court and the Court of Claims.

Senator MONRONEY. Right there, let me ask you, for fear I might forget it: Do we get reimbursed for servicing the Supreme Court Building with elevator repair and maintenance, and the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and others?

Mr. HENLOCK. Only for the sale of steam to the Government Printing Office, the City Post Office, and the Folger Shakespeare Library.

Senator MONRONEY. But we actually have the structural and mechanical care of the Supreme Court?

Mr. STEWART. By law.

Senator MONRONEY. When the Congress goes home, what happens? Do all the 127 elevator units continue to run, or are they reduced in numbers?

Mr. HENLOCK. Most of them are kept in service, Senator, but that is when the major overhaul inspection of cables and work of that kind has to be carried on.

Senator MONRONEY. But I am talking about the operation. Some of these undoubtedly are shut down, are they not, when Congress is not here?

Mr. STEWART. Oh, yes.

Senator MONRONEY. What proportion? About half?

Mr. CLANCY. About 50 percent.

RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. STEWART. The next is the contribution to the retirement fund. This is increased from \$45,000 to \$48,000. This increase results from increase in basic pay rates, and is required to cover the cost of Government contribution to retirement fund authorized by Public Law 854, 84th Congress.

Payment to employees' compensation fund is increased from \$1,800 to \$5,800, an increase of \$4,000. This item represents an increase of \$4,000 over the amount allowed for 1963, and is requested to cover the cost of the Government's payment to employees' compensation fund, required by section 209 of Public Law 86-767, which provides that each agency shall include in its annual budget estimates a request for an appropriation in an amount equal to the amount paid from the employees' compensation fund for compensation benefits to employees of the agency during the preceding fiscal year on account of service-connected injury or death.

FUNDS FOR PAINTING

The annual painting is increased from \$32,000 to \$56,500, an increase of \$24,500.

For 1963, \$32,000 was allowed. For 1964, \$56,500 is requested, an increase of \$24,500. The usual annual amount of \$32,000 provides for the painting normally required for the proper preservation and appearance of committee rooms, offices, corridors, restaurants, and other spaces in the Capitol.

Senator MONRONEY. How is this work done? By contract?

Mr. STEWART. Most of it is done by day labor, under the supervision of Mr. Clancy.

Senator MONRONEY. It seems like \$56,000 is quite a sum. Now, does that include all of the Capitol and the office buildings?

Mr. STEWART. Just the Capitol.

Senator MONRONEY. You get some in the Senate-House wings?

Mr. STEWART. And the tunnels.

Senator MONRONEY. And the tunnels and the document rooms and all that. That is included in that figure?

Mr. STEWART. That is included; yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that one of the reasons it jumps from \$32,000, because you are taking in more?

Mr. STEWART. Yes. For instance, we have here an item which is new, of \$2,650. Now, that is to paint the public corridors in the east front. They are 3 years old, now.

And to keep the building maintained, we like to brighten them up when they show some signs of wear.

BRONZE HANDRAILS

Now, we have another request in there, which is for a thousand dollars, to extend the existing bronze handrails on the east and west grand stairways in the House wing, principal floor, the full length of these stairways.

At present, these handrails terminate halfway between the half-space landing and the principal floor. In using these marble stairways, should anyone lose his balance, there is no handrail on the lower half of the stairway to grip to prevent a fall, which can result in an injury and a claim against the Government, under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This improvement is recommended in the interest of the public safety.

FUNDS FOR CLEANING DOORS

An increase of \$1,000 is requested to clean and reoxidize four pairs of bronze and glass panel doors and two ornamental bronze doors which are becoming tarnished with use.

Two of the bronze and glass panel doors are located in the east front extension at the street level entrance to the main lobby on that floor, and two are located in the Capitol extension at the principal floor entrance to the main lobby and rotunda on that floor.

The two ornamental bronze doors are located on the principal floor and lead from the main lobby on that floor to the House and Senate wings.

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR, GROUNDS' LIGHTING SYSTEM

The next is the maintenance and repair of the lighting system, grounds. It has increased from \$10,500 to \$13,000.

An increase of \$2,500 is requested under this allotment to meet increased costs of maintenance and electrical supplies and parts. No increase has been provided under this allotment for the past 5 years.

REPAIR ON WORKS OF ART

On repairs to the works of art, we would like to increase that from \$5,000 to \$12,100.

An annual amount of \$5,000 has been allowed for the past several years to restore and repair the Brumidi decorations on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol. It is requested that this amount be increased to \$10,000 for 1964, in order that more extensive work may be done, the need for which has become more apparent with the installation of improved illumination, which has revealed numerous hairline cracks in the plaster which should be cut out, repointed, and redecorated.

CLEANING BRONZE DOORS

An increase of \$2,100 is requested to clean, tone, and highlight the sculptured figures and ornamentation on the three bronze doors at the east entrances to the Capitol, principal floor.

The "Columbus" door at the east front entrance to the rotunda was modeled by Randolph Rogers and cast in Munich, Germany. This door was originally installed in Statuary Hall at the entrance to the House connection in 1863. In 1871, it was moved to the old east front entrance to the rotunda, and in 1961 it was placed in its present location.

The two bronze doors at the principal floor entrances to the Senate and House wings were modeled by Thomas Crawford and were cast in Massachusetts. The Senate door was installed in 1868, and the House door in 1905.

These three entrances to the Capitol are subject to heavy traffic, and as many as 20,000 persons pass through these doors daily during the tourist season. Constant use of these doors and touching and other contact with their surface cause them to tarnish.

For their proper care and preservation, it is proposed that they be treated annually, cleaned, toned down, and the sculptured figures highlighted and treated with a coating of copal and beeswax.

ROOF REPAIRS

For roof repairs and replacements, a nonrecurring item, \$49,800.

A nonrecurring amount of \$49,800 is requested for 1964 to replace three sections of the copper roof located over Statuary Hall and the Senate Law Library.

These sections of roof were last renewed in 1901. They have been repaired as found necessary during the past 62 years, but have now reached the point of deterioration where repairs will no longer suffice to keep rain and snow water from seeping into the building.

During the past year over 200 holes and cracks have been repaired in the section over Statuary Hall, and approximately 75 holes have been soldered in the section of the roof over the Senate Law Library. Upon close examination, it is evident that more cracks in the copper sections are developing.

For the proper preservation of the building, and especially to avoid costly damage to the ornamental ceiling over Statuary Hall, it is urgent that these deteriorated sections of roof be replaced in the fiscal year 1964 with new 16-ounce flat-seam copper roofing.

EXHIBIT CASES IN CRYPT

The next item is for exhibit wall and floor cases in the crypt. This is a nonrecurring item, in the amount of \$26,000.

At present, there are several old exhibit cases in the crypt. Under the funds requested for 1964, it is proposed to remove these cases, and to install in the crypt six floor cases at a cost of \$3,000 each, and 16 wall cases at a cost of \$500 each, of appropriate design and service.

The old cases now in the crypt were formerly located in the Library of Congress, and are very heavy and bulky and of the late Victorian period. They are completely out of character with the Greek Revival architecture of the crypt, and utilize valuable aisle space.

There are also located in the crypt the model of the Capitol and the sculptured group of the three suffragettes.

The program of improved illumination in the Capitol is scheduled to commence in this area in the near future. When completed, the improved lighting will accentuate the obsolescence and crudity of the existing exhibit cases.

Even the use of these cases has, however, demonstrated the suitability of the crypt as an exhibit area. The interest shown by visitors to exhibited items emphasizes the need for a proper exhibit.

As in the past, it is proposed to exhibit photographs, drawings, and other symbols relating to the progress and growth of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

The Architect of the Capitol has in his possession many interesting, rare, and valuable drawings prepared during the early growth of the Capitol, also photographs of the Capitol taken when photography

was in its infancy, showing the building prior to the addition of the Senate and House wings.

These and other items, when exhibited in the past, have served to arrest the attention of visitors and to cause them to express much interest.

The six floor cases, proposed to be purchased, would be double-faced cases, with wood exterior, sloped counter vision panels, with metal framed glazed sections.

The 16 wall cases, proposed to be purchased, would each consist of a single glazed panel with wood frame, and the surface for mounting the exhibits would be lined either with cork or a soft wood material covered with muslin or monks cloth.

COST OF CASES

Senator MONRONEY. How do you arrive at the cost of \$3,000 per case?

Mr. STEWART. May I ask Mr. Campioli, who prepared this statement, to answer this question?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. Senator, we obtained estimates on the six aisle cases, and the wall cases. This figure is actually based on estimates obtained.

Senator MONRONEY. Are these competitive estimates?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. No, they were for budget purposes, only.

Senator MONRONEY. Single source?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. It seems high to me, as do some of these other figures.

Mr. STEWART. They will all be advertised for bids.

Senator MONRONEY. But the work that you do, much of this other work that you do, will be your own work, and will not be competitive bid, cleanup stuff and things of that kind. All the painting will be done by your own people. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART. By day labor, yes. We will augment our regular force to do it.

EMPLOYMENT OF SKILLED NEGRO LABOR

Senator MONRONEY. This is quite a repair and renovating job to run in an amount of \$1,200,000.

Could I ask: Since there has been so much in the paper about the denial of job opportunities for skilled labor, what is the policy of the Capitol Architect for employing Negroes as skilled labor on jobs there?

Mr. STEWART. I have known of no refusal once any competent man came along.

I would like Mr. Clancy, who is the Supervising Engineer, and does most of the hiring of the day labor here in the Capitol, to supplement my statement.

Mr. CLANCY. If they come along, if they are competent, sir, we put them on.

Senator MONRONEY. How many have you taken on in skilled labor?

Mr. CLANCY. In skilled labor, I would say we have five.

Senator MONRONEY. What proportion would that be to your other skilled laborers, on painting, say?

Mr. CLANCY. About 25 percent, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. About 25 percent of the total number of skilled labor?

REFERRALS FROM UNIONS

Mr. ROOF. The painters are referred to us by the union.

Mr. CLANCY. As a rule, yes.

Senator MONRONEY. But do they refer Negro workers to you? I understand it requires apprenticeship, and the Secretary of Labor is now, and I think properly so, stepping up efforts to give greater job opportunities to skilled Negroes or to urge openings for them. Certainly the Capitol and the grounds, since they belong to all the people, should be a place where this principle should be given full emphasis.

Mr. CLANCY. We have some very competent colored men in our crew, in the Capitol—semiskilled.

Senator MONRONEY. But do you get them above semiskilled? I think this is one of the things the President is driving at, and one of the things that strikes a strong chord of sympathy with all who have watched the slowness of the construction trades to give greater opportunities to Negro people.

Mr. ROOF. Mr. Chairman, on the grounds, we have, I recall, an automotive mechanic and a crew of skilled maintenance mechanics. I believe they are all colored. At the powerplant there is one meter mechanic and one operating engineer, both colored. There are also seven firemen at the plant, six of whom are colored.

PLUMBING REPAIR BY CONTRACT

Senator MONRONEY. How about your plumbing? You have a tremendous plumbing contract coming up for the Library of Congress.

Mr. HENLOCK. That will be all by contract.

Senator MONRONEY. Are you going to protect, in your contracts, when this is let, the sharing of the jobs?

Mr. HENLOCK. We have nondiscrimination clauses.

Senator MONRONEY. In all your contracts?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. But do you find that discrimination still exists in your contracts?

Mr. STEWART. We have received a few appeals. It seems we are almost helpless to deal with the situation between the contractors and unions.

Senator MONRONEY. I do not think the U.S. Government is helpless in this instance. I mean it may appear to be, but it seems to me that with all the power of the Federal Government in asking others to cooperate and to share the better job opportunities, we should be in the forefront in insisting on opportunities that are equal for all races.

DILEMMA CREATED BY LAWS

Mr. STEWART. It is a difficult matter to attempt to control on contract work let under competitive bid procedures.

Senator MONRONEY. But you also require, you say, nondiscrimination?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. So you have your competitive bid, but the man who takes it on the competitive bid has agreed to not discriminate.

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. But if you have 50 jobs, and not one colored man is sent to fill that job by the supplying union, or the supplying contractor, then there is an effective discrimination, is there not?

Mr. STEWART. The discrimination does not exist on our part.

Senator MONRONEY. On people you hire, I would judge from what you say, 25 percent of your skilled labor force is Negro, and I know from the numbers you see around the office buildings, Negroes are fairly well represented in the unskilled jobs.

But it is in the skilled positions that the Government is trying desperately in civil service and throughout the whole structure of Government to give a more equal job sharing opportunities. Yet in our contract work you say the Government is helpless.

UNION ATTITUDE ON NONDISCRIMINATION

Mr. STEWART. To this extent: As a contracting officer I must deal with the successful bidder or contractor. If I demand that he employ so many Negro craftsmen and he has a contract with the union, and he demands consideration of the union for colored mechanics and none are referred by the union, what can the Government do? That is the crux of the problem.

Senator MONRONEY. You know where the Attorney General's Office is, do you not? You know where it is located. I think if you were denied the referrals, and you have asked for a sharing of those, then the labor union would be compelled in all good faith under the contract that you say guarantees nondiscriminating practices, to hire some Negro men of a skilled category, so that they will not all be just brick carriers or something of that kind.

Mr. STEWART. I go back again to the relation between the contractor and unions in competitive bidding; the job is let to a low bidder. That prime contractor is the one who hires the labor not the Architect of the Capitol.

ENFORCEMENT OF NONDISCRIMINATION

Senator MONRONEY. But the prime contractor has taken a contract guaranteeing nondiscrimination.

Mr. STEWART. That is true.

Senator MONRONEY. So who is going to enforce the nondiscrimination, or at least complain that there appears to be discrimination?

Certainly the Government has a right to call on somebody to fulfill its obligation under the nondiscriminatory clause.

Mr. STEWART. But the quarrel according to published reports seems to be between the contractor and the union. We get into the problem usually by appeals submitted to the President's Committee by colored mechanics. There have been very few of these appeals on our contracts.

POLICY FOR CAPITOL EMPLOYEES

Senator MONRONEY. Well, in your operation, you do have a great many things. This last batch of \$1,082,000, we have gone over, a portion of that, particularly in the painting and all, which is done by your people, will be done by day labor, and by skilled labor, much of it; will it not?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Will colored people be given an equal opportunity for these jobs if they have the ability to qualify as skilled workmen?

Mr. CLANCY. Absolutely, Senator, if they are qualified.

Senator MONRONEY. Will that be a qualification by you?

Mr. CLANCY. By the painter foreman, who comes under me.

Senator MONRONEY. And there will be no discrimination, at least on the hiring that we do?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir. None at all.

Senator MONRONEY. On the contract work that you will let out, and there is a great deal of it in the Capitol and in the House and Senate Office Buildings, that will be coming up and being finished, will you confer with the Attorney General to see that the nondiscriminatory clauses of the contract are meaningful?

Mr. STEWART. If you so wish, I would be very happy to do so. However, we now clear our contracts through the Justice Department for legal sufficiency.

Senator MONRONEY. I, for one, as a member of the committee, and I am sure the chairman also, would like to see a more equitable distribution in favor of seeing these things become meaningful.

Mr. STEWART. I certainly share your feeling.

Senator MONRONEY. This is probably one of the best markets for construction, I guess, on the face of the earth. Maybe New York is better, but I doubt it. And yet here, I am informed by the papers and by what I observe that it is almost impossible to find a skilled colored worker in a construction trade.

And this is a thing that, in the Nation's Capital, that is trying to tell the world of our fairness in this matter, should not continue, with the Government being helpless. We should do something about it, on the Government's own work, at least.

CONTRACTORS' APPRENTICES

Senator HAYDEN. Do contractors' apprentices do any work for you? That is all skilled labor.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, contractors do hire apprentices for work under our programs.

Senator HAYDEN. As I understand it, there are no colored young men who are apprentices. If they do not have the skill, of course, you do not want them.

Mr. STEWART. That goes back, I would say, to the union policy rather than a decision by myself. I am not in a position, of course, to know what apprentice applications are before the various trade unions.

If there is some way, we can strengthen our position on the question, I will be glad to pursue it.

DURATION OF APPRENTICE TRAINING

Senator HAYDEN. About how long does it take an apprentice until he can do skilled labor?

Mr. STEWART. I would say that the most adapted person that wanted to be a journeyman of any kind would take the best part of 3 years, and probably 4.

I myself learned a trade, and it took me 4 years. And there was no day off for Saturday. It was 4 years. And if I was qualified at the end of 3, it did not make any difference. The time required was still 4 years.

I do not know what the process is for apprentices in the various trades, but as you can well realize, there are certain apprentices that apply for a job that will develop more quickly than others.

I do not know what they have in the way of examinations, that is, after they have reached a certain point of training, or when they are finally qualified. Up to the present time, that has been done either through industrial schools or the unions themselves who have apprentice programs.

NO COLORED APPRENTICE APPLICANTS

Senator MONRONEY. In your own employment—and you have, I am sure, people that work for you in maintaining these buildings—do you give attention to the colored men who are employed first as apprentices, or as helpers, to promotions, to jobs that are equal to their craftsmanship after 3 or 4 years, as you say, in these unskilled jobs?

Mr. STEWART. In the 8 years that I have been Architect, I do not know more than one or two cases where any colored person has applied as an apprentice on any of our jobs.

Now, insofar as the journeyman is concerned, or the mechanic, Mr. Clancy can tell you how many applications he has had, if any.

JOURNEYMAN SITUATION

Mr. CLANCY. We have had plenty of applications, but all journeymen, Senator, no apprentices. You have to have a certain number of journeymen before you can work an apprentice, I understand. And we only have a couple of mechanics in each branch. The number of mechanics employed depends on the time we have to do the work.

Senator MONRONEY. But you are the ones who can choose these painters, and the foremen can choose their skill. And that applies not only to painting, but to pipefitting and to roofing and cement laying and bricklaying and all those kinds of things?

Mr. CLANCY. I might say our cement laying foreman is a colored man, and a very good one.

Senator MONRONEY. He is the foreman?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. I am glad to hear that. You have an unusual opportunity, I think, to at least show, in the Nation's Capitol, a stronger desire to recognize the right of colored people to progress in these building trades, consistent with their skills.

And I certainly commend you for what you have done and urge that more be done in this matter, particularly with the strengthening of your hand in contract enforcement.

DIFFICULTY WITH CONTRACTS

Mr. STEWART. Our difficulty comes primarily with contract work.

Senator MONRONEY. But I would certainly recommend that you call on the Attorney General for whatever help in the drafting of those contracts would be desirable, to insure that the opportunities are there.

REQUESTS TO ATTORNEYS

Mr. STEWART. Is it the desire of your committee that I contact the Attorney General or other Government officials for guidance when we need help in such matters?

Senator MONRONEY. I would like to see it made a matter of policy also on maybe the general service agency bill when it comes up, and the independent offices.

Mr. STEWART. We will give the matter close attention.

Senator MONRONEY. A great deal more is done in their construction, and we should try to reach a uniform policy. But with that, I think we could make some great progress.

EXTENSION OF CAPITOL

I note that for the extension of the Capitol appropriation, you are requesting a revised appropriation of \$700,000, although your original budget estimate was in the amount of \$1 million. But we gave you \$300,000 of this sum in the supplemental bill?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. The justification will be included in the record. (The justification referred to follows:)

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

Contract authorization: Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, and Public Law 87-14, 87th Congress.

Amount of contract authorization: To be determined by the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol.

Amount of contract authorization appropriated to date:

Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956.....	\$5, 000, 000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957.....	12, 000, 000
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.....	4, 000, 000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1962.....	1, 500, 000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963.....	500, 000
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.....	300, 000
Total appropriated.....	23, 300, 000
Appropriation requested in budget for 1964.....	1, 000, 000
Revised appropriation request for 1964.....	700, 000

Extension of the Capitol

Original budget request.....	\$1, 000, 000
Revised appropriation request.....	700, 000

The extension of the Capitol project is authorized by the act of August 5, 1955, as amended by the acts of February 14, 1956, and March 31, 1961.

Under the provisions of the Authorization Act, all work under the project is being performed by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, composed of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman; the President of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol.

Under the provisions of the Authorization Act, the scope of work to be performed and the amount of contract authorization are for determination by the Commission.

The authorized limit of cost for the extension of the Capitol project, as fixed by the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, is \$24 million.

Of this total, \$23 million has been appropriated to date, and \$300,000 is carried in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963, or a total appropriation of \$23,300,000—leaving a balance of \$700,000 yet to be appropriated for 1964. Originally, \$1 million was requested for 1964, but due to acceleration of the lighting-improvement program, it was necessary to request that \$300,000 of this amount be included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963, so that the revised amount of the appropriation request for 1964 is now \$700,000.

As of April 1, 1963, a total of \$23,454,342 has been obligated, and an additional amount of \$20,658 is to be obligated during the remainder of this fiscal year—or a total of \$23,475,000 obligated through June 30, 1963.

The balance of the authorization, \$525,000, is expected to be obligated in the fiscal year 1964 for lighting improvements and rewiring remaining to be done in the Capitol and incidental administrative expenses—or a grand total obligation of \$24 million through the fiscal year 1964.

This will complete all work approved by the Commission as of this date.

Work under the program approved by the Commission includes the following:

1. *Extension of the east central front of the Capitol*

The east central front of the Capitol has been extended 32 feet 6 inches and reproduced in marble. The extension has added to the Capitol Building 74 office, committee, and conference rooms; 3 large reception rooms and 2 large lobbies; an additional dining room for the Senate, and an additional dining room and a cafeteria for the House; and extensive storage space. This work was done at a cost of \$11,382,966.

2. *Alterations to the section of the existing building formerly constituting the east central front; also making necessary changes to the House and Senate restaurants to tie in their operation with the new dining facilities provided in the extended House and Senate connections*

This work has been completed at a cost of \$1,773,274.

3. *Repairs to the dome and sandblasting 32 coats of paint off the dome and repainting the same.*

This work has been completed at a cost of \$1,403,103, and the dome is now in a sound state of repair. A good part of the cost of this work consisted in the extensive scaffolding of the dome that was necessary in order to have access to the various parts of the dome, to carry on the inspection and repair work, as well as the sandblasting and painting operations. The cost also includes \$47,850 expended for birdproofing the peristyle of the dome.

4. *Construction of a terminal for the new Senate subway, under the Senate wing steps, together with (2) new elevators and escalator facilities.*

This work was completed at a cost of \$2,434,000.

5. *Rewiring and improving the illumination of the Capitol Building.*

This work is now in progress, and is expected to be completed in the fiscal year 1964, or shortly thereafter, at a cost of \$3,105,320. Contracts are let at such times as the work can be scheduled for performance without disturbing occupancy of the various sections of the building.

6. *Cleaning the exterior stonework of the Senate and House wings; birdproofing the entire building, except west central front.*

This work has been completed at a cost of \$175,021.

7. *Furniture and furnishings and restaurant equipment for extended portion of Capitol*

Authorization for furniture and furnishings was provided in the act of March 31, 1961—Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961. The cost of furniture and furnishings is \$627,838.

8. *Architectural, engineering, consultant, and sculptural services, administration, miscellaneous, and contingencies*

Obligations for these purposes have been incurred as approved by the Commission and are shown on the table appended hereto.

As previously indicated, obligations, totaling \$23,454,342, have been incurred to April 1, 1963, and the remainder of the authorization, \$545,658, will be obligated during the period April 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964.

As of April 1, 1963, \$22,525,270 has been disbursed, and the undisbursed balance of the appropriation of \$23 million provided to date, is \$474,730. It will be necessary to disburse this balance, together with the appropriation of \$300,000 carried in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963, by the end of the fiscal year 1963, and to disburse the \$700,000 appropriation requested for 1964 during the fiscal year 1964—or a grand total disbursement for the project of \$24 million.

The following table details the items obligated and to be obligated:

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL PROJECT

Obligations

	Obligated to Apr. 1, 1963	Estimated obligations, Apr. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963	Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1964	Total obli- gations
Obligations by object:				
Extension, reconstruction, and replacement of east central front of Capitol	\$11,382,966	-----	-----	\$11,382,966
Alterations to interior of section of building formerly constituting east central front, and related work	1,773,274	-----	-----	1,773,274
Birdproofing entire building, except west central front	81,197	-----	-----	81,197
Cleaning exterior stonework, Senate and House wings	93,824	-----	-----	93,824
Repairs, cleaning, and painting dome, and birdproofing peristyle	1,403,103	-----	-----	1,403,103
Senate subway terminal, including two new elevators and escalators to serve traffic from terminal	2,434,000	-----	-----	2,434,000
Improved lighting and rewiring through- out Capitol Building, including electronic clocks and legislative call system	2,610,320	-----	\$495,000	3,105,320
Architectural, engineering, sculpturing, and consultant services	1,835,035	-----	-----	1,835,035
Topographic survey of Capitol site, test borings and pits, surveys and studies, administration and miscellaneous	1,212,785	\$20,658	30,000	1,263,443
Furniture and furnishings, and restaurant equipment for extended portion of building	627,838	-----	-----	627,838
Total	23,454,342	20,658	525,000	24,000,000

EAST FRONT EXTENSION ILLUMINATION

Senator MONRONEY. How much longer are we going to have this appropriation title with us? The east front extension was completed some time ago.

Mr. STEWART. At the direction of the Commission in charge, a program for improved illumination in the other sections of the Capitol was included in this project. We can only do this work during adjournment, and in some of the public areas only after extensive experiments. It will probably take 2 to 3 years to completely finish this phase of the project.

Senator MONRONEY. This is the lighting, primarily?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. That will wind up, then, the extension of the east front of the Capitol?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir. The funds requested for 1964 will be the final amount authorized by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

Senator MONRONEY. And the cost of that will be \$700,000, which is \$1 million, less the \$300,000 already supplied.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

The next item is Capitol Grounds, where you are requesting \$496,000, an increase of \$61,000 over the current year appropriation.

ADDITIONAL LABORER-GARDENERS

I notice from page 61 of the justifications that you are requesting an additional eight laborer-gardeners to be financed from this appropriation.

(The justification follows:)

Capitol Grounds

1963 appropriation in annual act..... \$435, 000

Deductions:

Repairs and replacement, sections of sidewalks and curbing in vicinity of Taft Memorial—Nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, not required for 1964..... 20, 000

Replacement of dump truck—Nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, not required for 1964..... 4, 500

-24, 500

Base for 1964..... 410, 500

Additions:

Personnel compensation:

Wage-Rate increases authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Congress..... 11, 413

Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Congress, 49 laborers and mechanics on the Capitol Grounds roll are compensated on a wage-board, prevailing-rate basis. Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

An increase of \$9,707 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for these wage-board positions as a result of a general survey of Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington Metropolitan area, conducted during the past year. The new rates went into effect December 9, 1962, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Congress. This increase is necessary in order that the Capitol Grounds wage-board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.

An increase of \$1,706 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions falling due in that year, authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage-board system, for employees compensated under that act.

Within-grade promotions authorized by Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for employees compensated under that act..... 365

Overtime and holiday pay increased by \$6,000 to meet increased pay costs under that allotment resulting from base pay increases under Public Law 763 and Public Law 87-793 and from proposed addition of 8 laborer-gardener positions..... 6, 000

Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$1,000 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-weeks base—next year being leap year..... 1, 000

Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved October 11, 1962, Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962..... 1, 522

Capitol Grounds—Continued

Eight additional positions: Laborer-gardeners, wage board grade 6 at \$4,950 per annum each ----- \$39, 600

For many years, the Capitol Grounds comprised only the area lying between Independence Avenue and Constitution Avenue and First Street East and First Street West and totaled 58.8 acres. In 1929-35, the Capitol Grounds were enlarged by the acquisition and development of the area north of Constitution Avenue, lying between that avenue and the Union Station. This addition of 61.4 acres increased the total area of the Capitol Grounds to 120.2 acres. In 1937, the Capitol grounds maintenance force was fixed at a total of 54 employees. Only one position, that of a tree surgeon, has been added to this force in the ensuing 26 years.

When the maintenance force was fixed at 54 employees in 1937, in addition to maintaining the Capitol Grounds, this force also maintained the grounds surrounding the Old and New House Office Buildings, the Senate Office Building, and the Capitol Powerplant, comprising 8 acres—or a grand total area maintained of 128 acres.

With the acquisition in recent years of the New Senate Office Building site and additions to that site and of the 7 squares acquired for the Additional House Office Building project, the Capitol Grounds force now has to maintain a total of 155 acres.

This includes not only areas developed as park areas, but also areas used as parking lots. The parking lots have to be swept and kept clean of debris; holes and defects in the parking areas have to be repaired, and repairs have to be made to bumperguards. The Taft Memorial has also been a recent addition to the Capitol Grounds. There is an extensive amount of sidewalks to be maintained in the additional squares acquired.

During the coming fiscal year, the grounds and courts of the Rayburn House Office Building will be landscaped and will have also to be maintained.

It is impossible for the present force to satisfactorily maintain the expanded areas. With a 20-percent land expansion, there should be at least a 15-percent expansion of the maintenance force, and that is what is being requested for the fiscal year 1964.

In the interest of the orderly and efficient maintenance of the Capitol Grounds and other grounds under the Architect, it is urged that eight additional positions of laborer-gardeners be allowed for 1964.

Contribution to retirement fund—increased from \$18,400 to \$22,000----- 3, 600

This item is required to cover the cost of Government contribution to retirement fund required by Public Law 854, 84th Congress. The additional cost results from increase in basic pay rates and from the proposed addition of eight positions.

Supplies and materials—increased from \$10,000 to \$11,500--- 1, 500

An increase of \$500 is requested under this allotment to provide for the purchase of a greater quantity of gasoline and oil, due to increased consumption of these products resulting from the acquisition in recent years of more gasoline-operated equipment, such as the large street sweeper, leaf collector, front-end loader, and other vehicular maintenance equipment.

An increase of \$1,000 is requested for the purchase of additional plant material, particularly trees. During recent years, many trees on the Capitol Grounds have had to be removed due to storm damage and tree diseases. The additional amount asked for 1964 would be used for replacement of some of these trees.

Capitol Grounds—Continued

Equipment—increased from \$5,800 to \$26,300-----	\$20, 500
---	-----------

2 nonrecurring items of increase are requested for 1964 under the annual equipment allotment and total \$19,700.

An increase of \$4,300 is requested for the purchase of a 500-gallon wood tank power sprayer, with an 800-pound pressure pump, adaptable for mounting on a truck chassis, equipped with a 45-horsepower engine, three 50-foot lengths of high-pressure hose with couplings, and with high-pressure spray guns, for use in spraying the trees and shrubs in the Capitol and other grounds under the Architect with insecticides to safeguard against disease. This new sprayer equipment is urgently needed to replace a 1938 model power sprayer, which is now obsolete, badly worn, repair parts are no longer readily available, and further repair is no longer economically feasible.

An increase of \$15,400 is requested for the purchase of two gang mowers, 5 units each, mounted on tractor to replace two old 1949 gang mowers now in use. The existing mowers are obsolete, worn out and repair parts are no longer available. The gang mowers proposed to be purchased would be hydraulically controlled from the driver's seat, with a cutting width of approximately 11 feet, and would be equipped with 10 extra cutting units for a complete change on each mower.

An increase of \$800 is requested to increase the regular annual recurring allotment from \$5,800 to \$6,600 to meet current increased maintenance costs. No increase has been provided under the annual recurring allotment for the past 7 years.

Total additions-----	+ 85, 500
----------------------	-----------

Total estimate for 1964-----	496, 000
------------------------------	----------

ENLARGEMENT OF GROUNDS

Senator MONRONEY. Please go ahead and give your justification for this increase.

Mr. STEWART. For many years, the Capitol Grounds comprised only the area lying between Independence Avenue and Constitution Avenue, and First Street East and First Street West, and totaled 58.8 acres.

In 1929-35, the Capitol Grounds were enlarged by the acquisition and development of the area north of Constitution Avenue, lying between that avenue and the Union Station. This addition of 61.4 acres increased the total area of the Capitol Grounds to 120.2 acres.

MAINTENANCE FORCE

In 1937, the Capitol Grounds maintenance force was fixed at a total of 54 employees. Only one position, that of a tree surgeon, has been added to this force in the ensuing 26 years.

When the maintenance force was fixed at 54 employees in 1937, in addition to maintaining the Capitol Grounds, this force also maintained the grounds surrounding the Old and New House Office Buildings, the Senate Office Building, and the Capitol Power Plant, comprising 8 acres—or a grand total area maintained of 128 acres.

With the acquisition in recent years of the New Senate Office Building site and additions to that site and of the seven squares acquired for the additional House Office Building project, the Capitol Grounds force now has to maintain a total of 155 acres.

Senator MONRONEY. Now, wait a minute.

You are giving us the hard surface as well as the grounds or shrubbery, are you not?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; however, I am about to explain that.

Senator MONRONEY. All right.

Mr. STEWART. This includes not only areas developed as park areas, but also areas used as parking lots. The parking lots have to be swept and kept clean of debris; holes and defects in the parking areas have to be repaired, and repairs have to be made to bumper guards.

The Taft Memorial has also been a recent addition to the Capitol Grounds. There is an extensive amount of sidewalks to be maintained in the additional squares acquired.

During the coming fiscal year, the grounds and courts of the Rayburn House Office Building will be landscaped and will have also to be maintained.

It is impossible for the present force to satisfactorily maintain the expanded areas. With a 20-percent land expansion, there should be at least a 15-percent expansion of the maintenance force, and that is what is being requested for the fiscal year 1964.

In the interest of the orderly and efficient maintenance of the Capitol Grounds and other grounds under the Architect, it is urged that eight additional positions of laborer-gardeners be allowed for 1964.

COST OF ADDITIONAL GARDENER-LABORERS

Senator MONRONEY. What is the cost of these eight?

Mr. HENLOCK. \$39,600.

Senator MONRONEY. That is a good deal of money.

You are comparing 1937 with 1963. Have there not been a great many technological gains? I suspect, in using modern lawnmowers and other equipment, you reduce the need for so many gardeners.

Mr. HENLOCK. We have bought modern streetsweepers and things of that nature, and that is the reason we have been able to hold down the request to the extent we have in the interim.

Senator MONRONEY. But you are asking for eight new additional positions?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes; to bring the force up to its required level.

Senator MONRONEY. I admit some of these may sound piddling to you, but if the Congress cannot hold down their requirements, how are we going to go to the Government departments and ask them to get along on fewer personnel?

TRANSFERABILITY OF EMPLOYEES

And people that you could never find, apparently, in any Government budget, either legislative or others, people who can be transferred away from work that is no longer required, or no longer urgent, into the new job that may require additional personnel. People just stay on their one job forever, and that job never requires fewer people, but always requires more people.

Mr. STEWART. We do transfer our employees from one building to another when occasion warrants and we only ask to increase our force when new activities are added or existing workloads are expanded.

YEAR-ROUND DUTIES

Senator MONRONEY. Do these people stay on the same job the full 12 months?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, Senator. We state on page 66, with respect to periods when work cannot be done on the grounds:

In inclement weather the groundsmen are used for such work as repair and sharpening of tools, repair of equipment, cleaning debris from the Capitol, cleaning walls and floors, and washing windows and doors.

They are used all around.

Senator, we have with us a rather comprehensive statement of the work performed by the Capitol Grounds force during this fiscal year, including the tree surgeon work, and we would like to insert that in the record. I think it will be enlightening as to what the workload is.

Senator MONRONEY. That may be put in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

WORK PERFORMED ON THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS FROM JULY 1, 1962, UP TO
THE PRESENT DATE, MAY 15, 1963

The following is an outline of the work performed on the Capitol Grounds by the Grounds forces:

Tree Surgeons and crew.—Thirty-seven trees have been topped and removed from the Grounds during this period. Three of these trees were damaged or uprooted by storms, and 34 trees died of either natural causes or diseases.

Approximately 800 trees were trimmed and pruned on the Grounds during this period.

During the months of July and August 1962, the trees and shrubs on the Grounds were sprayed with arsenic of lead, DDT, and black leaf 40.

During the last 2 weeks in March through the first week in April, 1963 all the trees on the Grounds were sprayed with lime sulfur and dormant superior oil spray.

New plantings.—Approximately 100 plants have either been planted or transplanted on the Grounds. This plant material varied in size from 3 to 12 feet high. This planting work included plants that were transplanted at the Northwest corner of the terrace wall, July 1962; planting new privet hedge at Senate parking lot, March 1963; digging and replanting of large shrubs at House Office Building, due to construction, March and April 1963.

Approximately 6,000 spring flowering bulbs (tulips, narcissus, and crocus) were planted on the Grounds around Capitol and in fountain areas in November 1962.

Approximately 5,000 chrysanthemums were planted in September 1962, in the plant beds on the terrace and along the terrace wall.

Approximately 10,000 annuals, including: Cannas, dusty miller, petunias, marigold, zinnias, etc., will be planted in the beds on the terrace, starting next week. This operation will take about 2 to 3 weeks to complete, including bed preparation which was started this week.

Lawn work, seeding, top dressing.—July through August 1962, approximately 250 cubic yards of soil fill was placed in square 723, in vicinity of Union Station. This area was seeded in the fall of 1962.

September through November 1962, the following areas were seeded: around all the vaults; House side of Capitol, south side; west front, pond lawn; around Taft Memorial; areas on top of legislative garage, Senate Office Building courtyard; and small areas under trees all over the Grounds. Approximately 400 cubic yards of topsoil was spread in these areas, 3,000 pounds of seed applied, and 4 tons of fertilizer was spread. East front, Senate side, was seeded.

In the fall of 1962, approximately 12 weeks' time was spent working on squares 732 N and S. This work included removal of debris, rough grading, removal of foundations above the ground, etc. The last 2 weeks in April through the first week of May 1963, was spent in removal of stones, fertilizing, and seeding these areas.

Spring 1963, March and April, all areas that were seeded in the fall of 1962 were fertilized and spot seeded.

Plumbing, work on sprinkler system.—September 1962, the sprinkler system in the Senate Office Building courtyard was repaired. This involved excavating a trench to the depth of 12 feet to get to the valves.

October 1962, sprinkler system at House side of Capitol, south side, was put back in operation after completion of construction of vault in that area.

From the period of July 1962 up to the present, 25 3-inch valves; 8 2½-inch valves; 10 1½-inch valves; 4 8-inch valves, and 1 6-inch valve were replaced or added to the present sprinkler system.

October through November 1962, sprinkler systems were repaired or reinstalled in the vicinity of the four vaults on the west front of the Capitol.

Spring 1963, all the sprinkler systems on the grounds were checked over and sprinkler heads replaced where needed.

Snow and ice removal.—Snow and ice was removed from the drives, roads, walks, and steps during December 22, 1962, through January 5, 1963, and again on February 9 through 18, 1963. This included sanding and placing ice pellets on walks and roads.

Repairs to roads and parking lots.—During this period to the present, approximately 47 tons of bituminous plant mix (asphalt) was placed in the parking lots and roads.

Removal of leaves.—The fall crop of leaves was removed from the grounds during the months of October through December 1962.

Daily routine maintenance on the grounds.—The daily routine maintenance on the grounds includes daily sweeping of the Capitol steps and walks; removal of trash and debris from the grounds; mowing of all lawn areas during the last week in April through September; sweeping the roads and drives with the use of the mechanical streetsweeper every Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday mornings; trash pickup by our dump trucks for the various buildings; raking of leaves on the grounds, etc.

During the summer months, the sprinkler systems are in operation six nights a week. The Capitol steps are washed down twice a week.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE TREE SURGEON WORK AND THE TREES ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS, APRIL 29, 1963

At present, there are approximately 2,000 trees and 5,000 shrubs being grown and maintained on the Capitol Grounds. These trees and shrubs represent a good cross-section of plant material which is grown throughout the country, and include approximately 120 species and varieties of trees and approximately 100 species and varieties of shrubs and vines. This plant material is comprised of the most common trees and shrubs, such as forsythia and sugar maple, to the lesser known and rarer trees and shrubs, such as the California redwood and cedar of Lebanon.

All of these trees and a percentage of the larger shrubs and vines are maintained and cared for by the tree surgeons assigned to the Capitol Grounds forces. This crew is composed of two tree surgeons, W-11 and W-08, and one helper, W-05. The duties of the tree surgeons include: the responsibility for the performance of tree surgery and other general tree work involved in the maintenance, care, and preservation of ornamental and shade trees on the Capitol Grounds.

A brief résumé of the work accomplished from the fall of 1962 up to the present includes the following:

November 1, 1962, through the second week in February 1963: Trees trimmed and topped in both parks between Delaware Avenue and First Street, along D Street NE., and around parking lot (square 723) at D Street NE., and First Street NE.

Last 2 weeks in February: Trimmed and topped elms along First Street SW., and between Independence Avenue and Canal Street SW.

First 2 weeks in March: Trimmed and removed trees in park area between North Capitol Street and Louisiana Avenue NE.

Last 2 weeks in March through first week in April: Sprayed all the trees in the Capitol Grounds with lime sulphur and dormant oil spray. This work was done during the nights.

From the second week in April to the present: Work on trees in squares 732N and 732S; areas between C Street and Independence Avenue SE.; northwest lawn of Capitol in vicinity of air shaft; west lawn of Capitol.

The following trees have been removed from areas within the Capitol Grounds: Pennsylvania Avenue NW. between First and Third Streets: 26-inch sycamore, December 4, 1962; 20-inch sycamore, December 4, 1962; 22-inch sycamore,

December 5, 1962; 20-inch sycamore, December 5, 1962; 22-inch sycamore, December 5, 1962.

Third Street NW. between Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue: 18-inch elm, December 6, 1962; 20-inch elm, December 6, 1962.

Constitution Avenue NW. at Third Street: 22-inch elm, December 7, 1962.

Delaware Avenue NE. at C Street: 36-inch sycamore, December 18, 1962.

First Street NE. at Massachusetts Avenue: 17-inch oak, February 4, 1963; 18-inch oak, February 4, 1963; 20-inch oak, February 5, 1963; 15-inch oak, March 13, 1963.

First Street SW. at Independence Avenue: 26-inch elm, February 11, 1963; 20-inch elm, February 11, 1963; 22-inch elm, February 12, 1963; 24-inch elm, February 13, 1963; 33-inch elm, February 14, 1963.

New Jersey Avenue SE. and C Street and D Street SE.: 14-inch elm, February 19, 1963; 18-inch elm, February 20, 1963; 18-inch sycamore, February 19, 1963; 16-inch oak, February 25, 1963.

C Street SE. between South Capitol and New Jersey Avenue: 22-inch maple, February 22, 1963; 20-inch maple, February 22, 1963.

D Street SE. at South Capitol: 17-inch sycamore, February 20, 1963.

D Street SW. at South Capitol: 20-inch sycamore, February 21, 1963; 24-inch sycamore, February 21, 1963; 19-inch sycamore, February 21, 1963.

Second Street NE. at E Street: 16-inch oak, February 27, 1963.

Second Street NE. between D and E Streets: 14-inch red oak, February 4, 1963; 15-inch red oak, February 4, 1963.

East front Senate side: 48-inch white oak, April 2, 1963.

Area between New Jersey Avenue NW., D Street NW., and Louisiana Avenue NW.: 16-inch red oak.

West front House side: 36-inch linden, blown down by storm April 24, 1963.

A survey on the condition of the oaks, elms, and sycamore trees within the Capitol Grounds was conducted this past summer in collaboration with the Plant Pathologist of the U.S. Department of Interior. A final report has not yet been completed. These trees are being attacked by a plant virus, which is causing many trees to die back. This virus is being studied by the Plant Pathologist who as yet has found no cure. He has confirmed our spray program for all the trees on the Grounds to prevent any further spread of this virus.

The following sprays are being used throughout the season on the trees:

Dormant oil with lime sulfur spray in early spring, excepting the maples on which no dormant oil is to be used.

Summer spray on the elms using Black Leaf No. 40 with DDT.

Summer spray using DDT with arsenic of lead on remaining trees.

Summer spray on azaleas, boxwoods, and hollies using malathion and sevin.

Several of the hollies on the Grounds are infested with the Florida wax scale. This condition is being corrected by use of the above spray.

There are many areas of trees on the Grounds which are in good condition; however, there are also many areas which are in poor condition and require constant surveillance and work.

The Grounds has a request for funds, included in this appropriation, to begin a program for the replacement of trees which have died and have been removed in the past years.

Senator MONRONEY. But I still feel that we of all people must show some signs of consciousness of the cost of Government in these maintenance matters, and the shifting of employees when not needed to do some of these other duties might be helpful.

CONDITION OF GROUNDS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I might add at this time that we have had some severe criticism from some of the leaders of Congress for the condition of the grounds in the past, and there are two factors you can attribute as the cause of it.

One is personnel shortage and the other is that in the last 7 years we have constantly had some place in the Capitol Grounds torn up.

Senator MONRONEY. You still have.

Mr. STEWART. In addition, our grounds are open to the general public. Our lawns are repositories of paper and waste of all kinds that are discarded.

There are a great many persons coming here, and the fact that we have those conditions here has made it rather difficult to concentrate on any one area in the Capitol Grounds to bring it to the point of perfection that we would like to see it.

We hope with these additional men we can overcome some of these handicaps we have been under.

Senator MONRONEY. There will be two slight disruptions between the Capitol and the new Rayburn Office Building, I would say, before you get back to perfect order.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

The next item is Senate Office Buildings, which is not considered by the House of Representatives.

You are requesting an appropriation of \$2,945,000, an increase of \$693,850 over the current year appropriation.

I will place in the record pages 78 through 88 of the justifications. (The pages referred to follow:)

JUSTIFICATION

Senate Office Buildings

1963 appropriation in annual act-----	\$2, 235, 000
Pay supplemental in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963-----	16, 150
Total appropriations, 1963-----	2, 251, 150
Deduction: Repair and refinish terrace, old building, Constitution and Delaware Aves-----	- 30, 000
Base for 1964-----	<u>2, 221, 150</u>

Additions:

Personnel compensation:

Wage-rate increases authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Cong-----	28, 064
---	---------

Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Cong., 286 laborers and mechanics on the Senate Office Buildings roll are at present compensated on a wage-board, prevailing-rate basis. Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

An increase of \$19,223 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for these wage-board positions as a result of a general survey of Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington metropolitan area, conducted during the past year. The new rates went into effect Dec. 9, 1962, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Cong. This increase is necessary in order that the Senate Office Buildings wage-board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.

An increase of \$8,841 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions and other changes authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage-board system, for employees compensated under that act.

Within-grade promotions and other changes under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for employees compensated under that act-----

1, 905

Senate Office Buildings—Continued

Additions—Continued

Personnel compensation—Continued

Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$5,000 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year-----	\$5, 000
Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962, Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962-----	11, 835
2 additional positions: 1 electrician, wage board, 10 at \$5,845 per annum; 1 electrician helper, wage board, 5 at \$4,701 per annum-----	10, 546

At the present time, the electrical force for the 2 Senate Office Buildings consists of 9 men, including the foreman and 1 helper. Other than the addition of 3 men, who were added to the force in 1958 when the New Senate Office Building was staffed, there has been no increase in the size of the electrical maintenance force since 1956.

In addition to providing all the maintenance services for the extensive lighting and power distribution systems, this force is also required to maintain clock systems, legislative call systems, public address systems, fire alarm systems and interoffice communication systems. A large number of electrically operated refrigerators, cooking utensils, garbage disposals and other electrical appliances used by the cafeterias must be maintained in good repair and frequent replacements and adjustments are necessary for uninterrupted service. Vacuum cleaners and numerous other general utility devices require constant attention and repair by the electrical maintenance force.

During congressional sessions, the services of 2 electricians are utilized primarily for the maintenance and operation of the public address systems. In addition, the services of the electrical force are so urgently required during the day shift, that only 1 electrician can be spared to provide night services on the 4 p.m. to midnight shift. 2 men should be assigned to these services to conform to recognized safety regulations. Repairing and servicing of electrical equipment is a hazardous occupation, and the assignment of an additional man to the night force would eliminate the necessity of an electrician working alone on that shift.

In order to bring the Senate Office Buildings electrical maintenance force up to the minimum number required to insure satisfactory services essential to the functions of the Senate, it is requested that funds be allowed for 1964 to permit the addition of 1 electrician and 1 electrician's helper to the annual maintenance force.

Contribution to retirement fund, increased from \$87,300 to \$91,500-----	4, 200
---	--------

This item is required to cover the cost of Government contribution to retirement fund required by Public Law 854, 86th Cong., title IV: Civil Service Retirement Act amendments of 1956. The additional cost results from increase in basic pay rates.

Elevator repairs and improvements, increased from \$5,000 to \$55,000-----	50, 000
--	---------

A nonrecurring amount of \$50,000 is requested for 1964 under this allotment to provide for modernization of elevator No. 10 located in the southeast corner of the Old Senate Office Building. This is the only passenger elevator in the building that operates at the slow speed of 250 feet per minute. This elevator runs in conjunction with the adjacent elevator No. 11, which operates at a speed of 500 feet per minute.

Senate Office Buildings—Continued

Additions—Continued

Personnel compensation—Continued

Elevator repairs, etc.—Continued

Since construction of a pedestrian tunnel in 1959 from this corner in the old building to the New Senate Office Building, there has been a notable increase in passenger traffic on elevator No. 10. Modernization of this elevator would result in a marked improvement in the handling of traffic in this area.

Elevator No. 10 is a manually operated, outmoded elevator. The geared machine and hoisting motor are over 50 years old; replacement parts are no longer readily obtainable, and repair costs are not economically feasible.

Under the amount of \$50,000, it is proposed to convert elevator No. 10 from manual to automatic control and to increase the speed of the elevator from 250 to 500 feet per minute, thereby enabling operation of the elevator at the same speed as the adjacent elevator and permitting the car to operate with the same safety and efficiency as the other elevators in the building.

Maintenance, air-conditioning, and refrigeration systems—increased from \$9,700 to \$30,800.....

\$21, 100

Nonrecurring amounts of \$11,600 and \$9,500 are requested under this allotment for 1964.

\$11,600 is for replacement of the refrigerated drinking water condensing units in the 1st Street wing of the old building.

The present equipment consists of 2 15-horsepower refrigeration compressors, 2 condensers, 1 evaporator and miscellaneous gages, valves, switches, and controls. The equipment has been in operation for the past 30 years, is obsolete, worn out, and replacement parts are no longer available. Pumps, piping, and other parts are in need of replacement and repair. The electrical installation associated with the old compressors is of obsolete design, presenting a hazard to the maintenance personnel and, in general, does not conform to present day minimum requirements of the National Electrical Code. A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

\$9,500 is for replacement of fans Nos. 8 and 18 in the air-conditioning system of the old building. These 2 fans have been in operation for the past 25 years and have recently required extensive repair work to keep them in operation. The vibration in No. 8 fan has become so bad as to warrant condemnation. In order to keep No. 18 fan in operation, it has been necessary to reinforce it structurally at various times. This fan should have approximately 6,000 cubic feet per minute greater air capacity than it currently generates, due to increased heat load in the areas it serves. Vibration in the space below the fan is also of a very high degree. A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

Fire protection, attic floor, old building, nonrecurring item.....

136, 400

Approximately 40,000 square feet, or 60 percent, of the floor space in the attic of the Old Senate Office Building is used for the storage of combustible materials, such as printed documents, books, correspondence files, cartons, paper-wrapped packages, printed matter, furniture, and other miscellaneous combustible items.

Senate Office Buildings—Continued

Additions—Continued

Personnel compensation—Continued

Fire protection, etc.—Continued

The balance of the attic floor space is occupied by air-conditioning apparatus driven by electric motors, and electrically operated elevator machines and controllers. The machinery and storage areas are not segregated by fire retardant partitions, and the elevator shafts are not properly enclosed to restrict drafts and the spread of fire.

The attic floor is about 70 feet above street level, and in case of fire, much precious time would be lost to the city Fire Department in gaining access to the area. In addition, the attic floor level ordinarily is unattended by personnel and therefore an incipient fire could become conflagrant before being detected.

Since the storage of combustible materials must necessarily be continued in this area, the hazard to the uppermost part of the building should be eliminated in accordance with the recommendations of the District of Columbia Fire Marshal, the National Fire Protection Association, and other recognized authorities. These agencies strongly recommend the immediate installation of a wet type sprinkler system for the automatic and instant extinguishment of incipient fires, and the installation of fire resistant partitions and doors to retard the spread of fire and to segregate the machinery spaces from the storage areas.

A program for the elimination of fire hazards was commenced last year in the Capitol Building under funds allowed for such purpose by Congress, and the work proposed to be done in the attic of the Senate Office Building is, in effect, a continuation and extension of the fire hazard elimination program heretofore approved.

A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

Replacement of obsolete wiring, attic floor, old building,
nonrecurring item-----

\$35, 000

The electrical wiring for the lighting system on the attic floor of the Old Senate Office Building is over 50 years old, outmoded, and no longer serves satisfactorily its intended purpose. The insulation on the conductors has become brittle with age and there are insufficient circuits and panelboards to provide adequate illumination in the storage areas. The use of unprotected incandescent lamps suspended by deteriorated electrical cords and the inadequacy of the wiring installation presents a serious fire hazard. With the existing inadequate system, it is impossible to meet the minimum requirements and the constant demand for more lighting in the attic storage areas.

Under the amount requested for 1964, it is proposed to replace all of the existing wiring and exposed lamps, extend the electrical system to provide adequate illumination and make the installation conform with present-day requirements set forth in the National Electrical Code. A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

Senate Office Buildings—Continued

Additions—Continued

Personnel compensation—Continued

Installation and alteration of fireproof doors, basement, old building, nonrecurring item.....

\$14, 800

The existing corridor doors in the basement of the Old Senate Office Building, though approved type fire doors, are in such a state that they no longer efficiently serve fireproof purposes. Many of the doors have louvers in the bottom panel that were designed to be held in the open position by means of a fusible link that would cause them to close in the event of a fire. A large number of these louvers are now inoperative due to mechanical defects and should be repaired to make them again effective. 1 panel in each of several doors has been in the past replaced by glass or expanded metal. A number of doors that should be able to close are blocked in an open position. These doors should be so altered that they can be kept in an open position by means of fusible link door closers to provide for automatic closing in case of fire. Numerous doors that are normally kept in the closed position have defective door closers with the result that they are frequently left in the open position.

In addition, there are 74 wooden doors in the basement that should be replaced with metal doors.

All of the areas where corrective action or new metal doors are proposed contain flammable material in varying amounts and some offices have ceilings and walls covered with old type flammable acoustical tile.

Under the amount requested for 1964, it is proposed to make necessary repairs and alterations to existing fire doors to make them fire-resistant and to replace 12 wooden doors between offices and corridors and 62 wooden inside office connecting doors, including jambs and hardware, in the basement with fireproof metal doors.

Installation of electronic clock and legislative call systems, nonrecurring item.....

230, 000

This item was considered but not allowed by the committee last year and is submitted for reconsideration this year.

Under this allotment, it is proposed to replace the 450 existing clocks in the Old Senate Office Building, which are of an old design, with new synchronized, electronically-operated clocks, electronic receivers, and buzzers sounding the new legislative call system, and to install 130 visual indicating light units in Senators' suites and corridors in that building, connected with the clock system, to signify the various calls of the Senate by confirming and registering the audible buzzer signals.

Under this allotment, it is also proposed to install 130 visual indicating light units in Senators' suites and corridors in the New Senate Office Building, connected with the new electronic clock system already in that building, to signify the various calls of the Senate in the same manner as in the old building. These installations should be made in order to equip the two Senate Office Buildings with the same electronic clock and Senate call visual light system as is now installed in the Senate side of the Capitol with the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Senate Office Buildings—Continued

Additions—Continued

Personnel compensation—Continued

Converting for office and storage use space in old subway tunnel from the Capitol to the Old Senate Office Building nonrecurring item-----

\$165, 000

This item, considered but not allowed by the committee last year, was included in the 1964 budget estimates last fall at the direction of Senator Mansfield as chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and was recently approved by Senator Jordan as present chairman of that committee. The item has been endorsed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under the amount of \$165,000, it is proposed to convert for use as office and storage rooms the space in the old subway tunnel from the Capitol to the Old Senate Office Building.

It is proposed to provide 17 office rooms, varying in size from 17 by 17 feet to 20 by 13 feet, with finished plaster walls, acoustical tile ceiling, and vinyl tile floor with rubber tile baseboard, and with air conditioning and fluorescent lighting.

It is also proposed to provide 19 storage rooms, most of which would be 13 by 20 feet or 13 by 15 feet. The storage areas would be constructed of masonry blocks, painted inside and outside, and would be provided with louvered metal doors and wire mesh sections above for ventilation. Lighting would be fluorescent. The storage rooms would be so constructed as to permit later conversion as offices, if so desired in the future.

Toilets would be provided, 1 for men and 1 for women, approximately midway in the expanse of offices. The entire installation would be fireproof. Existing pipework in the corridors, consisting of large utility lines, would remain exposed. A corridor, approximately 6 feet wide, would be provided next to the utility lines from 1 end of the tunnel to the other.

If the work is accomplished by a combination of contracts and the Architect's forces, it is estimated that the job can be completed in approximately 4 months.

The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol, all recommend that the areas be furnished by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to the usual practice in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

Supplies and materials, increased from \$50,000 to \$60,000-

10, 000

An increase of \$5,000 is requested in order that a program may be initiated for replacing all fluorescent tubes in both buildings over a 2-year period, doing 1 building each year. Experience shows that a tube loses its effectiveness after 2 years of use, at which time it gives off inadequate illumination. Each building has approximately 18,000 fluorescent tubes and the current purchase cost is 80 cents per tube. This amounts to a total of \$14,400, or \$7,200 per year. \$5,000 would be paid under the increase requested for 1964 and \$2,200 from the regular annual recurring funds.

An increase of \$5,000 is requested for additional expenditure for cleaning materials due to the increased cost of such materials and the increase in personnel over the past years in Senators' offices and committees necessitating additional cleaning. The last increase provided under this allotment was in 1961.

Total additions-----	+723, 850
Total estimate for 1964-----	2, 945, 000

ELECTRICAL PERSONNEL INCREASES REQUESTED

Senator MONRONEY. This is a large increase, and I wish you would go into it in detail.

Mr. STEWART. The first item of increase is wage rate increases in the amount of \$28,064. The within-grade promotions under the Classification Act are \$1,905. The regular pay above the 52-week-base is \$5,000. The increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, "Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962" is \$11,835.

We are asking for two additional electricians, one a Wage Board 10 and the other a Wage Board 5, a helper, \$10,546.

At the present time, the electrical force for the two Senate Office Buildings consists of nine men, including the foreman and one helper.

Other than the addition of three men, who were added to the force in 1958, when the New Senate Office Building was staffed, there has been no increase in the size of the electrical maintenance force since 1956.

MAINTENANCE DUTIES

In addition to providing all the maintenance services for the extensive lighting and power distribution systems, this force is also required to maintain clock systems, legislative call systems, public address systems, fire alarm systems, and interoffice communication systems.

A large number of electrically operated refrigerators, cooking utensils, garbage disposals, and other electrical appliances used by the cafeterias must be maintained in good repair and frequent replacements and adjustments are necessary for uninterrupted service. Vacuum cleaners and numerous other general utility devices require constant attention and repair by the electrical maintenance force.

During congressional sessions, the services of two electricians are utilized primarily for the maintenance and operation of the public address systems.

In addition, the services of the electrical force are so urgently required during the day shift that only one electrician can be spared to provide night services on the 4-to-midnight shift.

Two men should be assigned to these services to conform to recognized safety regulations. Repairing and servicing of electrical equipment is a hazardous occupation, and the assignment of an additional man to the night force would eliminate the necessity of an electrician working alone on that shift.

In order to bring the Senate Office Buildings electrical maintenance force up to the minimum number required to insure satisfactory services essential to the functions of the Senate, it is requested that funds be allowed for 1964 to permit the addition of one electrician and one electrician helper to the annual maintenance force.

Now, the next is an item of \$4,200, which is a contribution to the retirement fund.

We are asking for \$50,000 for elevator repairs and improvements.

Senator MONRONEY. Now, wait a minute. Where do these go in?

MODERNIZATION OF ELEVATORS

Mr. STEWART. This allotment is to provide for modernization.

Senator MONRONEY. You are increasing it from \$5,000, which it has been, to \$55,000?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, that is right; an increase of \$50,000.

Mr. HENLOCK. The \$50,000 is nonrecurring, Senator, just for this 1 year.

Senator MONRONEY. But that is elevator No. 10?

Mr. STEWART. That is at the south east corner of the Old Senate Office Building. This is the only passenger elevator in the building that operates at the slow speed of 250 feet per minute. This elevator runs in conjunction with the adjacent elevator No. 11, which operates at a speed of 500 feet per minute.

Since construction of a pedestrian tunnel in 1959 from this corner in the Old Building to the New Senate Office Building, there has been a notable increase in passenger traffic on elevator No. 10. Modernization of this elevator would result in a marked improvement in the handling of traffic in this area.

Elevator No. 10 is a manually operated, outmoded elevator. The geared machine and hoisting motor are over 50 years old; replacement parts are no longer readily obtainable, and repair costs are not economically feasible.

Under the amount of \$50,000, it is proposed to convert elevator No. 10 from manual to automatic control, and to increase the speed of the elevator from 250 to 500 feet per minute, thereby enabling operation of the elevator at the same speed as the adjacent elevator and permitting the car to operate with the same safety and efficiency as the other elevators in the building.

SLOW ELEVATORS

Senator MONRONEY. You are going to take away that blessed manual control that the Senators love, with which they can get service, and put some more of this slow and uncertain automatic control on it?

MANUALLY CONTROLLED ELEVATORS PREFERRED

I have heard more Senators say that they would 10 times rather ride the manually controlled elevators in the Old Senate Office Building. They can get to their floors. They can get to the floor of the Senate when they need to.

And they can never get the elevators promptly in the New Senate Office Building, for which we spent a tremendous amount of money on all kinds of systems.

Mr. HENLOCK. Senator, we ordinarily make them automatic so that when an elevator operator is not available late at night, they can be operated automatically.

Senator MONRONEY. But you have made them so slow in the New Senate Office Building. You can never get up and down on the elevators.

Mr. HENLOCK. The speed of this elevator will be increased from 250 to 500 feet per minute.

Senator MONRONEY. What speed did you have in the New Senate Office Building?

Mr. RUBLE. About 400 feet per minute.

Senator MONRONEY. The automatic traffic just jams it up. I know of no elevators that are not jammed and overloaded. The few that

you do have operated by people, you can get up and down sometimes on.

But if we put this in for this amount, and say we are going to convert the Old Senate Office Building elevators over to those like the New Senate Office Building, I do not think you will have a vote in the Senate, certainly not from the people who have offices in the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. STEWART. Well, elevator No. 11 seems to be giving good service, does it not, right alongside No. 10? Have you heard any complaints about that?

Senator MONRONEY. I do not know, but almost all the elevators in the old building are still manually operated.

Mr. STEWART. May I ask Mr. Caraway: Is elevator No. 11 manually operated?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Let's not ruin those that move fast.

PRESENT SPEED OF ELEVATOR

Mr. CARAWAY. Senator, our trouble is that we have two elevators here at this corner. One is very slow, the one that we want to repair, and the people just will not ride on it, because it takes too long to get up.

The other elevator can almost go up and come down before this one moves.

Senator MONRONEY. Can you get the speed of the car without losing its advantages by automation?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; we still will have the operator, the same as we have now.

Senator MONRONEY. But this says automatic control, in the justification.

Mr. CARAWAY. That can be used at night.

Senator MONRONEY. But will that slow it down? These are 400 feet a minute, the architect says. But you still cannot get up and down on them over here.

PROPOSED SPEED PLUS AUTOMATION

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, we are going to increase this one to 500 feet a minute.

Senator MONRONEY. 400 and 500 feet a minute is not very much difference. If you put the automation on, you are still going to be tying up traffic. That is what I am trying to say. Can we save a little bit of money here, and just leave them like the Senators like them in the Old Senate Office Building, but speed them up?

Mr. CARAWAY. It will operate the same as the other elevators.

Senator MONRONEY. But still, he is asking for automatic control, as well as increasing the speed.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, we have two elevators over there now with automatic control, but still you can go up there and push the button three times and the operator will come right to you. It can be put on automatic at night.

I do not believe they are the same system that you have in this building—that we are going to put on elevator No. 10.

Mr. RUBEL. The speed of the elevator is the same. The traveling speed of the elevator is the same, whether it is on manual control or automatic.

AUTOMATIC ELEVATORS CAPABLE OF CONTROL

Senator MONRONEY. Something seems to happen on the automatic. The boy can move the handle up or down, and he comes and gets you.

Mr. RUBEL. That is true.

Senator MONRONEY. He closes the door himself. He does not have to wait.

Mr. RUBEL. There are certain time sequences required with automatic control, which an operator can speed up if he is an intelligent man.

Senator MONRONEY. If you keep manning the automatic elevators, then you might as well have the men operating them, and not have to delay the traffic as it backs up here now.

I mean at noon today you could hardly get up or down to save your life.

Mr. RUBEL. The primary purpose of including the feature of automatic control on any elevator in these buildings is so that they can be operated by any individual after hours, when there are no operators available. I am sure that is found to be quite useful. I find it so myself when I am here late at night.

Senator MONRONEY. If someone remembers to turn them on.

Mr. RUBEL. There is always an automatic elevator available.

Senator MONRONEY. You might have to hunt all around the building for them, then, because oftentimes I have found the automatic elevators not turned on when you are trying to get down after the shift.

Mr. RUBEL. There are certain ones selected for availability at night, and if they were not available, it would mean walking up and down stairs.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, I have done that, in the past.

All right. Next item?

AIR CONDITIONING AND REFRIGERATION MAINTENANCE

Mr. STEWART. The next one is for maintenance, air conditioning, and refrigeration systems—increased from \$9,700 to \$30,800—\$21,100. Nonrecurring amounts of \$11,600 and \$9,500 are requested under this allotment for 1964; \$11,600 is for replacement of the refrigerated drinking water condensing units in the First Street wing of the old building.

The present equipment consists of two 15-horsepower refrigeration compressors, two condensers, one evaporator, and miscellaneous gages, valves, switches, and controls.

The equipment has been in operation for the past 30 years, is obsolete, worn out, and replacement parts are no longer available. Pumps, piping, and other parts are in need of replacement and repair.

The electrical installation associated with the old compressors is of obsolete design, presenting a hazard to the maintenance personnel, and, in general, does not conform to present-day minimum requirements of the National Electrical Code. A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications; \$9,500 is for replace-

ment of fans Nos. 8 and 18 in the air-conditioning system of the old building. These two fans have been in operation for the past 25 years, and have recently required extensive repair work to keep them in operation.

The vibration in No. 8 fan has become so bad as to warrant condemnation. In order to keep No. 18 fan in operation, it has been necessary to reinforce it structurally at various times.

This fan should have approximately 6,000-cubic-feet-per-minute greater air capacity than it currently generates, due to increased heat load in the areas it serves. Vibration in the space below the fan is also of a very high degree. A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

FIRE PROTECTION, OLD SENATE OFFICE ATTIC

Fire protection, attic floor, old building—nonrecurring item—\$136,400.

Approximately 40,000 square feet, or 60 percent, of the floor space in the attic of the Old Senate Office Building is used for the storage of combustible materials, such as printed documents, books, correspondence files, cartons, paper-wrapped packages, printed matter, furniture, and other miscellaneous combustible items.

The balance of the attic floor space is occupied by air-conditioning apparatus driven by electric motors, and electrically operated elevator machines and controllers. The machinery and storage areas are not segregated by fire-retardant partitions, and the elevator shafts are not properly enclosed to restrict drafts and the spread of fire.

The attic floor is about 70 feet above street level, and, in case of fire, much precious time would be lost to the city fire department in gaining access to this area.

In addition, the attic floor level ordinarily is unattended by personnel, and, therefore, an incipient fire could become conflagrant before being detected.

Since the storage of combustible materials must necessarily be continued in this area, the hazard to the uppermost part of the building should be eliminated in accordance with the recommendations of the District of Columbia Fire Marshal, the National Fire Protection Association, and other recognized authorities.

These agencies strongly recommend the immediate installation of a wet-type sprinkler system for the automatic and instant extinguishment of incipient fires, and the installation of fire-resistant partitions and doors to retard the spread of fire and to segregate the machinery spaces from the storage areas.

A program for the elimination of fire hazards was commenced last year in the Capitol Building, under funds allowed for such purpose by Congress, and the work proposed to be done in the attic of the Senate Office Building is, in effect, a continuation and extension of the fire hazard elimination program heretofore approved.

A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

OBSOLESCE WIRING REPLACEMENT

Replacement of obsolete wiring, attic floor, Old Building, non-recurring item; \$35,000.

The electrical wiring for the lighting system on the attic floor of the Old Senate Office Building is over 50 years old, outmoded, and no longer serves satisfactorily its intended purpose.

The insulation on the conductors has become brittle with age and there are insufficient circuits and panelboards to provide adequate illumination in the storage areas. The use of unprotected incandescent lamps suspended by deteriorated electrical cords and the inadequacy of the wiring installation presents a serious fire hazard.

With the existing inadequate system, it is impossible to meet the minimum requirements and the constant demand for more lighting in the attic storage areas.

Under the amount requested for 1964, it is proposed to replace all of the existing wiring and exposed lamps, extend the electrical system to provide adequate illumination and make the installation conform with present-day requirements set forth in the National Electrical Code.

A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

INSTALLATION OF FIREPROOF DOORS, OLD BUILDING

Installation and alteration of fireproof doors, basement, Old Building, nonrecurring item; \$14,800.

The existing corridor doors in the basement of the Old Senate Office Building, though approved type fire doors, are in such a state that they no longer efficiently serve fireproof purposes.

Many of the doors have louvers in the bottom panel that were designed to be held in the open position by means of a fusible link that would cause them to close in the event of a fire. A large number of these louvers are now inoperative, due to mechanical defects, and should be repaired to make them again effective.

One panel in each of several doors has been in the past replaced by glass or expanded metal. A number of doors that should be able to close are blocked in an open position.

These doors should be so altered that they can be kept in an open position by means of fusible link door closers to provide for automatic closing in case of fire.

Numerous doors that are normally kept in the closed position have defective door closers with the result that they are frequently left in the open position.

In addition, there are 74 wooden doors in the basement that should be replaced with metal doors.

All of the areas where corrective action or new metal doors are proposed contain flammable material in varying amounts, and some offices have ceilings and walls covered with old type flammable acoustical tile.

REPAIR OF FIRE DOORS

Under the amount requested for 1964, it is proposed to make necessary repairs and alterations to existing fire doors to make them fire resistant, and to replace 12 wooden doors between offices and corridors and 62 wooden inside office connecting doors, including jambs and hardware, in the basement with fireproof metal doors.

FUNDS FOR CLOCK SYSTEM

Now, there is an item of \$230,000, which we submit again——

Senator MONRONEY. This was turned down by the committee last year. Why did you submit it in the same amount?

Mr. STEWART. The estimate was prepared by Mr. Rubel, who can explain this item further.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, if the Congress turned this down, obviously we were not necessarily happy with the old clocks in the Senate Office Building, but we were unhappy about this awful cost for these 100 offices.

Mr. STEWART. The program has just been completed in the past session in the Capitol. The idea was to submit the item again for your review, after you had a chance to see it in operation in the Capitol, in case you wanted to consider it again this year.

Senator MONRONEY. Those that I have heard mention it think it is far overpriced, and there must be some better way of notifying the Members. In other words, the installation of clocks—this is all Senate Office Building stuff, is it not?

Mr. STEWART. This is in the old building.

Senator MONRONEY. The new building is having just as much trouble with its bells, you see, and this would only take care of half. Would it take half a million dollars to get these things in both buildings?

Mr. RUBEL. The \$230,000 takes care of both buildings.

Senator MONRONEY. Because the clocks here are just about as bad. They are worse over there. We had to, in a number of committee rooms, put in clocks installed on the face of the other clocks, because of the poor quality.

CLOCK REPAIRS

Are we stuck by the contractor on this kind of bad delivery of equipment that does not work?

Mr. STEWART. You mean on the recent installation?

Senator MONRONEY. Of the clocks that were put on this building.

Mr. RUBEL. The contractor has been making the repairs at his own expense, even though we have a guarantee which has expired.

Senator MONRONEY. They never have worked right.

Mr. RUBEL. Some of these clocks are too heavy to operate properly. You are talking about the big clocks with the long bronze hands. The hands are much too heavy, and they are out of balance, so that the motor bearings wear out very quickly. The manufacturer has corrected some of them, at his own expense.

Senator MONRONEY. They can put cheap electric clocks on the face of them, so that at least you can tell what time it is.

Mr. RUBEL. And the esthetic effect would be spoiled.

Senator MONRONEY. The esthetic and practical have to be tested against each other, and you need to know the time of day.

Mr. RUBEL. I would like to say we are not having any trouble in the Capitol Building with the clocks. I can assure you of that. They are all properly synchronized.

LEGISLATIVE CALL SYSTEM

Senator MONRONEY. The next item was kicked out last year, too.

Mr. STEWART. It was kicked out, but included in the 1964 budget estimates this fall at the direction of Senator Mansfield as chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules Administration, and was recently approved by Senator Jordan, as present chairman of that committee.

This item has been endorsed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Senator MONRONEY. Before we get on this one, I had one question I wanted to ask.

SUGGESTION OF DIAL SYSTEM

Has there been any consideration given to a system where you would dial a telephone number when legislative bells sound, and a recording would advise you of the purpose of the bell being sounded?

In other words, you swamp the minority and majority cloakrooms the minute a bell rings. The offices all call in there, and they are just absolutely swamped.

Well, if one boy, talking into a line, could answer the incoming calls for a while, you would not need all these stars and all this other stuff to tell you what is going on over in the Senate. And that is on the new clocks.

Mr. STEWART. The purpose of putting the lights around the clock was to give the information to the Member or his office as to just what it was, whether it was a two-call or a three-call, or whatever it was.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be unnecessary, I think, with a very simple telephone system that could be worked out to work over our telephones. In other words, everybody has a secretary, and their secretary is going to be on the job when the Congress is in session, when we are having a session, and if the communication is all you are trying to get, what the rollcall is about, what it is for—

Mr. STEWART. I might say this by way of information, Mr. Chairman. In the Rayburn Building, that has been recently approved by the House Office Building Commission, we are going to have lights in the clocks in all of the suites, so that everyone is going to be informed.

Senator MONRONEY. That is the business of the House. But the Senate has not been very well impressed, I think, by these clocks, or by the glowing lights.

NO LIGHTED CLOCKS IN SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. RUBEL. If I may say a word, Senator: the reason you are still having all of these telephone calls to find out what the signal was sounded is because we do not have the lights in the Old Senate Office Building, or in the New Senate Office Building, where they are really needed. There is where the calls should be recognized.

Senator MONRONEY. That is right. They are not needed at all, hardly, in the rooms of the Capitol.

Mr. RUBEL. They are needed more in the buildings than in the Capitol.

Senator MONRONEY. In the offices.

But what I am trying to say: You come in here and request a quarter of a million dollars for a system of lights and a new clock.

And I do not believe everybody has checked the telephone company to find out if there is not a way they can all be notified at the time of a rollcall, that each office could be rung with a bell with someone on the line saying the quorum call is for this or that purpose.

Mr. RUBEL. I have not checked that.

Senator MONRONEY. Let's have that checked, and give us a figure on what the telephone company could do. I think it would be a rather quick and easy solution to this problem, without the necessity of putting in all these lights.

Mr. RUBEL. I will certainly look into it.

CONVERSION OF TUNNEL

Senator MONRONEY. On the converting of this tunnel: \$165,000. It appears to me, and many Members who discussed it last year, that it was unventilated and unhealthful and would serve as the most substandard quarters possible to be installed on Capitol Hill.

Inasmuch as people would like to have more space for their robotypes, it just seems like we can make recapture, if we had the courage to do so, of some of the quarters that have been squirreled away by various groups that got in and have homesteaded space that they do not necessarily need or require.

Mr. CAMPIOLI. Senator, these spaces will be air conditioned.

QUESTION OF USE AS FALLOUT SHELTER

Senator MONRONEY. Sure, but it is still a tunnel, and damp. I just do not think the Senate wants to do this.

Further, there has been quite a lot of discussion that this is ideal space for a fallout shelter. Whether we want to have one up here or not is immaterial to me, but it seems we have had some correspondence and some challenge over the fact that there has been no cooperation on the part of the Senate to join in what we are urging the Nation to do, and that is to provide some fallout shelters.

Mr. STEWART. May I inform you on some of the details?

Senator MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. At the inception of the Civil Defense program, I was selected as the representative of the Congress to coordinate the efforts of the Congress with Civil Defense. They have made exhaustive studies of our present buildings and spaces to which to go in event of attack. Places for storage of emergency equipment and materials have all been charted and laid out.

I decided some months ago to delay submission of the plan to the Congress until the surrounding areas around the Capitol buildings, in the neighborhood, were properly taken care of by Civil Defense authorities, or at least there was some study made as to how they were going to take care of those people, so that if something should happen, everyone in this section of the city would not be directed to our buildings resulting in a use going far beyond our capacity.

So far as use of the House Office Buildings and the House Wing of the Capitol for such purpose is concerned, such use is now being considered by the Speaker of the House.

The matter of use of the Senate Office Buildings and the Senate wing of the Capitol will also be placed before the Senate Committee

on Rules and Administration for determination as to use of Senate facilities as a shelter area.

Senator MONRONEY. Where will you put it in?

Mr. STEWART. For instance, for one place, we have in mind the House subway tunnel, which is comparable to the old Senate subway tunnel.

Senator MONRONEY. You could not do that if you used it for office space.

Mr. STEWART. No sir.

There are still other areas in various places throughout the buildings where you could stock emergency items and use as shelters. The matter is being continually studied. That is the status of it at the present time.

Senator MONRONEY. We will print in the record, at this place, the justification for the remodeling on that.

Having been turned down once by the Senate, I think it is rather doubtful that they would change their minds.

(The justification referred to follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Conversion of tunnel space

Converting for office and storage use space in old subway tunnel from the Capitol to the Old Senate Office Building, nonrecurring item---- \$165,000

This item, considered but not allowed by the committee last year, was included in the 1964 budget estimates last fall at the direction of Senator Mansfield as chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and was recently approved by Senator Jordan as present chairman of that committee. The item has been endorsed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under the amount of \$165,000, it is proposed to convert for use as office and storage rooms the space in the old subway tunnel from the Capitol to the Old Senate Office Building.

It is proposed to provide 17 office rooms, varying in size from 17 by 17 feet to 20 by 13 feet, with finished plaster walls, acoustical tile ceiling, and vinyl tile floor with rubber tile baseboard, and with air conditioning and fluorescent lighting.

It is also proposed to provide 19 storage rooms, most of which would be 13 by 20 feet or 13 by 15 feet. The storage areas would be constructed of masonry blocks, painted inside and outside, and would be provided with louvered metal doors and wire mesh sections above for ventilation. Lighting would be fluorescent. The storage rooms would be so constructed as to permit later conversion as offices, if so desired in the future.

Toilets would be provided, one for men and one for women, approximately midway in the expanse of offices. The entire installation would be fireproof. Existing pipework in the corridors, consisting of large utility lines, would remain exposed. A corridor, approximately 6 feet wide, would be provided next to the utility lines from one end of the tunnel to the other.

If the work is accomplished by a combination of contracts and the Architect's forces, it is estimated that the job can be completed in approximately 4 months.

The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol, all recommend that the areas be furnished by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to the usual practice in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

A breakdown of the estimate is given in the detailed section of the justifications.

SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Senator MONRONEY. The next item is "Supplies and materials."

Mr. STEWART. We are asking an increase of \$5,000, to replace all the fluorescent tubes in both the buildings over a 2-year period, doing one building each year. The experience shows that the tube loses

effectiveness after 2 years of use, at which time it gives off inadequate illumination.

Each building has approximately 18,000 fluorescent tubes, and the current purchase cost is 80 cents per tube, which amounts to a total of \$14,400, or \$7,200 a year—\$5,000 would be paid under the increased request for 1964, and \$2,200 from the regular annual recurring funds.

An increase of \$5,000 is requested for additional expenditures for cleaning materials, due to the increased cost of such materials and the increase in personnel over the past years in the Senators' offices and committees, necessitating additional cleaning.

The last increase provided under this allotment was in 1961.

RAT CONTROL

Senator MONRONEY. Speaking of cleaning, what is the situation regarding rat control up here?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Caraway can answer that question.

Senator MONRONEY. I understand in the House situation, since they have cleaned out and torn out that area, the rats that once dwelled in the restaurants and various other installations across from the Library of Congress in that block have now moved over to the House Office Building, and I was wondering if it is getting equally bad over on the Senate side.

Mr. STEWART. The House Office Buildings are due for an intensive program of elimination of rodents next year.

Senator MONRONEY. Is the money contained in this bill?

Mr. STEWART. The money is contained in this bill for it.

Senator MONRONEY. How about the Senate side?

Mr. CARAWAY. I have only had a complaint about small mice, Senator, and we put out poison to control that situation.

Senator MONRONEY. But you have more restaurants in the New Senate Office Building and larger restaurants on the Capitol side, and more people have coffee and food dispensing in their offices.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is our biggest trouble, people eating in the offices.

Senator MONRONEY. But you have no problem over on our side?

Mr. CARAWAY. Not with the rats. I haven't heard any complaints except about mice.

Senator MONRONEY. Never let it be said there are more in the House than there are in the Senate. Anyway you will give recognition to that, and if there is any outbreak let us join with the House.

CONTRACT WITH EXTERMINATOR

Mr. STEWART. Our experience has shown that the best answer we can find is to make a contract with an exterminating company to maintain a regular, periodic control program. The work of the company that we have had over in the Capitol and also in the House Office Buildings has been very effective.

Senator MONRONEY. In the Capitol it has been pretty bad, has it not?

Mr. STEWART. Not as bad now as it was in years gone by.

Senator MONRONEY. You have a rodent control experiment?

Mr. STEWART. We have a rodent control program in the Capitol. Outside of a few rats that may be attracted by the restaurant garbage pails near the two sidewalk lifts, I doubt if there are many in the Capitol.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Senator MONRONEY. The committee will now consider your request of \$2,230,000 for the Capitol Power Plant, an increase of \$178,000 over the current year appropriation. This request contains a request for two additional positions.

(The justifications follow.)

JUSTIFICATION

Capitol Power Plant

1963 appropriation in annual act-----	\$2, 052, 000
Additions:	
Personnel compensation:	
Wage-rate increases authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Cong.-----	13, 230
Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Cong., 82 laborers and mechanics on the Capitol Power Plant roll are compensated on a wage board, prevailing-rate basis. Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.	
An increase of \$10,609 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for these wage board positions as a result of a general survey of Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington metropolitan area, conducted during the past year. The new rates went into effect, Dec. 9, 1962, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Cong. This increase is necessary in order that the Capitol Power Plant wage board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.	
An increase of \$2,621 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions and other changes falling due in that year, authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage board system, for employees compensated under that act.	
Within-grade promotions authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for employees compensated under that act.-----	505
Overtime and holiday pay costs increased by \$4,000 to meet increased costs under that allotment resulting from base pay increases under Public Law 763 and under Public Law 87-793.-----	4, 000
Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$1,800 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year-----	1, 800
Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962—Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962-----	1, 839

Capitol Power Plant—Continued

Additions—Continued

Personnel compensation—Continued

2 additional positions: 1 wage board 12 instrument mechanic at \$6,781 per annum; 1 wage board 10 welder helper at \$5,845 per annum-----

\$12, 626

Wage board instrument mechanic: At the present time there are 4 instrument mechanics provided at the Capitol Power Plant to calibrate, service, and keep in repair the hundreds of gages, thermometers, flowmeters, and other control instruments not only at the Capitol Power Plant but also in the plant's extensive steam and chilled water distribution systems connecting the plant with the various buildings which it supplies with steam and refrigeration. With the addition of the New Senate Office Building, the extension of the east front of the Capitol, modifications to the Library of Congress heating and ventilating systems, changes, improvements, and expansion of the Capitol Power Plant facilities to meet expanded requirements, there are now many more instruments to be serviced and the work cannot be carried on properly without the addition of another mechanic to the maintenance force.

These control instruments must be calibrated and adjusted at regular intervals to insure proper operating conditions, as inaccurate readings could actually cause dangerous situations to arise. This is particularly true of the complex pneumatic control systems that regulate pressure, temperature, and flow of steam, chilled water, and air conditioning.

Wage board welder's helper: There is 1 position of welder provided at the Capitol Power Plant. This position was allowed in 1960 and has made it possible to carry on welding work on a fairly regular basis. There is not only much need for such service at the plant and in its steam and chilled water distribution systems but there is also a growing need for such service in the buildings supplied by the plant. Welding repairs must be made to chilled waterlines, hot-oil pipelines for snow melting, steam lines, and other equipment. As it is, the welder now has to attempt to do the work of both a welder and a helper and under such conditions his services cannot be used to best advantage and his output is necessarily handicapped.

It is strongly urged [that an additional position of welder's helper be allowed for 1964 in order that the heavy workload to be cared for may be met in a satisfactory and efficient manner, with a consequent increase in output.

Personnel benefits: Contribution to retirement fund—Increased from \$33,400 to \$35,100-----

1, 700

This additional cost results from increase in basic pay rates and is required by Public Law 854, 84th Cong.

Annual gas service—Increased from \$1,700 to \$12,000-----

10, 300

For a number of years, the annual allotment for purchase of gas from the local public utility has been \$1,700. With the recent installation of 2 gas-fired boilers at Poplar Point Nursery to serve the 8 new greenhouses constructed at the nursery under authority of Public Law 1005, 84th Cong., and placed in service last year, it is now necessary to purchase gas in the total amount of \$12,000, based on actual operating experience. An increase of \$10,300 under this allotment is therefore requested for the fiscal year 1964.

Capital Power Plant—Continued

Additions—Continued

Purchase of electrical energy—Increased from \$968,000 to \$1,100,000-----

\$132, 000

For 1963, \$968,000 was allowed for purchase of 80,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy from the local public utility at an average cost of 1.2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

For 1964, \$1,100,000 is requested for purchase of 92,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy, also at an average cost of 1.2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

The increase is due primarily to increased wattage use resulting from improved and additional illumination installed throughout the Capitol Building under the Capitol extension project. This program is now about 75-percent completed and the full benefit of the program is beginning to be realized. Additional lighting improvements will continue to be effected in the fiscal year 1964. All of this results in the use of additional electrical energy, along with the improved lighting.

In addition 3 new elevators and escalators in the House wing of the Capitol and the power supply system serving the new subway transportation system connecting the Rayburn House Office Building with the House wing of the Capitol are expected to be placed in service during the latter half of the fiscal year 1964, resulting in the use of additional electrical energy.

It is also expected that electrical energy will be required during the latter half of the fiscal year 1964 for preliminary operation and testing of the air-conditioning and lighting systems and other equipment in the Rayburn House Office Building; also, for heating, air-conditioning, and ventilating improvements in progress at the main Library of Congress Building, and for a gradual increase in requirements of the other buildings under the Architect.

Total additions-----+178, 000

Total estimate for 1964-----2, 230, 000

WAGE INCREASES

On the wages increases, just call out if it is wage increases under public law, so that we can save time.

Mr. STEWART. Wage-rate increases are \$13,230. The Classification Act increase is \$505. The overtime and holiday pay costs are \$4,000. Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$1,800 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year.

Increased pay costs due to Federal Salary Reform Act, \$1,839.

ADDITIONAL POSITIONS

Two additional positions for which we are asking \$12,626—one Wage-Board-12 instrument mechanic, and one Wage-Board-10 welder helper.

At the present time there are four instrument mechanics provided at the Capitol Power Plant to calibrate, service, and keep in repair the hundreds of gages, thermometers, flow meters and other control instruments not only at the Capitol Power Plant but also in the plant's extensive steam and chilled water distribution systems connecting the plant with the various buildings which it supplies with steam and refrigeration.

With the addition of the New Senate Office Building, the extension of the east front of the Capitol, modifications to the Library of Congress heating and ventilating systems, changes, improvements, and expansion of the Capitol Power Plant facilities to meet expanded requirements, there are now many more instruments to be serviced and the work cannot be carried on properly without the addition of another mechanic to the maintenance force.

These control instruments must be calibrated and adjusted at regular intervals to insure proper operating conditions, as inaccurate readings could actually cause dangerous situations to arise. This is particularly true of the complex pneumatic control systems that regulate pressure, temperature, and flow of steam, chilled water, and air conditioning.

WAGE-BOARD WELDER'S HELPER

There is one position of welder provided at the Capitol Power Plant. This position was allowed in 1960 and has made it possible to carry on welding work on a fairly regular basis.

There is not only much need for such service at the plant and in its steam and chilled water distribution systems but there is also a growing need for such service in the buildings supplied by the plant. Welding repairs must be made to chilled water lines, hot-oil pipelines for snow melting, steam lines, and other equipment.

As it is, the welder now has to attempt to do the work of both a welder and a helper and under such conditions his services cannot be used to best advantage and his output is necessarily handicapped.

It is strongly urged that an additional position of welder's helper be allowed for 1964 in order that the heavy workload to be cared for may be met in a satisfactory and efficient manner, with a consequent increase in output.

OTHER INCREASES

Now, the personnel benefits are increased \$1,700, that is the contribution to the retirement fund.

The annual gas services are increased from \$1,700 to \$12,000.

Mr. HENLOCK. The gas is used for gas-fired boilers at the nursery.

Senator MONRONEY. You must be heating that, all with gas. Is that correct?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Because the gas, apparently, that you used in your principal plant—was the gas used there to fire the coal?

Mr. RUBEL. No; there was no use of gas there.

Mr. STEWART. None at all. We have four small oil-burning units being installed now for summertime use.

Mr. RUBEL. That is correct. They will be oil fired, as proposed.

Mr. STEWART. But this is for two gas-fired boilers down at the nursery, which we installed recently for eight new greenhouses. They are in operation now. It is now necessary to purchase gas in the total amount of \$12,000, based on actual operating experiences. We have eight new greenhouses down there, and an increase of \$10,000 under this allotment is therefore requested.

PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY

Senator MONRONEY. On the purchase of electrical energy, I see it increased from \$968,000 to \$1,100,000. Is that because of the Rayburn Office Building?

Mr. RUBEL. In part, Senator, and also a gradual increase in the other buildings, where we are modernizing the lighting.

Mr. STEWART. That is for increased wattage use resulting from improved and additional illumination installed throughout the Capitol Building under the Capitol extension project.

Senator MONRONEY. What rate of pay per kilowatt?

Mr. STEWART. 1.2 cents. That is a good low rate.

Mr. RUBEL. Yes, sir. That is because we purchase it at 13,000 volts, and we step it down in each building.

Senator MONRONEY. And you carry it from the powerplant on your own lines over here?

Mr. RUBEL. All the energy is supplied by the Potomac Electric Power Co.

Senator MONRONEY. And how do you step it down at each place?

Mr. RUBEL. The 13,000-volt feeders are brought into transformer stations in the various buildings, and we step it down to 208 volts.

LIGHTING CAPITOL DOME

Senator MONRONEY. Have we cut down the lighting on the dome of the Capitol?

Mr. RUBEL. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Maybe it is just on the cloudy evenings that it doesn't seem to be as bright.

Mr. RUBEL. When the humidity is high, it doesn't seem as bright.

Senator MONRONEY. But it is the same intensity?

Mr. RUBEL. The same as since the beginning.

Senator MONRONEY. It is turned off at 12, is it not? Or is it 11?

Mr. RUBEL. It is turned off about midnight.

Senator MONRONEY. How much would it cost to keep it lighted until daylight.

Mr. ROOF. We have a study on that, Senator, and we can give it to you for your information.

Senator MONRONEY. I think one place in the world where we would like to keep this symbol of freedom on a 24-hour basis—I just would be interested in knowing what the cost would be.

Mr. ROOF. We have a figure we can give you on it.

(The information is as follows:)

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1963.

HON. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the recent hearings before your subcommittee on the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1964, you requested that I furnish for the record the estimated cost of keeping on the floodlighting of the Capitol dome during the period daily from midnight to sunrise.

This estimate is as follows:

(a) Electrical energy-----	\$2, 500
(b) Maintenance, repair, and replacements-----	2, 000
Estimated total annual cost-----	4, 500

Except during the period of the blackout during World War II and certain dimouts during coal strikes, the following schedule has been followed with respect to lighting the dome for many years:

1. Four searchlights (2 on the east front and 2 on the west front) are focused on the Statue of Freedom surmounting the dome. These four lights stay on during the entire night. They illuminate the Statue of Freedom and the upper portion of the dome, so some light is already provided for the dome during all hours of darkness.

2. The floodlights which illuminate the dome proper are turned on at dusk and off at midnight.

If your committee desires that the floodlighting of the dome be kept on during the entire night, it is requested that the estimated annual cost of \$4,500 be added under the appropriation item "Capitol buildings."

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Senator MONRONEY. Under the "Capitol Power" Plant, your justification states, there is the providing of heat, light, power, refrigeration, for the Capitol, Senate, and House Office Buildings, U.S. Supreme Court Building, Library Building, and the Folger Shakespearean Library.

I think you testified you did not receive any reimbursement from these buildings, which are not considered a part of the legislative establishment.

Mr. HENLOCK. We do actually receive reimbursement from the Government Printing Office. That was \$52,000 last year for the steam furnished them. From the Washington City Post Office we received a reimbursement of \$49,000. And from the Folger Shakespearean Library, which is authorized to be supplied by our plant by law, \$5,400—or a total of more than \$100,000, reimbursement.

Senator MONRONEY. That is in all, \$100,000?

Mr. HENLOCK. Yes, sir. And that is covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, the floor space where we serviced the Supreme Court Building and so one would seem to be a rather significant amount, would it not?

Mr. RUBEL. Yes, sir. It is somewhat less than the Government Printing Office service.

Mr. HENLOCK. Of course, we ordinarily consider the library part of the legislative establishment expenses. Actually, there would only be the Supreme Court.

Senator MONRONEY. We could charge the library, too, and make a separate appropriation for it just like the Government Printing Office. It serves the public just as it does us. But could you give us an estimate and submit it for the record?

COST OF FURNISHING LIGHTING

Mr. HENLOCK. Our electrical energy estimate is based on \$31,000 for electrical energy for the Supreme Court for next year, and \$172,000 for the two library buildings for next year.

Senator MONRONEY. \$172,000 for the two libraries, and for the Supreme Court \$32,000?

Mr. HENLOCK. \$31,000.

Senator MONRONEY. That is nearly \$200,000. That is not hay. Those would be the only ones we are not being reimbursed for?

Mr. HENLOCK. And the Botanic Garden.

Senator MONRONEY. And what was the amount you gave me on the others?

Mr. HENLOCK. \$100,000 reimbursement for steam. The \$200,000, if reimbursed, would be for electricity.

HEATING AND REFRIGERATION

Senator MONRONEY. You gave me the electricity. But we also furnish the heat.

Mr. ROOF. And refrigeration.

Senator MONRONEY. You could run an estimate on floor space, could you not?

Mr. RUBEL. On the heat, yes.

Senator MONRONEY. On the heat and refrigeration.

Since this comes to a pretty sizable amount, when you consider your powerplant cost of \$2 million, if we could run—well, this would be a recovery of 10 percent of it right there, you see, on these two items.

Mr. STEWART. Will you work that up, Mr. Rubel, for the record?

Mr. RUBEL. Yes, sir.

Estimated annual costs for heating, cooling, and electrical power, 1964 budget

Service	Library buildings		Supreme Court Bldg.	Botanic Garden conservatory and office building	Total	Remarks
	Main	Annex				
Heating.....	\$26,000	\$36,000	\$15,000	\$13,000	\$90,000	Includes prorated cost of purchased electrical energy consumed at the U.S. Capitol Power Plant. Do. Metered in each building by the power company.
Cooling.....	11,000	58,000	40,000	None	109,000	
Electric lighting and small power.	86,400	86,400	31,200	1,715	205,715	
Total.....	123,400	180,400	86,200	14,715	404,715	

¹ Installation of cooling apparatus partially completed. Work scheduled for completion in 1965.

SOURCES OF STEAM, REFRIGERATION, AND ELECTRIC ENERGY

Steam for space heating and for generation of domestic hot water is generated and distributed by the U.S. Capitol Power Plant. Likewise chilled water (40° F.) for space cooling is refrigerated and distributed by the U.S. Capitol Power Plant. Electrical energy for lighting and motor-driven equipment, including energy consumed at the U.S. Capitol Power Plant for steam generation and refrigeration, is purchased at 13,000 volts from the Potomac Electric Power Co., and transformed to lower voltages by the Government.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Senator MONRONEY. For "Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care," your request for fiscal year 1964 is in the amount of \$3,522,000, an increase of \$2,677,500 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. I will insert in the record at this point pages 182 through 195 of the justifications.

JUSTIFICATION

Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care

1963 appropriation in annual act	\$844, 500
Deductions:	
Installation of floor tile, both buildings: air-conditioning compressor room, west cellar, and southwest attic, main building; receiving room, annex	3, 500
Repairs to mosaic ceilings and floor tile and marble floor tile, main building, 7th year allotment of repair program	20, 000
Clean and restore ceiling decorations, west entrance vestibule, 1st floor, main building: nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	10, 000
Plaster repairs and renewals, both buildings: nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	10, 000
Elevator modernization and improvements, annex: nonrecurring item to convert annex west passenger elevators Nos. 1 and 2 to automatic operation, allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	105, 000
Improved lighting, Coolidge Auditorium: nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	3, 500
Improved lighting, bookstack, main building: nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	15, 000
Installation of safety guardrails, driveway, west basement entrance, main building: nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	4, 500
Replacement of flagstone terrace, west front, main building: nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, dropped for 1964	8, 500
Total deductions	-180, 000
Base for 1964	664, 500
Additions:	
Personnel compensation:	
Wage-rate increases authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Cong.	10, 005
Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Congress, 57-laborers and mechanics on the Library Buildings and Grounds roll are compensated on a wage-board, prevailing-rate basis. Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.	
An increase of \$7,884 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington metropolitan area, conducted during the past year. The new rates went into effect December 9, 1962, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Congress. This increase is necessary in order that the Library Buildings and Grounds wage-board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.	
An increase of \$2,121 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions falling due in that year, authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage-board system, for employees compensated under that act.	
Within-grade promotions and other changes authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for employees compensated under that act	310
Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$1,400 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year	1, 400
Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962, Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962	485

*Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued***Additions—Continued**

Maintenance and repair, air-conditioning and refrigeration systems increased from \$6,000 to \$8,500-----	\$2, 500
This increase is requested to cover the maintenance of additional equipment being installed in fiscal 1963 under contracts for new heating, ventilating, and cooling systems for the main building.	
Maintenance and repair, elevators increased from \$5,000 to \$15,000-----	10, 000
The increase consists of a nonrecurring item of \$10,000 for necessary repairs and improvements to the hydraulic sidewalk lift in the parking area, east, side, main building. Now nearly 30 years old, this lift is in need of a major overhauling and of the replacement of the hydraulic mechanism, which leaks, causing the lift to slip when in the stationery up position. Its present condition is hazardous.	
Annual care of grounds increased from \$2,000 to \$2,800-----	800
This increase for annual routine maintenance of the 5½ acres of grounds is requested in order to offset price increases for materials and repair parts, to obtain a more adequate supply of materials used, and to provide funds for the replacement of a number of plants which have been lost due to drought, damage, and old age. There has been no increase in this allotment since 1960.	
Installation of floor tile, both buildings: This item is requested to install new tile in the main reading room, main building, and in the Government Printing Office printing branch space, ground floor, annex-----	36, 300
Repairs to mosaic floor tile and marble floor tile, main building, 8th year allotment: Work completed with funds provided during the 1st 7 years of the program includes floors on all 4 sides of the 2d floor, main entrance hall; the marble tile floor in the west south curtain (south exhibit hall), 2d floor; the mosaic ceilings, 1st floor, main entrance hall; the mosaic floor in the southwest pavilion, 2d floor; the combination mosaic-marble tile floors in the north-south corridors, west side, 1st floor; and the marble-mosaic floors in the north, east, and south corridors, 1st floor, main entrance hall. Funds for 1962 were not used for this purpose due to other urgent needs, but funds for 1963 (the 7th year) will be used to complete repairs to the central and west portions of the main entrance hall, 1st floor, and start repairs needed in the ground floor corridors, which are all marble tile. Under the funds requested for 1964, it is proposed to continue repairs in the ground floor corridors. Because of the highly specialized nature of the work and the skilled service required, it is requested that the work be authorized to be done without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, as has been authorized in previous appropriations for this purpose-----	20, 000
Clean and restore ceiling decorations, main building: 2 areas are covered by this request: (1) to complete work on the east corridor ceiling, 2d floor, exhibit hall, funds available in fiscal 1962 were not sufficient to complete this corridor; all other ceilings in this area have been finished; (2) to restore and repair decorated plaster ceilings, 1st floor, north-south corridors, west side—there are cracks in the plaster in these corridors which need repair, and the decorations need to be cleaned and touched up; these corridors handle a considerable amount of employee and visitor traffic-----	21, 000

Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued

Additions—Continued

Acoustical treatment, second floor reading room, main building: This is presently the Rare Book Reading Room. Readers complain of being irritated by noises from telephones, typewriters, and conversations in nearby staff workspace which, due to the architecture of the room, cannot be isolated from the reader space. Funds are requested for acoustical treatment of the Rare Book Reading Room to decrease the noise level. This would consist of suitable fabric coverings and the application of acoustical plaster to the ceiling.....	\$8, 400
Roof repairs and replacements, main building: It is desired to replace the slag roof on the Whittall Pavilion with a copper roof. This roof abuts the roof of the Coolidge Auditorium, which was replaced with funds provided in fiscal 1962. The roof on the Whittall Pavilion is over 25 years old and needs to be replaced. This pavilion houses the extremely valuable collection of Stradivarius violins and Tourte bows.....	6, 500
Fire protection system, both buildings: This item is requested to permit the installation of a fire-detection system in the book-stacks of both buildings for the protection of the Library's vast collections, many of them irreplaceable and invaluable. The system proposed is one which detects fires in the incipient stages of combustion and sets off an alarm immediately. This system has distinct advantages over other systems which are not activated until the later stages of a fire when enough heat and/or smoke are generated to set off an alarm. The detection system desired is already in use in numerous other libraries and museums throughout the country.....	265, 000
Replacement of electric tram, main building: This tram, which is 15 years old, is used for transporting books and other library materials through the tunnel between the 2 buildings. Due to its age, it is now worn out and repair parts are difficult and slow to obtain (some parts are no longer available except through special and expensive manufacture). It is therefore desired to replace the tram with a new one.....	3, 500
Replacement of wooden plan file cases with steel cases, annex: Thirty-six 5-drawer plan file sections are needed to complete the replacement of obsolete wooden cases housing posters and other oversize materials in the Prints and Photographs Division, deck 4, south, annex. This is the second phase of a 2-phase program, the first phase of which was completed with the purchase of thirty 5-drawer sections in fiscal 1962.....	4, 700
Repairs and improvements to space for the relocation of the Tabulating Section, main building: It will be necessary to move the Tabulating Section out of its present location in the south curtain, main building cellar, due to demolition work in this area to be done in connection with the heating, ventilating, and cooling contracts. This work would disrupt the Tabulating Section operations to the extent that it would be impossible for the section to function while the work is in progress. This section performs work which cannot be interrupted—for example, preparation of the Library's biweekly payroll, monthly billings for the Card Division, various statistical and accounting jobs. Consequently, relocation of the section is required, and since the new space will require special preparation (improved lighting, a raised floor for powerlines, a suspended ceiling, and other miscellaneous work), the relocation will be permanent.....	8, 000

*Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued***Additions—Continued**

Replacement of message tube systems, main building: This item is requested to permit the replacement of the message tube systems servicing the bookstacks and other points in the main building. Many of these tubes have been in use since 1897, when the building was occupied; they are not uniform in size or operation; they are inefficient, and, in some cases, inoperative because of the impossibility of getting repair parts. Replacement of these obsolete tubes is necessary in order to improve service to readers and staff and to reduce maintenance problems.

\$80, 000

Lighting improvements, main reading room, main building: This item is requested to permit the replacement of the inadequate and antiquated method of illumination in the main reading room, main building, installed many years ago, with an improved up-to-date lighting installation, which will provide the required uniform illumination intensity on the central desk and on all reading desks in the order of 35 to 40 foot-candles. The poor quality of illumination on the reading desks, upon which readers must depend, is entirely inadequate functionally and greatly detracts from an appreciation of the fine architectural features of the reading room. The artificial illumination on the central desk, where the activities of the Library staff are concentrated, is substandard to an intolerable degree, an obstruction to the efficiency of the personnel, and harmful to the health and vision of any employees working in this area over an extended period of time—dropping off to as low as 2 foot-candles within a few feet of the desk lamps. Under the amount requested, it would be possible to install an entirely adequate, up-to-date lighting installation, consistent with recent developments in the illumination engineering field of a type recently installed in many libraries and ecclesiastical structures with high-domed ceilings, with complete satisfaction. Such installation would both meet the functional requirements of illumination and enhance the beauty of the architectural features of the reading room.

55, 000

Lighting improvements, Copyright Section in annex and Card Index Section, main building: The lighting in the main and annex Library Buildings is far below accepted present-day standards, having been installed in the main building many years ago and in the annex at the time of its construction in 1935-38. Until recently, little relief was possible because only direct current power was available for electric lighting, thus precluding the opportunity of using the more efficient alternating-current-operated illumination. Now that both Library buildings have been converted to 60-cycle alternating current, it is considered essential that steps be taken to initiate a program for improvement of the illumination in these buildings, commencing with the more critical areas. For 1964, funds are requested to replace the existing outmoded and unsatisfactory lighting installations in the Copyright Section in the annex and in the Card Index Section in the main building with adequate modern lighting. The Copyright Section is occupied by the Copyright Office, the Science Division and the Cyrillic Bibliographic project. Tasks performed in these areas include such operations as cataloging, editing, proofreading, filing, searching files, and accounting; also, reference to typed index cards, filing, searching, and cross-referencing. Work of this nature is very demanding on the eyes and it is essential that these areas be provided with adequate and proper lighting. A survey discloses that the highest foot-candle reading during the day in these areas is 32 foot-candles, and in some locations it drops as low as 13 foot-candles, whereas the present-day accepted standard of illumination for work of this character is 75 foot-candles or more.

36, 300

*Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued***Additions—Continued**

Replacement of city water distribution system and sewer and drainage systems serving the main Library building and grounds, nonrecurring item..... \$2, 225, 000

The water piping systems, the sanitary piping systems, the storm drainage systems, and associated equipment in the main Library of Congress building have, for the most part, been in service since completion of the building in 1897.

These systems are now badly deteriorated, obsolete, and inadequate, and in some respects contrary to current requirements of the District's Public Health Service.

They have exceeded their normal life span by many years. The useful life span generally accepted by experts for cast iron piping is 60 years, steel piping is 30 years, plumbing fixtures is 20 years, and hot-water generators is 25 years.

The water supply of the main Library building, as in the case of many other buildings, although wholly adequate when the building and piping were new, has become inadequate after 66 years of use. Gradual reduction in the capacity of the water distribution systems has resulted from increasing demands for service; from corrosion and roughening of the pipes; and a progressive decrease in pipe diameters due to the formation of aggregation of iron compounds with other substances known as tuberculation. Although cast iron resists water corrosion better than wrought iron or steel, it is about equally susceptible to tuberculation. Nonferrous materials are now being used in good construction to avoid corrosion and tuberculation.

Samples of piping taken at random from the Library installations disclose such a seriously advanced condition of deterioration as to indicate the approach of total impairment.

Failure and emergency repairs are occurring with such frequency as to have necessitated recent detailed inspections of the existing systems. Such inspections have been made and disclose that about 80 percent of the pipes and fittings manufactured and installed in 1897 are still in use today despite their extraordinary age. Since 1897, about 20 percent of the original installations have been replaced to correct serious leaks and make emergency repairs.

Such inspections also disclose that the existing water distribution system, sanitary systems and roof drainage systems are, after 66 years of service, in inconceivably poor physical condition, with imminent prospects for failure without warning, in part or as a whole, at any time in the not too distant future. Samples of the Library piping installations removed during the performance of recent emergency repairs disclose a grave state of deterioration and indicate that their retention in service is an ever-present threat to the continuous functioning of the Library, and a hazard to the book collections, decorative painting, and marble walls.

Expenditures for repairs and other maintenance operations have reached the point of no return, because the service life of these installations has already far exceeded their reasonable maximum-life cycles.

Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued

Additions—Continued

Replacement of city water distribution system, etc.—Con.

On July 31, 1961, water backed up extensively through the wash basins. Investigation disclosed that waste water was being forced out through the drains in the wash basins with sufficient pressure and velocity to drench the adjacent walls and ceiling and to collect in quantity on the floor. At the same time, a pipe broke in the cellar.

On May 31, 1962, floods and leaks occurred during a heavy rainfall. Water backed up in the ladies' locker rooms, men's locker room, vending machine area adjacent to the cafeteria, and the area below the Coolidge Auditorium. This backing up of water was caused, largely, by water backing up in lavatories and sewer openings. At the same time, accumulations of water appeared in the spiral stairway in the northeast corner of the southwest pavilion, extending from the visitors' gallery to the first floor; also in the south bookstack.

On June 2, 1962, there was a flash flood in the cellar. These are some examples of recent incidents at the Library, and confirm the gravity of the situation.

The rain leaders are badly rusted internally. The thickness of the pipe walls has become greatly decreased and numerous cracks are evident. Several hubs and fittings are broken because no expansion joints were provided in the vertical leaders. Normal settling of the building and expansion due to temperature changes have caused these failures. Cracking and wet plaster have been observed in some parts of the building due to leaks in the roof drains. Rust and corrosion in many of the cast iron pipe joints have forced out the packing and lead. Overflow has occurred in the cellar and in the courtyard floor drains during heavy rainfall.

The sanitary sewers are also in very poor condition and in some cases are inadequately sized. Additional loads have, of necessity, been imposed on the sewer system from time to time to meet expanding needs, thereby aggravating conditions. Water entering into the floor drain in the area of new air-conditioning unit No. 1 caused flooding on 2 separate occasions in the new cafeteria shortly after its opening on Mar. 4, 1963. Recent observations made in the manholes on the Library grounds have revealed that the terra cotta and cast iron piping is badly clogged by internal accumulations, and some of the pipes have been found filled with silt.

Sections of pipe removed from the domestic hot and cold water distribution systems show that as little as 15 percent of the original cross-sectional area is presently available for the flow of water, and these pipes are worn thin and corroded at the threaded areas to an incredible degree. A recent leak in a hot-water line in the cellar caused damage to publications stored in that area.

The water distribution system, consisting of 66-year-old galvanized steel pipe, is so badly rusted and corroded that about 75 percent of the interior walls of the pipe are clogged. In many sections, pitting has penetrated the pipe walls. Deterioration has now reached the point where very little strength remains in the piping walls. The system has to be constantly repaired, requiring one mechanic and one helper on the average of 1 day per week to keep the system in operation. This emergency repair work is increasing at a fast rate. The system is now in such an unsatisfactory physical condition that it is capable of serving only approximately 50 percent of the demand summer load of the building.

Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued

Additions—Continued

Replacement of city water distribution system, etc.—Con.

There is every indication that within a very few years widespread failure and extensive water damage is likely to occur.

Accumulations in the chilled water drinking lines have reached the point where they practically preclude the flow of water to the drinking fountains on the third floor.

On May 19, 1959, the District of Columbia amended its plumbing code to require that all new buildings be provided with 2 separate sewer systems, each independent of the other. The one is for the purpose of collecting all domestic and industrial wastes and conveying them to interceptors draining only to a sewer-treatment plant, and the other is for the purpose of collecting storm water and discharging the same into the nearest water courses.

The Library of Congress, like other buildings in the older section of Washington, comprising approximately half of the District, are still served by the old combined sewer system. In replacing the Library sewer system, it is proposed to provide two separate sewer systems as now required by the District Plumbing Code.

The estimated cost of replacing the city water distribution system and sewer and drainage systems serving the main Library buildings and ground with new, modern, sanitary, safe, and efficient systems is \$2,225,000.

It is urgently recommended that funds for this replacement be granted for the fiscal year 1964, in the interest of the preservation of the building and the public safety and public health.

Fire extinguishers and fog nozzles for firehose, both buildings:

This item consists of two parts: 1. It is desired to obtain 420 dry chemical fire extinguishers to replace approximately 310 existing soda-acid and foam-type extinguishers and provide 110 additional ones for locations in the bookstacks not now adequately covered. Dry chemical extinguishers have the following advantages: (a) minimum of maintenance; (b) they will not damage library materials, such as soda-acid and foam-type extinguishers will; (c) unlike soda-acid and foam-type extinguishers, dry chemical may be used effectively and without danger on electrical fires. 2. The replacement of existing solid stream nozzles with fog nozzles on interior firehose is recommended. The latter are considered more effective, especially for close work such as would be needed inside the buildings and are less destructive than the solid stream nozzles. About 90 fog nozzles are needed.

\$18, 000

Installation of three fire hydrants, grounds, main building: Request withdrawn on the recommendation of the District of Columbia Fire Department.

10, 000

Repairs and replacements, sidewalks surrounding main building: Due to the hazardous conditions of several sections of sidewalks surrounding the main building, there is an urgent need for repairs to protect pedestrians from accidents, which, should they occur, are likely to result in Federal tort claims. Temporary repairs are made from time to time but these do not last.

12, 000

Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care—Continued

Additions—Continued

Installation of underground sprinkler system, grounds, main building: The present garden-hose method of watering the grass, shrubs, and other plants is entirely inadequate for the proper maintenance of the 4 acres of ground involved: (a) it is time-consuming during dry spells prevalent in the summer, grounds maintenance personnel spends up to 32 man-hours per week performing this duty, time that could be better used in other important aspects of grounds maintenance; (b) it is inefficient—during the last summer, for example, which was very dry, considerable plant loss was suffered due in large measure to the deficiencies in the watering system. An underground sprinkler system would correct these conditions. The Library Annex and other buildings under the care of the Architect of the Capitol have similar systems-----		\$20, 000
Cleaning granite walls and other stonework, grounds, main building: This item is requested to permit the completion of work done with funds provided in fiscal 1962 to clean the exterior stonework of the main building. Inadvertently, the estimate and subsequent contract for 1962 did not include cleaning the low walls, pylons, benches, etc., which border the grounds and are as soiled as the building was before it was cleaned-----		2, 300
Total additions-----		+ 2,857,500
Total estimate for 1964-----		3,522,000

WAGE INCREASES

Please proceed with your explanation of this item.

Mr. STEWART. The wage rate increase is \$10,005. Within-in grade promotions under the Classification Act is \$310. Regular pay above 52-week basis is \$1,400.

Senator MONRONEY. From what page are you reading?

Mr. STEWART. Page 184.

Senator MONRONEY. OK.

INCREASED PAY COST

Mr. STEWART. The increased pay cost for Federal Salary Reform Act is \$485.

The maintenance and repair of the air-condition and refrigeration systems is increased by \$2,500. The maintenance and repair of the elevators is increased \$10,000.

Senator MONRONEY. That is a nonreoccurring cost, is it not?

Mr. STEWART. That is right, nonreoccurring.

And annual care of grounds—we have asked for an additional \$800.

Senator MONRONEY. That is in addition to money that you have asked for in the Capitol budget?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

INSTALLATION OF FLOOR TILE

We are asking \$36,300 for installation of floor tile in both buildings—this is in the main reading room, main building, and in the Government Printing Office, Printing Branch space, which is in the ground floor in the annex.

Then \$20,000 for repairs to the mosaic tile floor, main building. This is the eighth-year allotment. We have been granted \$20,000 each year for this work for the past 7 years.

RESTORATION OF DECORATIONS

The next item is \$21,000 to clean and restore the ceiling decorations in the main building.

These funds are requested in order to complete work on the east corridor ceiling, second floor Exhibit Hall, and to restore and repair decorated plaster ceilings, first floor, north-south corridors, west side. There are cracks in the plaster in these corridors which need repair, and the decorations need to be cleaned and touched up.

OTHER ITEMS

The next item is \$8,400 for acoustical treatment of the second floor reading room of the main building.

The next item is roof repairs and replacements in the main building, which is \$6,500.

FIRE DETECTION SYSTEM

The next item is \$265,000 for installation of a fire detection system in the bookstacks of both buildings.

Senator MONRONEY. This is a very special fire protection system, especially for museums or libraries, I think you stated?

Mr. STEWART. That is right. The system proposed is one that detects the fires in the incipient stages of combustion and sets off an alarm immediately.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, if you had a fire and used a regular sprinkler system, you could destroy all of the books, and this system is supposed to prevent the fire from ever getting into a large blaze. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Mr. RUBEL. It indicates the location of the fire by a signal light and an alarm, so that you don't lose any time in getting to the location.

Senator MONRONEY. But where does the signal light go on? Do you have a control?

Mr. RUBEL. In the police guard's office, where there is someone on duty 24 hours of the day.

Senator MONRONEY. How many? Would there be enough to put out the fire?

Mr. RUBEL. The Library representatives are here, and I am sure they can answer that question.

Mr. WELCH. Yes, sir, there would be a control box in the main building, and we have a roving police force trained in fire protection. The alarm would also be simultaneously sounded in the local fire department, and they would respond immediately.

REPLACEMENTS, VARIOUS AREAS

Mr. STEWART. The next item is \$3,500 for the replacement of the electric tram in the main building. This tram, which is 15 years old, is used for transporting books and other Library materials through the tunnel between the two buildings. And it is just about worn out.

Now, next is replacement of wooden plan file cases with steel cases in the annex, for which we are asking \$4,700.

Repairs and improvements to space for the relocation of the Tabulating Section, main building are estimated at \$8,000.

Replacement of message tube systems in the main building, for which we are asking \$80,000.

Many of these tubes have been in use since 1897, when the building was occupied. They are not uniform in size or operation. They are inefficient and in some cases inoperative, because of the impossibility of getting repair parts.

LIGHTING IMPROVEMENT, MAIN BUILDING

The next item is lighting improvements for the main reading room in the main building. That is \$55,000.

Senator MONRONEY. Does that include wiring, changing the wiring?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir. The artificial illumination on the central desk, where the activities of the Library staff are concentrated, is substandard to an intolerable degree, an obstruction to the efficiency of the personnel, and harmful to the health and vision of any employees working in this area over an extended period of time—dropping off to as low as two foot-candles within a few feet of the desk lamps.

Under the amount requested, it would be possible to install an entirely adequate up-to-date lighting installation, consistent with recent developments in the illumination engineering field, of a type recently installed in many libraries and ecclesiastical structures with high-domed ceilings, with complete satisfaction.

Now, the next item is for \$36,300 for lighting improvements. Copyright Section in annex and Card Index Section, main building.

REPLACEMENT, WATER, SEWAGE AND DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

Senator MONRONEY. This is a big item, this next one.

Mr. STEWART. The next item is \$2,225,000, which provides for the replacement of the city water distribution system and sewer and drainage systems serving the Main Library Building and grounds.

Mr. Rubel has with him some exhibits, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to show the committee.

Senator MONRONEY. It is 5 o'clock. I just wonder if we would not do better by breaking off at this point, since this is a big item, and there are only one or two other items remaining. How long would it take you to explain the exhibit?

Mr. STEWART. Only a short while.

Mr. RUBEL. We brought them with us. It would only take about 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Just to see what they are. They are over 60 years of age. The water supply of the main building, which was wholly adequate when the building was new, has become inadequate after 66 years of use. Progressive decrease in pipe diameters is due to the formation of iron compound.

CONDITION OF PIPES

Mr. RUBEL. These are samples of pipes that have been cut out of the plumbing system in the main building of the Library of Congress. They have been in service for 63 years, and as you can see, this one practically has no opening for water to flow through. This other one has lost more than 50 percent of the opening.

Senator MONRONEY. Are those selected samples out of many, or is this somewhat typical?

Mr. RUBEL. They are just random samples that we took out at various locations in the building and are typical of the general condition throughout the building.

This is one of the better samples, but you can see how the metal has been eaten away and eroded, and there is practically nothing left.

This assembly is typical of many of the threaded connections throughout the building. And this is what happens when you try to repair a connection of that type. The threads are all eaten away.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that steel?

Mr. RUBEL. A steel pipe, yes, sir.

These are samples of some of the cast iron sanitary pipes. Because of the building settling, over the 60-year period, the resulting pressure from settlement is exerted on the cast iron pipes in their deteriorated condition causing sections of the pipe to spall out.

GROWING MAINTENANCE PROBLEM

Senator MONRONEY. The maintenance of this has been growing exceedingly high.

Mr. RUBEL. It is getting to the point of no return. It is exceedingly high.

Here is another typical piece of 2-inch steel pipe which is almost completely filled with products of corrosion. In order to force the water through a pipe of this kind, you have to increase the pressure. When you increase the pressure, this fracture is what happens. I have some more, but they are all of the same type.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you very much. That was a graphic exhibit.

AGE OF PIPE SYSTEMS

In other words, do I understand, Mr. Stewart, that practically all the basic plumbing of the building, that is, the basic piping of the building, is about 60 years old, cast iron, and the steel piping is 30 years old, and the plumbing fixtures 20?

Mr. RUBEL. No. Pardon me, sir. Those are the generally accepted normal lifespans. But all of these pipes are 63 years old.

Senator MONRONEY. I see. This is the Main Library. The other annex is not a problem?

Mr. STEWART. It is not involved.

Senator MONRONEY. That is only 10 years old?

Mr. STEWART. Twenty-five years.

AMOUNT AND TIME NEEDED

Senator MONRONEY. \$2,225,000. How long will it take?

Mr. RUBEL. It will take 1 year to prepare the designs and specifications to be ready for competitive bids, and it will take at least 3 years to complete the job, because it has to be done in sections, so as not to disrupt the activity of the building.

Mr. HENLOCK. And consequently we asked the House Appropriations Committee if they would make the money available until expended to meet that condition, and they indicated they would.

Senator MONRONEY. OK. I think this description will be printed in full in the record. Do you have anything further to add? I think this is rather convincing.

Mr. STEWART. Nothing further.

FIRE EQUIPMENT

Our next item is \$18,000 for fire extinguishers and fog nozzles for firehose in both buildings. Then we had an item of \$10,000 for installation of three fire hydrants on the grounds of the main building, but we are withdrawing that at the recommendation of the District of Columbia Fire Department.

Senator MONRONEY. You don't have to have that?

Mr. STEWART. No. That item may be withdrawn.

DRINKING FOUNTAINS

Senator MONRONEY. Now, that you have found \$10,000, how about putting some drinking fountains for the visitors on the Capitol Grounds? We have thousands of tourists here, but many of them—I do not think there are any modern drinking fountains that are available in the Capitol area.

Mr. STEWART. Senator, proposals have been made from time to time to put additional fountains on the grounds, but there is a problem that the water would be warm, not chilled; also, the fountains which we do have suffer greatly from vandalism. And I would say for every two drinking fountains out there you would need four policemen, to keep some sort of order around them and to maintain a state of cleanliness. The visitors to this Capitol are all Americans, and they run the scale from good to bad, from the top to the bottom.

We do have a fountain at the west entrance to the Capitol Grounds on First Street and three fountains at the Grotto on the Constitution Avenue side of the grounds. In the Capitol itself there are 15 drinking fountains for public use.

Senator MONRONEY. Where are they?

Mr. ROOF. Ten are in the east front extension.

Senator MONRONEY. I haven't explored that.

Mr. ROOF. We put them in the east front extension.

Senator MONRONEY. There are none in the older parts of the Capitol, are there?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; they are in the House and Senate connecting wings of the Capitol Building.

SIDEWALK REPAIRS, MAIN BUILDING

Then the next item is \$12,000 for repairs and replacements of the sidewalks surrounding the main building. There have been temporary repairs made from time to time.

UNDERGROUND SPRINKLER SYSTEM

Then there is \$20,000 for the installation of an underground sprinkler system on the grounds. We recommend this, because the method of watering the grass and shrubs is entirely inadequate for maintaining the 4 acres of grounds. It is time consuming.

The ground force spends up to 32 man-hours per week performing this duty, time which could be much better used performing other aspects of ground maintenance. It is inefficient. During the last summer, for example, which was very dry, considerable plant loss was suffered due in large measure to the deficiencies in the watering system. An underground sprinkler system would correct these conditions. The Library Annex and other buildings under the care of the Architect of the Capitol have similar systems.

CLEANING WALLS

We are asking \$2,300 for cleaning of the granite walls and other stonework in the grounds around the main building: This item is requested to permit the completion of work done with funds provided in fiscal 1962 to clean the exterior stonework of the main building. Inadvertently the estimate and subsequent contract for 1962 did not include cleaning the low walls, pylons, benches, et cetera, which border the grounds and are as soiled as the building was before it was cleaned, \$2,300.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

Senator MONRONEY. For furniture and furnishings of the Library buildings, the request is in the amount of \$189,000, a decrease of \$36,000 under the amount for fiscal year 1963.

(The justification follows.)

JUSTIFICATION

Library buildings and grounds: Furniture and furnishings

1963 appropriation in annual act	\$225, 000
Deductions:	
Visible file cases for Serial Record Division	1, 000
Calculating machine, Copyright Office	900
Electric adding machines, Copyright Office, Order Division, and Card Division	5, 000
Metal bookcases, Legislative Reference Service	3, 600
Miscellaneous office equipment	2, 900
Microfilm reading machines, Serial Division and Stack and Reader Division	4, 500
Sign printing machine, Buildings and Grounds Division	4, 600
Steel trays for Card Division	58, 800
Recording equipment, Music Division	8, 000
Card catalog cases, Catalog Division	35, 000
File cabinets, Prints and Photographs Division	7, 700
Total deductions	-132, 000
Base for 1964	93, 000
Additions:	
Annual maintenance and repair, office machines and devices—annual allotment increased from \$13,000 to \$20,000 to meet current requirements	7, 000
Calculating machines for the Budget and Accounting Offices	2, 200
Electric adding machines: Accounting Office, 1; Division for the Blind, 1; Card Division, 2; Copyright Office, 2; Music Division, 1; Order Division, 3; Serial Division, 2	4, 400
Miscellaneous office equipment	3, 300
Microfilm reading machines and editing equipment for the Manuscript Orientalia, Serial and Stack and Reader Divisions	7, 000
Recording equipment, Music Division	8, 000

Library buildings and grounds: Furniture and furnishings—Continued

Additions—Continued

File cabinets, Prints and Photograph Division: 18 cabinets tabulating card size, each containing 10 double drawers, for stereoscope card collators.....	\$3, 000
Catalog cases, Processing Department: 60 3 by 5 15-drawer sections for replacements in the Official Catalog, 40 3 by 5 15-drawer sections for expansion of the Shelf List Catalog.....	22, 000
Catalog cases, Copyright Office: 124 15-drawer sections for expansion and the replacement of obsolete equipment in the Copyright Card Catalog.....	11, 000
File cabinets, Legislative Reference Service: 70 5-drawer cabinets to replace existing old 4-drawer cabinets.....	4, 000
Card file sections, Stack and Reader Division: 9 3 by 5 15-drawer sections for replacements in Central Charge File, 6 3 by 5 15-drawer sections for expansion of the Microfilm Reading Room Catalog.....	1, 500
Bookracks, Stack and Reader Division: 150 bookracks for use on study tables.....	3, 500
Charging desk, Loan Division.....	3, 000
Automatic writing equipment, office of the Secretary.....	3, 200
Collating machine, Legislative Reference Service.....	2, 000
Electric document sorter, Copyright Office: Machine to facilitate alphabetizing of 600,000 cards used for preparation of Catalog of Copyright Entries and a like number for the maintenance of the Copyright Card Catalog.....	6, 200
Carpeting, Legislative Reference Service—headquarters office....	2, 200
Type for Printasign machine: extra case of type to provide more variety and flexibility in use of machine allowed in fiscal 1963....	2, 500
Total additions.....	+96, 000
Total estimate for 1964.....	189, 000

MAINTENANCE, MACHINES, AND DEVICES

MR. STEWART. For annual maintenance and repair, office machines and devices, the annual allotment is increased from \$13,000 to \$20,000 to meet current requirements. That is an addition of \$7,000.

There are calculating machines for the budget and accounting offices, \$2,200; electric adding machines—

Senator MONRONEY. That will be put in. The total estimate is \$189,000 for all the items listed.

BOTANIC GARDENS

The next item is the "Botanic Gardens," where you are requesting \$483,000, an increase of \$31,000 over the current year appropriation. Pages 261 through 266 will be placed in the record at this point.

(The justifications follow:)

Salaries and expenses, Botanic Garden

1963 appropriation in annual act.....	\$452, 000
Deductions:	
Replacement of boilers, Poplar Point Nursery—nonrecurring item allowed for 1963, not required for 1964.....	—48, 500
Base for 1964.....	403, 500

Botanic Garden—Continued

Additions:

Wage-rate increases authorized by Public Law 763, 83d Cong.----- \$8,384

Under the provisions of Public Law 763, 83d Cong., 46 laborers and mechanics on the Botanic Garden roll are compensated on a wage-board, prevailing-rate basis. Public Law 763 provides that the compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

An increase of \$5,741 is requested for 1964 to meet on a full-year basis the cost of increased wage rates established for these wage-board positions as a result of a general survey of Government and industrial employees' wages in the Washington Metropolitan area, conducted during the past year. The new rates went into effect Dec. 9, 1962, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85-872, 85th Cong. This increase is necessary in order that the Botanic Garden wage-board employees may be compensated on a full-year basis in the fiscal year 1964 in accordance with present prevailing rates.

An increase of \$2,643 is requested for 1964 to meet the cost of within-grade promotions falling due in that year, authorized by Public Law 763 under the wage-board system, for employees compensated under that act.

Overtime and holiday pay increased by \$1,000 to meet increased pay costs under that allotment resulting from base pay increases under Public Law 763 and the Classification Act----- 1,000

Regular pay above 52-week base allotment increased by \$1,000 to cover 2 additional days instead of the usual 1 additional day day above the 52-week base—next year being leap year----- 1,000

Increased pay costs due to Public Law 87-793, approved Oct. 11, 1962, "Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962"----- 1,850

Increase of \$4,110 requested for 1964 to finance a GS-4 clerk position which was held vacant during 1963, and for which no funds were asked last year. This clerk is required to assist the GS-9 administrative assistant and the GS-5 clerk in the performance of the administrative and clerical work necessary to be done for the operation of the gardens and to cover present workload conditions----- 4,110

1 additional position—W-4 laborer-gardener----- 4,056

This item was requested but not allowed for 1963 and is re-submitted for consideration for 1964.

8 additional greenhouses, a boiler plant and office structure have been erected and placed in service at Poplar Point Nursery. The services of an additional laborer are required to keep the office clean, sweep and wash floors, clean toilets; also, sweep and keep clean the concrete floors of the greenhouses; wash windows; and assist the gardeners in the outside maintenance work.

At the present time, it is necessary for these duties to be performed by the greenhouse employees, experienced in gardening work. The allowance of this position would free the greenhousemen from these tasks and permit their experience to be utilized performing duties of a more responsible nature.

General annual repairs—increased from \$5,200 to \$6,500----- 1,300

This increase is necessary to meet present-day maintenance costs. No increase has been provided under this allotment for the past 14 years.

Botanic Garden—Continued

Cleaning interior and exterior walls of main conservatory—non-recurring item..... \$12, 000

This is a nonrecurring item requested to provide funds for cleaning the exterior and interior walls of the main conservatory of the Botanic Garden, located on Maryland and Independence Avenues, adjacent to the Rayburn House Office Building.

The conservatory was completed and occupied in 1933 and the exterior and interior walls have not been cleaned in the ensuing 30 years. The exterior limestone walls are now streaked and dirty and the interior brick walls are dingy looking and should be cleaned at this time, in order that the conservatory may present an appearance in harmony with the new Rayburn House Office Building, rather than an unsightly contrast as at present.

During the past several years, funds have been allowed for cleaning the exterior of the Capitol Building, the Old Senate Office Building, and the Main Library Building, resulting in a vastly improved appearance of those buildings, and the request for funds for cleaning the Botanic Garden Conservatory is a continuation of this program.

Enlarging toilet facilities in main conservatory, nonrecurring item..... 5, 000

This is a nonrecurring item requested to provide funds for enlarging the existing toilet facilities at the Botanic Garden conservatory. The toilet facilities at the conservatory, originally considered adequate when the number of visitors annually to the conservatory was only one-third the present number, are now totally inadequate to serve the 350,000 visitors who come to the conservatory annually. The men's facilities consist of 1 toilet stall, 1 urinal, and 1 washbasin. The women's facilities consist of 1 toilet stall and 1 washbasin. Frequently, when large groups are visiting the conservatory, long lines are formed at both facilities, and many times employees of the conservatory are required to leave their duties to be posted at either the men's or women's restrooms to allow the women to use both restrooms, or vice versa, when there is an overflow of one sex.

The amount requested for 1964 will provide for 3 toilet stalls and 3 washbasins in the women's room, and 2 toilet stalls, 2 urinals and 2 washbasins for the men. The additional space required will be acquired by extending the toilet areas over the trenches on the inside of the conservatory. Construction over these trenches will present no major problems. Crawl space will be provided under the floors of these additions to insure accessibility to the pipes in the trenches. This enlargement of facilities will in no way affect the space available for interior plantings.

Supplies and materials—increased from \$10,000 to \$12,000..... 2, 000

This increase is necessary to meet present-day maintenance costs. No increase has been provided under this allotment for the past 8 years.

Botanic Garden stock; increased from \$15,400 to \$19,700..... 4, 300

This increase is necessary to meet present-day maintenance costs. We are asking a \$900 increase in nursery stock; a \$1,400 increase for moss and soil to meet increased costs of peat moss, fiber moss, topsoil, and bedding materials; a \$2,000 increase for miscellaneous equipment to meet the expanding needs for garden-type equipment required for cultivating, digging, planting, and hauling since the addition of the new greenhouses and outside nursery at Poplar Point Nursery. No increase has been provided under this allotment for the past 13 years.

Botanic Gardens—Continued

Surfacing roads in nursery with bituminous concrete paving,
nonrecurring item..... \$27, 500

Rehabilitation of Poplar Point Nursery will be completed in 1964 through installation of topsoil in 4 nursery plots and the planting of these plots with nursery stock to be used for future plantings on the Capitol and other grounds under the Architect of the Capitol.

The existing roads at the nursery are not serviceable for the extensive use required. They are dirt roads and are frequently mired with mud in the spring and winter; develop large holes and deep ruts in freezing weather; are dusty during dry spells, and constantly wash away during heavy rains. During the past winter, nursery vehicles were frequently stuck in mud and holes, and nursery employees often found themselves knee-deep in mud.

Sufficient funds were available in the amount appropriated for relocation of the greenhouses to the nursery to surface the portion of the nursery roadway extending from the entrance to the nursery along the west side to a point beyond the north front of the nursery headhouse. Under the funds requested for 1964, it is proposed to surface the remaining road areas, comprising approximately 10,500 square yards.

It is proposed to pave the remaining road areas with a permanent type of paving, consisting of 4 inches of bituminous concrete paving in 2 courses—a 2-inch binder course topped by a 2-inch surface course conforming with the standard specifications of the District government for street and alley improvements.

Installation of lawn sprinkler system in grounds of main Conservatory; nonrecurring item..... 7, 000

It is recommended that an underground lawn sprinkler system be installed in the grounds about the main Conservatory in order that an attractive lawn area may be maintained for this facility. For many years, such systems have been installed in the Capitol Grounds and found decidedly advantageous in lawn maintenance, as well as a saving in man-hours required for manual watering. The condition of the lawns, at present, is not in keeping with the beauty of the Conservatory collections.

Total, additions..... +79, 500

Total, estimate for 1964..... 483, 000

OTHER ITEMS

Senator MONRONEY. I see you are asking for nonrecurring items, such as \$48,000 for the new boilers.

Mr. HENLOCK. That \$48,000 was allowed last year, Senator, and is a nonrecurring item not required for 1964.

Senator MONRONEY. Then you have pay adjustments in pages 261 and 262.

Mr. STEWART. General annual repairs have been increased from \$5,200 to \$6,500.

Senator MONRONEY. You have the addition of one more W-4 gardner. You have finances to pay for a GS-4 clerk. What other personnel?

PERSONNEL INCREASES

Mr. HENLOCK. There are only two job increases. The GS-4 clerk position has been a vacancy for a number of years. The personnel

workload has increased to the point where, with tax computations and other similar items on payrolls, we would like to have the third clerk next year, and the other job is a laborer's job at the Poplar Point Nursery to assist in the cleaning work there.

CONSERVATORY ITEM

We next have an item for cleaning the walls of the conservatory.

Mr. STEWART. That is \$12,000. And enlarging the toilet facilities is \$5,000.

Senator MONRONEY. Isn't that pretty high?

Mr. HENLOCK. No, the estimate for cleaning the building was based on a comparison of the cost of the other buildings that have been done. We have had experience with the House and Senate wings of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the Old Senate Office Building. In the case of the Botanic Garden Conservatory, we propose to do both interior and exterior cleaning, Senator.

INADEQUACY OF TOILET FACILITIES

Mr. STEWART. The next item is enlarging the toilet facilities in the main Conservatory. That is really badly needed, because the number of visitors is constantly increasing. The exhibits are attracting many more persons annually.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that the one at Independence and First Street?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir. The toilet facilities at the Conservatory, originally considered adequate when the number of visitors annually to the Conservatory was only one-third the present number, are now totally inadequate to serve the 350,000 visitors who come to the Conservatory annually. The men's facilities consist of one toilet stall, one urinal, and one washbasin.

The women's facilities consist of one toilet stall and one washbasin.

Frequently, when large groups are visiting the Conservatory, long lines are formed at both facilities, and many times employees of the Conservatory are required to leave their duties to be posted at either the men's or women's restrooms to allow the women to use both restrooms, or vice versa, when there is an overflow of one sex.

SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

For supplies and materials, we ask an increase from \$10,000 to \$12,000, and for the Botanic Garden stock we would like to get an increase of \$4,300. That is for miscellaneous equipment to meet the expanding needs for garden-type equipment required for cultivating, digging, planting, and hauling since the addition of the new greenhouses and outside nursery at Poplar Point Nursery. No increase has been provided under this allotment for the past 13 years.

ROAD SURFACING, NURSERY

The next item is for surfacing the roads at the nursery for which we are asking \$27,500.

Senator MONRONEY. Could not this be put off for another year?

Mr. HENLOCK. Senator, that is the case where you gave us the money to develop the nursery and to rehabilitate the nursery for the

growing of plant materials, for the Rayburn House Office Building and the other buildings and grounds of the Capitol, and as we develop the plots they are inaccessible, because the roads become so bad in wet weather or snow or similar weather that trucks and men actually get mired knee deep in the mud and can't even have access to the areas.

Senator MONRONEY. This seems like an awful lot of money, to me, for roads to be used only for getting the nursery stock out. Is not that the purpose of it?

Mr. HENLOCK. It is to give access to the area. Here in blue on this map is what has to be done. The pink is what is being done under the relocation funds, and the blue is what would have to be done under these funds in order to give access to the growing areas.

There are 10,500 square yards of road areas to be surfaced. The work will be done by competitive bids in accordance with specifications of the District government for similar work. We do consider this a rather urgent item, Senator.

LAWN SPRINKLING SYSTEM, MAIN CONSERVATORY

Senator MONRONEY. You have a lawn sprinkling system for the grounds of the main conservatory, \$7,000. This increases the amount of funds over what was available last year by \$79,500. Is that correct?

Mr. HENLOCK. That is the gross increase. There is a net increase of \$31,000.

NO FUNDS FOR WEST WING OF CAPITOL

Senator MONRONEY. Now, there are no funds, Mr. Stewart, included in here for the so-called west wing of the Capitol, are there?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. And you are not asking for any?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir. As a member of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, I may say that there has been no action taken by the Commission with respect to the west front, with the exception of showing an interest in having some sketches made as to what the possibilities of extension are. But there has been no go-ahead approval given by the Commission.

Senator MONRONEY. It is my understanding that you are of the opinion that Public Law 242, 84th Congress, amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, and Public Law 87-14, 87th Congress, now provide authorization for extension of the west front of the Capitol. Is that correct?

Mr. HENLOCK. That is correct. That is our interpretation, Senator. Those acts authorize carrying out scheme B of the architectural plan of 1904, which provides for extension of the east central front 32 feet 6 inches and the reconstruction and refacing of the west front in marble, and the law says such work may be accomplished with such modifications or additions to that plan as the Commission may authorize.

Senator MONRONEY. So under your interpretation, it would be subject to now being authorized, and the planning could be approved by the Commission?

Mr. HENLOCK. Subject to appropriation of the necessary funds being approved by you.

Senator MONRONEY. And if appropriations are not provided, nothing would happen?

Mr. HENLOCK. I think that is a safe answer.

NEEDED WEST WING REPAIRS

Senator MONRONEY. Under the provisions of Public Law 242 as amended, the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, with the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States as Chairman, includes the Architect of the Capitol. What action, if any, has the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol taken with regard to the cracks and bulges which are visible in the wall of the west front?

Mr. STEWART. No formal action has been taken. At the last meeting of the Commission I explained, by exhibits, the condition of the west wall, and recommended that I be permitted to proceed with preliminary plans for reconstruction and extension of the west front.

Senator MONRONEY. You mean authorizing the rebuilding of the west front?

Mr. STEWART. Yes. They discussed the matter at some length and are certainly interested in proper preservation of the west front. I am on record with the Commission as advocating extension and reconstruction of the west front at an early date. Mr. Henlock, who was at the meeting, can supplement my statement with respect to any actions taken.

Mr. HENLOCK. The Commission decided not to take any further action until after the President of the Senate would confer with the leaders of the Senate, and ascertain their wishes.

ADVICE OF OUTSIDE EXPERTS

Senator MONRONEY. Has the Commission given any consideration to asking for technical advice of outside architectural engineering experts on the stability of the foundations, and the present defects, without the necessity for enlargement of the Capitol? I had the pleasure of being shown the enlargement plan, which I would judge would cost a great deal more than the east front work would cost.

Mr. HENLOCK. \$20 million.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that what they estimated the new construction would cost?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. We estimated in 1957 that that project would cost approximately \$17 million. Since that time there has been an increase in cost of construction of approximately 2 to 3 percent a year. In addition to that, the schemes developed since that time would enlarge the area of the extension.

Senator MONRONEY. With a great deal of extended construction, it would appear to me. And it would seem to me before we do anything, it certainly would be helpful to the Commission to have an outside engineering study made on what could be done to correct the deficiencies without rebuilding.

Mr. STEWART. All the soundings have been made. Outside consultants have been called in.

ADVICE OF FINE ARTS COMMISSION

At the time of the inception of the east front program and the extension of the Capitol, a brochure was submitted to my Office by various architects throughout the country. I did not feel I was qualified to select them entirely on my own, as to their capabilities for the job, and I asked for help from some of the members of the Fine Arts Commission.

We went through the brochures we had received. I gave them the privilege of adding any other architects' name to our list, from which I agreed to submit recommendations to the Commission for the extension of the Capitol.

WORK WITH OTHER ARCHITECTS

We decided at that time that as nearly as possible we would try to select architects from the various sections of the United States.

We selected Mr. Arthur Brown, of California, who was the architect on the Labor building, and the internal revenue department building, uptown, as one consultant. We selected Henry Shepley, from New England, as another, and John Harbeson, from Philadelphia, who served as consultant for the remodeling and restoration of the House and Senate Chambers in the U.S. Capitol in 1949 and 1950. And when it came to the associate architects, we went to the Southwest, to Dallas, Tex., and then to Atlanta, Ga., for the Southeast.

We had covered the Far West with Arthur Brown. We wanted to get someone from the Middle West. But the ones who were qualified for this type of work, according to the information that was submitted to me, and that satisfied the Commission, were not available at that time. So we went to New York and got Alfred Easton Poor's firm. The associate architects are still in business. They are still qualified and able to do the work. I do not know of anyone who knows any more about the conditions of the Capitol and its west front than the group of architects we now have retained.

In addition, at the time we were extending the east front and examinations were made of both the east and west fronts, other outside specialists qualified in stone masonry were called in. They fully concurred in our plans. They made some suggestions, which we followed. And frankly, I do not see how it would be humanly possible, and be safe, to even take and reface the old stone wall, the way it is.

Senator MONRONEY. That is what I am saying. But I wondered if it would not be possible to correct the stresses on the walls on the west front without going to the expense of adding several floors of rooms and corridors to that side of the building, which already overbalances by far the other side of the building. All that anyone has suggested generally is to make the building safe and preserve the structure intact. To build a lot of new offices and new rooms, which may or may not be needed, would not necessarily have to be undertaken at this time if means could be found to strengthen and to brace or to correct the defects that exist in the foundation.

SITUATION ON EAST FRONT

Mr. CAMPIOLI. Senator, the same problems exist on the west front that existed in the east front.

Senator MONRONEY. We saw the dome hanging over the top of the Capitol by probably 6 feet; was it not?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. By 15 feet.

Senator MONRONEY. You could see it from the ground, and all that went to brace it. So this was certainly not a condition that exists on the west front. Because there is nothing overhanging, at least, with nothing at all supporting a portion of that massive dome.

Mr. CAMPIOLI. Of course, the dome is just the central part behind the central portico. The two old original wings are the worst part of the Capitol, both on the Senate side and on the House side. They are the two portions that have the bulges in them and also contain the stones that are moving.

Senator MONRONEY. Well we will see whether we need to include anything in there. Because if you have any ideas of what it would cost for an engineering-architectural determination—

Mr. STEWART. With the present market, we are committed to marble.

Senator MONRONEY. I am talking about the engineering portion of the building.

POSSIBILITY OF REPAIRS WITHOUT REBUILDING

Mr. STEWART. Oh, the study? Our studies are already made, and if we get the go-ahead signal we can readily develop them on full scale. We have sufficient sketches and studies made now.

Senator MONRONEY. I am trying to ask you: Is it possible to do this without rebuilding the whole west front of the Capitol? And how can we determine on a sound technical basis where means, under today's engineering practices, can be instituted to make the foundation safe so that the rest of the building will stand for another 100 years? In other words, a great many people, after a vast amount of thought, turned it down out of hand last year. So let us come up with something that would be a little more informative as to what it would cost us if you can get an engineering study or recommendation that funds be provided in this bill to get an engineering study as to how to correct the deficiencies without rebuilding the west front.

Mr. CAMPIOLI. Senator, in 1957, when we made the surveys of the building, Mr. Stewart had been given broad authority which not only took in the east front, but at that time, with the engineers that we had engaged, we investigated the entire building. This included not only the investigation by core borings of the exterior walls, but also the digging of test pits in the basement structure along side of all of the exterior walls, both on the east and west sides. And at that time, it was found that the conditions of the walls are similar on both the west and the east, insofar as refacing, versus addition.

We did make the investigation on the east front in an attempt to see whether the east front could be refaced instead of added to. And because of the structural system of the building, being built of wall bearing construction, the conclusion was that we could not remove

the existing stones or hang new stones onto the existing structure, without distorting the architecture and perpetuating the cracked conditions that we have now. The cracks would carry through from the old stones into the new stones. These stones are not just veneers, but they are deep-set stones, some of which go in a couple of feet or several feet into the walls. So, in effect, that study has already been made.

Senator MONRONEY. Has there ever been pulled together any report of the study?

Mr. CAMPIOLI. We have various reports in the office which cover this subject in toto.

PARKING ON VACATED LAND

Senator MONRONEY. I will go into that later. Quite frequently visitors from States, including my own, drive 1,400 or 1,500 miles to Washington. Of course, they want to come up to the Capitol and want to see Congress in session and want to see the things up here, but they are disappointed because they can't possibly park within walking distance from the Capitol. I just wondered if something better than what we have got could not be done for visitor parking within a block or two of the Capitol or the Senate or House Office Buildings?

Mr. STEWART. There is underway a program on the House side under which we are going to construct underground garages in the area just south of the Rayburn Building for about 1,220 automobiles, plus some of the shops out of the old building. There has even been some discussion that square 732, across the street from the Library of Congress may be used, in part, for an underground garage with a landscaped area on top, together with such other construction as Congress may approve.

Senator MONRONEY. Parking space is very badly needed up here.

Mr. STEWART. When we made our studies on the extension of the east front of the Capitol, we planned to construct a garage under the plaza that would take care of a thousand parking places for employees as well as another thousand for the visitors to the Capitol. But that part of our program has never been approved.

Senator MONRONEY. This is all that the committee will go into at this time. We will take up other matters tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The committee will stand in adjournment. Thank you for your patience in going through all of this.

(Whereupon, at 5:25 p.m., Wednesday, June 5, 1963, the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m. June 6, 1963.)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1963

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m., pursuant to recess, in room 1223, New Senate Office Building, Hon. A. S. Mike Monroney (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Monroney, Hayden, and Young.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

STATEMENTS OF L. QUINCY MUMFORD, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS; RUTHERFORD D. ROGERS, DEPUTY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS; ROY P. BASLER, DIRECTOR, REFERENCE DEPARTMENT; HUGH L. ELSBREE, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE; ABRAHAM L. KAMINSTEIN, REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS; LEWIS C. COFFIN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PROCESSING DEPARTMENT; WILLIAM J. WELSH, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT; ROBERT D. STEVENS, COORDINATOR, PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM; AND JULIUS DAVIDSON, CHIEF OF FISCAL SERVICES.

FISCAL SITUATION

Senator MONRONEY. The committee will be in order.

The subcommittee begins its hearings today with the Library of Congress. We are pleased to have with us Dr. Mumford, the Librarian of the Library of Congress.

I note from the justification that a total of \$19,972,340 in direct appropriations was made available to the Library for the current fiscal year.

For 1964, the request is in the amount of \$21,252,400, an increase of \$1,280,000. I will insert into the record at this point, tables I, II, and III of the justification which gives the breakdown by appropriations of these sums.

(The tables referred to follow.)

TABLE I.—Comparative summary of appropriations and appropriation estimates

	1963 appropriation	Supplemental for pay increases, 1963 ¹				1963 adjusted	1964 requested	Increase or decrease 1964 over 1963
		Per estimates	Amount absorbed	Net request	Supplemental			
Salaries and expenses:								
Library of Congress:	\$9,810,430	\$308,088	\$30,238	\$277,850	\$263,950	\$10,074,380	\$10,405,000	+ \$330,620
Reappropriation.....	67,000					67,000		-67,000
Salaries and expenses, Copyright Office.....	1,619,700	62,291	5,591	56,700	53,860	1,673,560	1,794,000	+120,440
Salaries and expenses, Legislative Reference Service.....	1,870,000	102,210	6,610	95,600	90,820	1,960,820	2,143,000	+182,180
Salaries and expenses, distribution of catalog cards.....	2,700,700	61,008	4,508	56,500	53,670	2,754,370	3,077,000	+322,630
Books for the general collections.....	570,000					570,000	670,000	+100,000
Books for the Law Library.....	110,000					110,000	110,000	
Salaries and expenses, books for the blind.....	1,884,700	9,700		9,700	9,210	1,893,910	1,902,000	+8,090
Salaries and expenses, organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents.....	112,800	3,823	3,823			112,800	112,800	
Preservation of American motion pictures.....	60,600	132	132			60,600	60,600	
Indexing and microfilming the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church records in Alaska.....	15,000					15,000		
Total, regular appropriations.....	18,820,930	547,252	50,902	496,350	471,510	19,292,440	20,274,400	+981,960
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program).....	678,000	2,000		2,000	1,900	679,900	978,000	+298,100
Total.....	19,498,930	549,252	50,902	498,350	473,410	19,972,340	21,252,400	+1,280,060

¹ As contained in exhibit B-1, Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 63-6, dated Jan. 7, 1963. (H. Doc. No. 63.)

TABLE II.—*Summary of budgeted positions—1962, 1963, 1964*

Appropriation title	1962 total number	1963 total number	1964 total number
Salaries and expenses, Library of Congress.....	1,211	1,253	1,351
Salaries and expenses, Copyright Office.....	247	247	253
Salaries and expenses, Legislative Reference Service.....	208	215	222
Salaries and expenses, distribution of catalog cards.....	288	319	337
Salaries and expenses, books for the blind.....	31	31	33
Salaries and expenses, organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents.....	19	19	19
Preservation of American motion pictures.....	2	1	1
Salaries and expenses, revision of annotated Constitution.....	1	2	-----
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program):			
U.S. personnel.....	4	4	9
Native personnel.....	30	59	94
Total.....	2,041	2,150	2,319

NOTE.—The total number in each instance includes the full-time equivalent of part-time positions.

TABLE III.—Summary of increases and decreases requested, fiscal year 1964

Increases	Salaries and expenses, Library of Congress	Copyright Office	Legislative Reference Service	Distribution of catalog cards	Books for the general collections	Books for the blind	Special foreign currency program	Alaskan church records	Total
To maintain present level of staff in 1964:									
Ingrade increases, wage boards, and reallocations	\$140,517	\$19,205	\$27,723	\$20,089		\$3,310			\$210,844
Pay increase cost for 1964 (Public Law 87-793)	319,838	53,604	87,739	55,297		8,090			524,568
Regular pay above 52-week base (2 extra days)	68,008	11,866	15,636	13,548		1,584			110,642
Full-year cost of Children's Book Section	8,065								8,065
Subtotal	536,428	84,675	131,098	88,934		12,984			851,119
To meet increased prices: Printing and binding—Increased charges by Government Printing Office	25,300			11,000					36,300
Total to maintain present operating level	561,728	84,675	131,098	99,934		12,984			890,419
To meet increased workload, to strengthen service, and to reduce arrangements:									
(102) Salaries, new positions	615,170	(6) 33,197	(7) 36,255	(18) 87,706		(2) 10,130			782,548
Personnel benefits, new positions	49,324	2,568	2,827	6,900		810			62,429
Telephone service	3,200								3,200
Rental of space	111,320								111,320
Rental of equipment	35,000								35,000
Printing and reproduction			6,000	128,000					134,000
Supplies and materials			6,000						6,000
Books and library materials					100,000	12,166			112,166
Total, to meet increased workload, etc.	814,014	35,765	51,082	222,696	100,000	23,106			1,246,663
Total, increases, regular appropriations	1,375,742	120,440	182,180	322,630	100,000	36,090			2,137,082
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program):									
Foreign currencies							(35) \$268,000		(35) 268,000
U.S. dollars							(5) 30,100		(5) 30,100

STATEMENT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Senator MONRONEY. I believe you have a prepared statement, do you not?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a summary statement here. I wish to thank you for this opportunity to explain the Library's estimates for 1964.

TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED

The appropriation requests for fiscal year 1964 total \$21,252,400. Apart from the foreign currency program, which I shall discuss separately, the total is \$20,274,400 an increase of \$981,960 over the corresponding total for fiscal year 1963.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, the funding in actual dollars or the outflow of dollars would be this.

Mr. MUMFORD. This does not include the foreign currency program.

Senator MONRONEY. You will be increasing only \$981,960 in actual dollar expenditures.

INCREASES OVER 1963

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, that is correct. What I am about to say relates to this. When nonrecurring items and other decreases are taken into account to arrive at a base for 1964, the increases over 1963 amount to \$2,137,082. Among the nonrecurring items and other decreases, the main item is \$1,100,000 for renovation of the Naval Weapons Plant.

NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT QUARTERS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and the committee for the prompt and favorable action which we received last year in approving the renovation of space in the Naval Weapons Plant after our hearings had taken place in the House and to which the House agreed.

Senator MONRONEY. These quarters are now in full use, are they?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, they are to become available after the first of next year. Since the \$1,100,000 will be obligated in 1963, that is the \$1,100,000, no funds will be required for the purpose in 1964. I wish to point out that, in keeping with our commitment in 1961, we are eliminating four more elevator positions because of further automation of our annex elevators.

PERCENT OF RETURN TO TREASURY

I would also like to point out that the Library of Congress returns approximately 22 percent of its appropriation to the Treasury. This results from the card distribution sales and from copyright fees. Of the increases over the base for 1964, 41 percent is required solely to maintain the present staff, because of such mandatory items as pay raises and within-grade salary advancement.

NEW POSITIONS FOR CATALOGING WORK

The remaining requests are for improving services and to meet urgent workload requirements and they have been included in the estimates only after very careful selection of priority needs. First,

under our main appropriation head, "Salaries and expenses," Library of Congress, for fiscal year 1964 we are concentrating heavily on cataloging operations. The largest single request is for 57 new positions in the Descriptive and Subject Cataloging Divisions at a cost of \$406,404.

ARREARAGES IN WORK

For decades the Library had accumulated arrearages which were inherited by the present Library administration. One of my first objectives was to reduce these arrearages, and largely through more stringent acquisition policies, progress was made toward this goal. However, unprecedented advances in man's knowledge, new sources of publication (particularly in newly developing countries), and the lessons learned from World War II regarding the significance of recorded knowledge in the conduct of foreign policy and to national survival have resulted in an increased flow of publications into the Library despite more selective approaches to acquisition.

CATALOGING DIVISIONS UNABLE TO HANDLE VOLUME

For several years, we have found that every section of the cataloging divisions has received more material than could be handled by available staff. Until there was prospect of additional space for the Library, I could not ask for sufficient staff to attain currency, but with the Naval Weapons Plant space in the offing, this obstacle will be removed, and I therefore urge your favorable consideration of this request. I cannot stress too strongly how central to the effectiveness of the Library of Congress and, indeed, to the Library economy of the Nation this enlarged program would be.

DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS FOR "INDEX OF RUSSIAN ACCESSIONS"

The second item under our main appropriation head is the request to finance by direct appropriation an important bibliographic project hitherto financed by funds from other Federal agencies. I refer to the "Monthly Index of Russian Accessions," for which 38 positions are requested at a cost of \$222,429.

DESCRIPTIVE AND SUBJECT CATALOGING DIVISIONS

Senator MONRONEY. The Descriptive and Subject Cataloging Divisions, is that one of your revenue-producing divisions?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. The Descriptive Cataloging Division provides the entry, the author, the title, and description of the book, and the Subject Cataloging Division provides the subject heading and classification number. This information is made available to libraries throughout the country through the sale of copies of our printed catalog cards. So these divisions are linked to revenue-producing operations, although they are not directly revenue producing.

In other words, the cards we sell are a product of the work of the Descriptive and Subject Cataloging Divisions.

Senator MONRONEY. You do not charge for these cards from this division that you distribute, or do they stay in the Library themselves?

Mr. MUMFORD. We have to catalog the books for our own use. Then we print additional cards which are sold to libraries throughout the country.

STAFF OF CATALOGING DIVISION

Senator MONRONEY. How many do you now have in the Descriptive and Subject Cataloging Division?

Mr. COFFIN. We have a total of 183 budgeted positions in the 2 cataloging divisions.

Senator MONRONEY. This Descriptive and Subject Cataloging?

Mr. COFFIN. Yes; 114 of these are in the Descriptive Cataloging Division and 69 are in the Subject Cataloging Division.

Senator MONRONEY. You are now asking for 57 new ones?

Mr. COFFIN. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Nearly 33½-percent increase?

Mr. COFFIN. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. What is the reason or justification of the additional workload that would require this one-third increase in your personnel all in 1 year?

Mr. MUMFORD. We have figures in the justification book that show the arrearages that have accumulated because we have not been able to stay current with the cataloging of material as it comes in. As I indicated, we have not been able to ask for additional catalogers in recent years because we didn't have space to put them. On page 24, we indicate the arrearages that remain, that await cataloging, representing 166 man-years of work at present production levels.

EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RECEIVE FUNDS

This rather sharp increase is designed to enable us to stay current with incoming material and to work off the old material.

Senator MONRONEY. What happens if these 57 are not granted? In other words, if your personnel would remain the same?

Mr. MUMFORD. Sir, we would continue to accumulate more and more arrearages and the material would not be available for use for the Congress, for the Government, and people generally who use the Library.

Senator MONRONEY. These books that come in that you are proposing to catalog, descriptive and subject, these will still be cataloged so that anybody wanting that book by title can get it from the Library?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. That is the point. With our present staff, we cannot catalog everything that is coming in. We need additional staff.

Senator MONRONEY. What portion is "Additional cataloging services"? Descriptive would certainly describe the subject matter. So instead of by author and title, you would have it by biography or engineering.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is the work of the Subject Cataloging Division. The Descriptive Cataloging Division concerns itself with the form of entry of the name, a title and description of the book, and sometimes special notes about the origin or relation of the work concerned to others, for example, in the same series.

Senator MONRONEY. All of these books are now on hand in the Library, is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

LIST OF UNPROCESSED MATERIAL

Senator MONRONEY. You want the 57 new positions to catalog them. They are all on hand in the Library?

Mr. MUMFORD. We are dealing with two things, existing arrearages now on hand, and additions to these arrearages that will accumulate if the staff is not increased. On pages 23 and 24 is a tabulation, in the third column, of material that has been received but has not been processed.

This shows how we are falling behind every year. If we don't get additional staff, we will continue to fall further and further behind.

PRELIMINARY CATALOGING BACKLOG

Senator MONRONEY. You are behind on preliminary cataloging. What does that mean? You have fallen further behind. You were 5,000 behind in 1962, and you are 16,000 behind now.

Mr. MUMFORD. These are not cumulative figures, Mr. Chairman. Each of the figures in column 3 represents the amount of material we received over and above what we were able to catalog for each year. The figures have to be added together to get the total.

Senator MONRONEY. You received 125,000 and cataloged 108,000.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Last year you received 114,000 and cataloged 108,000. You have fallen further behind but you bought more books.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is right. On page 24 you see some totals of those arrearages.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, on your preliminary cataloging section, you are behind 41,281 books, is that right?

Mr. MUMFORD. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. English language section, 19,460 books.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. For foreign languages section, 65,395 books. Serials section, 10,217 books. Slavic languages section is 15,339 books, is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes sir.

Senator MONRONEY. To get the number of books you are behind, you would have to add that column of figures, is that right?

Mr. MUMFORD. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. These evidently total some 150,000-plus books.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. That would be approximately correct. It does not include the Far Eastern languages section, since this section is a fairly recent establishment and is faced with a different sort of arrearages.

HOUSE ACTION

Senator MONRONEY. The House report which came out today did not give you the 57 additional employees. In fact, they cut it by \$324,000, allowing the \$100,000 of the \$424,000 requested for the basic cataloging operations. While they were sympathetic, the House report says, the committee fully appreciates the importance of this

request and is entirely sympathetic to it but under all circumstances did not feel it should go that far this year. The report says:

Chronic arrearages in uncataloging material is an old problem and with the increased volume of material being produced throughout the world, is becoming more critical each year.

The committee would like to see the Library get current and keep current. But with the move to some activities to the Naval Weapons Plant put off until next April, which, when it occurs, will free 40,000 to 50,000 square feet of space, the committee was reluctant to add these people now. They would have to be crowded under makeshift arrangement with consequent inefficiencies and it would take considerable time to recruit trained catalogers.

In an effort to enable them to make a start, \$100,000 is allowed by the House for possibly 20 additional employees sought. Do you have the space now?

Mr. MUMFORD. As we indicated to the House committee, we could accommodate a number of catalogers temporarily in a way that we would not place them permanently, such as working on the decks where the books are shelved.

It is true, that it would take time to recruit catalogers but we think we can recruit many more than are allowed in the House report. If a larger number of positions could be allowed on a part-year basis to be annualized later, we would like it very much.

Senator MONRONEY. You may continue.

DIRECT APPROPRIATION FOR RUSSIAN ACCESSION INDEX

Mr. MUMFORD. The second item under our main appropriation head is the request to finance by direct appropriation an important bibliographic project hitherto financed by funds from other Federal agencies. I refer to the "Monthly index of Russian accessions," for which 38 positions are requested at a cost of \$222,429.

I should emphasize that 28 of these are already on the staff. An independent survey financed by the National Science Foundation has made a positive finding regarding the usefulness of the index to scientists and research scholars. It is the only comprehensive list coming to the United States. Since the support of the other Federal agencies cannot be continued for reasons which I shall be glad to explain in detail, it would be most unfortunate if those who are making such significant use of this valuable research tool should find that it is no longer available.

Senator MONRONEY. You are asking for 38 positions but you mentioned some of those are now being carried and I presume from payrolls of other departments or using agencies.

Mr. MUMFORD. Money is being transferred from another agency for the support of the 28 positions.

Senator MONRONEY. Twenty-eight of the 38?

Mr. MUMFORD. The addition of 10 positions would enable us to reinstate the table of contents of journals which had to be eliminated some time ago and to index material more promptly.

OTHER AGENCIES' FINANCING DISCONTINUED

Senator MONRONEY. You say that other agencies are not going to continue this financing?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. We are asking for the whole 38 here.

Senator MONRONEY. If it is so good, why don't they continue?

Mr. MUMFORD. The National Science Foundation, for this current fiscal year, has been providing all the support. However, it has indicated that it is not its policy to support continuing projects of this kind.

Senator MONRONEY. How much of the 28 have they been financing?

Mr. MUMFORD. All of it.

Senator MONRONEY. Then it is only one agency that has been cooperating?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. If it is so good, why does not the Defense Department and the National Science Foundation, with all their money, and others contribute some to this?

Mr. MUMFORD. Could I go off the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator MONRONEY. If it is necessary. This is an open hearing, I see no reason to be off the record unless there is security.

Mr. MUMFORD. It does involve security.

Senator MONRONEY. This is an open hearing and we better not take it up.

USE OF INDEX

Mr. MUMFORD. I think I can answer your question to some degree. A number of Government agencies find the index of use. It is also used throughout the country by scientists who are doing work for the Government, for example, on Government contracts, and by research people generally.

Its use is not limited to governmental agencies. No governmental agency feels that it is using it enough to support a very substantial part of it.

Senator MONRONEY. It seems to me that these agencies that I mentioned, and you could pick up several more—probably NIH with all of its use—would help share these. These are not books. These are Russian papers.

Mr. MUMFORD. This is an index to books and periodicals, and as such it is the only comprehensive record of Russian material that is coming into the country.

OBLIGATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

Senator MONRONEY. You are asking for a quarter of a million dollars in this item?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Certainly, if these are valuable, and I believe they would be valuable, I think the other agencies of Government should share some responsibility for this.

Mr. MUMFORD. Are you familiar with the publication, Mr. Chairman?

Senator MONRONEY. No, sir, I am not.

PUBLISHING OF INDEX

Mr. MUMFORD. Here is a copy of just 1 month. It includes the material that is received by the Library of Congress and also that which is received by the other large research libraries of the country.

Senator MONRONEY. Who publishes it?

Mr. MUMFORD. The Government Printing Office.

Senator MONRONEY. Where are the funds for the publication of it carried?

Mr. MUMFORD. They are a part of the total budget.

Senator MONRONEY. Are these sent free to people who ask for them?

Mr. MUMFORD. No. I also wish to point out that later on in the appropriation for "Card distribution," we have included \$28,000 for the printing of it.

Senator MONRONEY. That is the cost of the printing?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. But you sell the cards, do you not, to the libraries?

Mr. MUMFORD. Libraries subscribe to the publication primarily as an index, but for those books for which we print cards, they may also buy such cards at standard charges.

Senator MONRONEY. They would only buy them in the event that they had the material on hand in the library, would they not?

Mr. MUMFORD. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. What is the circulation price?

Mr. MUMFORD. \$12 a year.

Senator MONRONEY. What is the circulation of it?

Mr. MUMFORD. It is about 600.

Mr. COFFIN. Approximately 600 subscribers, plus approximately 400 institutions to which we send it to on exchange, plus several hundred U.S. Government depository libraries.

Senator MONRONEY. How long has this been underway, this Monthly Index. Is this the second year?

Mr. MUMFORD. Since 1948.

PERSONNEL ON INDEX WORK

Senator MONRONEY. How many employees do you now have? Is it 28?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. You told me, though, that the National Science Foundation was paying for all 28. When did they take that up. They didn't take it up in 1948, did they?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Another agency took it up—since these are open hearings, we cannot mention the other agency—some years back. National Science picked up part of the cost a couple of years ago, and this year is bearing the total cost.

HOUSE ACTION ON PERSONNEL

Senator MONRONEY. I take it, from reading the House report, that the House committee did not act favorably on the additional personnel; is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. They specified that the National Science Foundation should provide support for the 38 positions requested.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, they didn't give you any funds

Mr. MUMFORD. Not directly; no.

Senator MONRONEY. They do not have appropriating authority over the National Science Foundation. They did propose a transfer from the National Science Foundation of \$258,000; is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. That is the way I understand. I don't know just what the mechanics of this will be. Presumably, this is a mandatory direction.

Senator MONRONEY. But the funds are not included in this bill?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, they gave the whole 38, plus the cost of printing.

Senator MONRONEY. You may go on.

REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUMFORD. For the Reference Department, I am requesting seven low-grade positions at a cost of \$33,855, mainly for stack attendants to meet the increased workload in the Stack and Reader Division and to reduce a serious arrearage in binding preparation work.

Senator MONRONEY. Is this all of the personnel increases you have asked for?

Mr. MUMFORD. Under this appropriation. We are asking for small additions in the Legislative Reference Service and in the Copy-right Office.

TOTAL PERSONNEL REQUEST

Senator MONRONEY. Let us get them all right here in one package on the personnel increases and then we can take them up one by one: You have asked for 57 new ones, I believe, in the Cataloging Divisions.

Mr. MUMFORD. On table III, Mr. Chairman, in the left-hand column, it shows the total of 102 positions, which includes all of the positions under the appropriation head "Salaries and Expenses," Library of Congress.

Senator MONRONEY. I am trying to find out how many. You have 135 total.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. 102 are in the Library of Congress; 6 are in the Copyright Office; Legislative Reference Service, 7; 18 in the distribution of catalog cards, and 2 in the Books for the Blind; is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. For a total of 135 and a salary increase from now on of \$782,548; is that correct?

STAFF UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM

Mr. MUMFORD. That is correct. Plus the additional positions that would be required under the Public Law 480 program.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be paid for in local currency; is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. Except for five that would be paid for in U.S. dollars. Then from that should be deducted the four elevator operators that we are giving up.

NET STAFF INCREASES

Senator MONRONEY. That is down at the bottom of the page. This 135 minus 4 would be 131 net increase this year. What was your increase last year in personnel?

Mr. MUMFORD. 109, including 29 positions under the special foreign currency program.

Senator MONRONEY. The increase last year was 109, this year up 135. How much longer are these increases going to continue to accelerate?

We are sympathetic with the Library. We know it does a very, very fine job. But there is a limit, I think, to that which this committee can be burdened with in the legislative appropriations bill. We have been quite generous, I think, in the past as shown by the 109. Now you have come back with a request for 135. I know of no department of Government that can get all it wants to carry on all the functions and all the things that it would like to do.

Mr. MUMFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I say this. As I have said to this committee before, and to the House committee, that a large reference and research library must grow. It cannot remain static if it is to fulfill its function. As it grows, it will need additional manpower to acquire materials, to catalog and classify and service them. So, some additions in personnel are inevitable as needed. For years, the Library did not have adequate staff to meet its obligations. We have been trying to make up for a lot of lost time.

Senator MONRONEY. I would say we have been rather generous with 109 last year. We were not being penurious. Now you come back for 135.

EARLIER REDUCTIONS

Mr. MUMFORD. Back in 1948, 1951, and 1955, the Library received considerable reductions in staff.

Senator MONRONEY. I don't remember any reductions.

Mr. MUMFORD. There were some rather drastic reductions in those years.

TOTAL LIBRARY PERSONNEL

Senator MONRONEY. What is your total personnel in the Library of Congress?

Mr. MUMFORD. Including the staff that is supported by the funds transferred from other agencies for the work which we do for them, and the gift and trust funds, it totals about 3,000. From appropriated funds it is in the neighborhood of 2,110.

Senator MONRONEY. That is before this 135 that you are asking for now?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. I, for one, feel that you are expanding more rapidly than the condition of this budget would justify. We have to make room for many other agencies in this. We are anxious not to have our own legislative budget excessive. Yet this is an amount that appears to me to be adding more and more all the time.

RETURNS ON CARD DISTRIBUTION SERVICE

Mr. MUMFORD. May I point out that a very substantial number of the staff that we have been requesting in recent years have been the result of our card distribution service, and all the cost of such positions is returned to the Treasury. In fact, more than 100 percent of the cost of this is returned to the Treasury. The Copyright Office also is included in this and it returns over a million dollars in fees to the Treasury. So that for the acquisition, cataloging and servicing of

materials, these overall figures are not representative, because the totals do include these other activities.

Senator MONRONEY. The transfer of the quarter of a million dollars would not result in any large gain for the Treasury.

Mr. MUMFORD. We are returning about \$3 million in the sale of cards and over \$1 million from copyright fees.

Senator MONRONEY. You may go on.

NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT QUARTERS

Mr. MUMFORD. Thank you. I now come to several nonsalary items under this same appropriation. The estimates include an item of \$111,320 to provide for a full year's maintenance of the Naval Weapons Plant space; provision was made for only 3 months cost in 1963. Unfortunately, it is now apparent that there will be some delay in completing the renovation process and the space is not likely to be ready for occupancy before April 1, 1964. Consequently, we shall not need the \$111,320 requested, and the estimates should accordingly be reduced by \$111,320.

REQUEST FOR COMPUTER

One item to which we give high priority on our list of requests is \$35,000 for the installation of a small-scale computer to replace our present electrical accounting machine setup. Such an installation is of great importance to the Library in improving the effectiveness of such business operations as payroll, billing, and accounting, and to make possible the investigation of computer utilization in certain limited bibliographic applications.

This summarizes the principal requests under our main appropriation.

I might mention, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this request for a computer, that through a grant from a foundation we have had a survey undertaken during the last 2 years by some of the top experts of the country, to tell us in what ways the Library of Congress can benefit from automation. We don't have a final report as yet, but we think that, in addition to being used primarily in administrative applications such as payroll, a small computer would give us a chance to undertake some experimentation in substantive library applications.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

For the Copyright Office, I am asking for six new positions at a cost of \$35,765, the first request for new positions since fiscal year 1960. These are to meet the steady but continual increases in copyright registrations and to cope with increasingly complex legal problems.

There has been a steady increase in registrations. For the current year it is running about 4.7 increase over last year.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

For the Legislative Reference Service, the request is for seven relatively low-grade positions at a cost of \$39,082, plus \$12,000 for supplies, photoduplication service, and published research materials

which can be sent to congressional offices in response to inquiries. The increase in the total number of inquiries has been phenomenal, going from 84,195 in 1961 to an estimated 108,000 in 1963, an increase of 22 percent which has been handled with only a 3½-percent increase in staff. The seven positions requested will not in all likelihood close the gap, as it is now expected that the number of inquiries in 1964 will almost certainly go up to 115,000.

Senator MONRONEY. How many people do you now have in the Legislative Reference Service?

Mr. ELSBREE. 215, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MONRONEY. And the total payroll cost of that is how much?

Mr. MUMFORD. \$1,960,000.

Senator MONRONEY. Nearly \$2 million.

Mr. DAVIDSON. No; the payroll alone is less than \$1,800,000 for this year.

Senator MONRONEY. The payroll cost before these are included would be \$1,800,000; is that correct?

Mr. ELSBREE. With the projected January pay increase, it would be higher than that. It depends on which pay increase you compute it on.

Senator MONRONEY. I have commented to you and through your various people a number of times regarding this. I think you are rather familiar with my estimation of the services which I will not detail for the record here. These seven people, I presume, would be minor researchers.

Mr. ELSBREE. They are not research positions. We are trying to relieve the research people of some of the reference work.

Mr. MUMFORD. The request is for one GS-8 and four GS-7's. One GS-4 and one GS-3.

BREAKDOWN OF INQUIRIES

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have any breakdown as to the line that most of these inquiries take? Are these all originals or are part of these just pulling out of a drawer and sending to Members of Congress who make inquiries on something vaguely connected with the mimeographed preparation that has been made?

Mr. ELSBREE. We have been very dissatisfied with the breakdown of inquiries we have. We are putting a great deal of information about our inquiries this year on IBM cards. These are not all answered by an original response. A large part of them are answered by sending out materials. The constituent inquiries which have been growing, frankly, most rapidly—

Senator MONRONEY. This surely does not include the thousand of debate subject kits that we sent out in this 108,000.

Mr. ELSBREE. There would be some included but mostly these requests are for multiple copies. We do not count each copy separately. But there are a great many such requests.

Senator MONRONEY. These are included in the 108,000?

Mr. ELSBREE. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Let us squeeze the water out of this and get the material for the record that is requested by Congress that is originally prepared and delivered to Congress and cut out the mimeographed stuff.

I would like to get this thing down to see what we are getting for this \$1,800,000 that we are spending. Numbers mean nothing if it is going to be mimeographed.

Mr. ELSBREE. We are trying very hard to put this information on IBM cards. The manual analysis of this many inquiries has been a bigger job than we have been able to undertake. As nearly as I can estimate, about 11,000 of these requests are answered in some form of written reply, reports, and memorandums. I want to say, frankly, that the constituent request which we answer by sending prepared material has been the type of request that has increased most rapidly.

Senator MONRONEY. These have to be referred by a Congressman or Senator. You don't take any direct requests?

INCREASE IN REQUESTS

Mr. ELSBREE. No, sir, they have to be referred. On the other hand the number of requests that do require answer in some form of report has also been increasing at a fairly rapid rate. About 15 percent last year. I would estimate perhaps 10 percent this year. In other words, the increases are fairly heavy in original work but they are heaviest in the constituent requests, there is no question. We have economized in the handling of constituent requests, so I am confident when we do have computer run tabulations, and I hope we will in a year or two, that we can demonstrate we are in actuality spending less money in the handling of the much larger number of constituent requests today than we did spend a few years ago when we had fewer requests. We are mass-producing them.

I agree completely, Mr. Chairman, that the mere fact of numbers is not a good indication of our workload. I am not going to be satisfied until we have a much better breakdown. I haven't felt that we should ask for a lot of money to do a lot of hand tabulation of 90,000 or 100,000 inquiries. If we can put the information on the IBM cards, we certainly ought to get a much better workload breakdown that we have ever been able to produce.

Senator MONRONEY. Congress would be very interested in having that. You may continue on page 5, I believe.

CARD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. For the self-supporting card distribution program, I included in the regular estimates 18 positions, at a cost of \$94,696, which are required to help prepare for publication the very much expanded book catalogs. During the course of this fiscal year, the continued sharp increase in card distribution business, which could not have been anticipated, has compelled me to submit an amendment to increase the printing allowance by \$100,000. This will be needed to print the large number of additional cards demanded by libraries throughout the country. In due course, funds spent for this program will be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, with 10 percent profit added.

BOOKS FOR GENERAL COLLECTIONS

Another high priority request is the \$100,000 additional for books for the general collections. Books are, of course, the life blood of the Library. A combination of circumstances is responsible for making

funds hitherto available for this purpose very inadequate. There is a continuing worldwide increase in book production, the natural result of the formation and development of new countries. There are a number of new subject areas in which we must collect widely because of the particular interest of the Congress, the Federal Government, and research scholars; I need cite only the increasing interest in science, and technology, in Slavic areas, in all of Asia, and in all of Africa. Coincident with the increase in the world production of books, there have been sharp price increases, reducing the purchasing power of the dollar.

INCREASE IN PRICES OF MATERIALS

On page 90 of the justification book, Mr. Chairman, we have indicated some of the rather dramatic increases in the price of materials which we have to purchase. The average price per piece, for instance, in 1960, was \$2.15 for books and in 1962, \$2.77, an increase of 28.8 percent. In serials and periodicals there has been a similar increase. The overall increase on a per piece basis has risen from 56 cents in 1960 to 81 cents in 1962, an increase of 44.6 percent.

AMOUNT FOR ACQUISITION OF BOOKS

Senator MONRONEY. Your general acquisition for books was \$570,000 last year, and it is \$670,000 this year, is that correct? This is on page 87 of your justification.

Mr. MUMFORD. With the proposed increase; yes.

Senator MONRONEY. This takes care of your inventory of books that you refill on new publications or on wornout books.

Mr. MUMFORD. Books that we cannot acquire except through purchase. We acquire through copyright and through exchange with libraries in this country and abroad. We have a network of exchanges around the world. But there is a great deal of material that we cannot obtain other than by purchase.

Senator MONRONEY. This is an expenditure that we feel we could not well object to because it is the principal purpose of the library.

Mr. MUMFORD. This \$100,000 additional that we are asking is a bare minimum. Actually, it is not adequate to meet the new situations that we have to face with increased production and increased prices.

HOUSE REDUCTION

The reduction by the House to \$80,000 is very much regretted and of concern to us.

Senator MONRONEY. I thought I saw a figure somewhere as to the percentage that flows into this in foreign books.

FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Mr. COFFIN. On page 88, 72.8 percent of this appropriation applies to foreign acquisitions.

Senator MONRONEY. Have you explored using counterpart or local currencies of Public Law 480 on this?

Mr. MUMFORD. We are acquiring materials under Public Law 480 from India, Pakistan, and Egypt.

Senator MONRONEY. We have funds in Israel and in a great many places.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir. There is a request in here for an extension of the Public Law 480 program to Burma, Indonesia, and Israel. We have indicated to this committee and to the House committee we would like to explore in other countries the possibility of using local currency.

Senator MONRONEY. Would that tend to reduce the acquisition cost of these books?

Mr. MUMFORD. I think in the long run it would if we had an extensive program going. Mr. Rogers can speak to this more specifically. But the difficulty is that although we have such funds in many countries they may not be excess to other needs of the Government, military and otherwise, and are, therefore, not available for library use.

PURCHASE MADE IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, as perhaps you know, although the Congress appropriates money to the library in hard dollars, the actual purchases abroad, in countries where there are surplus foreign currencies, are made in those currencies.

Senator MONRONEY. And you turn your dollars over to the Treasury?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. So we have turned worthless currency into a production for us. It does not help you on your dollar appropriation but we are advised that this is what you are using them for and it makes the Congress look with more favor on utilizing these currencies. You may continue

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. MUMFORD. For books for the blind, the overall net increase requested is \$8,090 for the pay increase required by Public Law 87-793. Under this appropriation head I am happy to report a reduction of \$28,000 in the cost of repairing talking book machines as a result of voluntary efforts, which we have actively encouraged, of groups throughout the country called Telephone Pioneers. This reduction more than offsets the increase required to take care of the cost of initiating a braille music program, a new program authorized by Public Law 87-765.

FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

I come now to the foreign currency program authorized by section 104(n) of Public Law 480. For this program I am requesting an increase of \$298,100. Of this amount \$268,000 is for foreign currencies surplus to general U.S. needs and \$30,100 for hard dollar support. The program, which is now in the second year of operation in India, Pakistan, and United Arab Republic, has been eminently successful. Materials from one or more of the three countries are being acquired and distributed to the Library of Congress and to 29 participating libraries at the rate of 1 million pieces per annum. The program has been so well accepted by the participating libraries that in addition

to the \$10,000 in direct support contributed last year, this year's direct support has amounted to \$17,500 which, like last year's support funds, will result in that much being covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Furthermore, the interest of libraries throughout the country in this program is demonstrated by their contributions of over \$150,000 for a cooperative cataloging project to support the cataloging of materials acquired from the three countries in which the program operates. This cataloging project is of direct benefit to the Library of Congress.

ADDITIONAL CURRENCY REQUEST

Therefore, I strongly recommend for 1964 an additional \$268,000 in foreign currencies and \$30,100 in hard dollar support to initiate programs in three more countries, Burma, Indonesia, and Israel, where we are informed that there are foreign currencies surplus to the general needs of the United States and where we know that materials of interest to the Library of Congress and participating libraries are available.

A small portion of the foreign currencies will be expended for bibliographic listings, which are exceedingly helpful not only to the participating libraries but to about 300 other U.S. libraries. Useful books are also published in English in the countries where this program would operate; it is proposed to initiate a program to acquire limited quantities of these for some 300 U.S. college and university libraries not equipped to handle the foreign language materials.

I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to present the most urgent needs of the Library of Congress. My staff and I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

SPECIAL STUDIES

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you, Dr. Mumford. On page 35 of the justification, summarizing Reference Department salaries and expenses you state that a staff of 15 in the Slavic and Central European Division prepared 12 special studies in 1961 and 17 special studies in 1962 as the Division's principal workload. For whom were these special studies prepared.

Mr. BASLER. I could get a list of those but I don't have them here.

Senator MONRONEY. For the congressional committees?

Mr. BASLER. Some of them, yes, sir.

Mr. MUMFORD. I think the majority would have been for committees or Members of the Congress. But ordinarily we would not prepare special studies for individuals.

(The material referred to follows:)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Special reference studies or reports prepared by the Slavic and Central European Division, Reference Department, fiscal year 1962

Title	Prepared for—
A guide to Rumanian area studies.....	Use as a reference tool.
Comments from the Soviet press on shortages in consumer goods, housing, and industrial and agricultural production.	Congressional request.
Helvetica.....	Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions.
Soviet space program.....	Congressional request.
Assistance on a Senator's report of his trip to Russia.	Do.
First review of draft report of the visit by a delegation of American librarians to the U.S.S.R.	American Library Association.
Militant statements by Soviet military leaders.	Congressional request.
Second review of draft report of the visit by a delegation of Americans to the U.S.S.R.	American Library Association.
U.S.S.R. and East European library resources and their utilization in the Library of Congress.	Do.
Hungarica.....	Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions.
West German library developments since 1945.	Publication by the Library of Congress.
LC holdings related to Hitler putsch of 1923..	Mr. Richard Hanser, Larchmont, N.Y.
Russian acquisitions.....	Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions.
Polish acquisitions.....	Do.
Czech acquisitions.....	Do.
Location in LC sources and translation of 100 significant terms used Communist political communications.	Congressional request.
Parallels of statements in speech by Nasser to statements in Communist literature.	Do.

RECORDS OF WORK DONE

Senator MONRONEY. I do not believe it would be reasonable to ask you for such a detailed breakdown for the accomplishments in each of the divisions but I think it would be useful to analyze on a strictly random basis the work of some of these divisions.

I am somewhat mystified that you prepared 17 special studies, answered 42,000 reference inquiries, issued 39,700 items to readers, examined 15,500 booklists, searched 19,100 items, and recommended 33,500 items for acquisition in 1962 in this category. How did you arrive at these figures?

Mr. MUMFORD. They are work records that are kept.

Senator MONRONEY. Everytime any one of these items is ordered, is that made a matter of record?

Mr. MUMFORD. That is correct. That is the only way we would have a workload record.

Mr. BASLER. We keep monthly statistics on the work that is performed in this Division.

Senator MONRONEY. Then do you estimate it on the annual basis?

Mr. BASLER. We add them up to arrive at the annual figure.

Mr. MUMFORD. They are actual figures, not estimated.

Senator MONRONEY. It is all rounded out pretty neatly so I presumed it was estimated. How many people are engaged in keeping books on these requests; the 42,100 reference inquiries, 39,700 items to readers

Mr. BASLER. There are 15 members of the staff of the Slavic and Central European Division. Each of them participates to some extent in this and keeps a tabulation of what he does.

Senator MONRONEY. Of his own work?

Mr. BASLER. That is right. They are totaled at the end of the month and at the end of the year.

USERS OF STUDIES

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have any way of accurately describing the users of these studies and all this information that is supplied. That is, who are these 150,000 odd people.

Mr. BASLER. The readers who come to our reading room, sir, are not all identifiable.

Senator MONRONEY. Are these not mainly mail inquiries?

Mr. BASLER. No. Of the 42,100 reference inquiries, a considerable portion of these occur right in the Slavic reading room.

Senator MONRONEY. How about the 39,700 items to readers?

Mr. BASLER. Those are served in the Slavic reading room.

Senator MONRONEY. How about the book list, 15,500?

Mr. BASLER. These are all checked by the 15 members of the Slavic and Central European Division staff.

Senator MONRONEY. This is still furnished to the reader, is that correct?

Mr. BASLER. No; the book lists are checked for acquisition purposes to recommend the purchase or acquisition through gift or exchange of items we need.

Senator MONRONEY. I would like to include at this point, in the committee record, pages 4 through 12 of the justifications, a good portion of which has previously been testified to by the Librarian.

(The material referred to follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Salaries and expenses, Library of Congress

1963 regular bill.....	\$9,810,430
Reappropriation of unobligated balances of fiscal year 1962 under this head.....	67,000
Supplemental for pay increases, Public Law 87-793.....	263,950
1963 adjusted.....	10,141,380
1964 estimate.....	10,405,000
Net increase.....	\$263,620
Increases.....	\$1,375,742
Decreases.....	1,112,122
Net increase.....	263,620

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Decreases:	
1. Elevator operator positions (4).....	-12,122
Reduction of 4 elevator operator positions, including fringe benefits, due to conversion to automatic elevators in two locations in the Library.	
2. Renovation of Naval Weapons Plant.....	-1,100,000
Nonrecurring item to reimburse General Services Administration for the renovation, including air conditioning, of space at the Naval Weapons Plant.	
Total decreases.....	-1,112,122

Salaries and expenses, Library of Congress—Continued

Increases:

1. Ingrade increases, wage board increases, and reallocations..... +\$140, 517

For projected increase in salary level for 1964 over 1963 as follows:

Ingrade increases.....	\$71, 417
Reallocations.....	56, 000
Wage board increases.....	13, 100

Total..... 140, 517

It is estimated that approximately 50 percent of the total request is for within-grade increases; 40 percent for reallocations and 10 percent for wage board increases. To absorb this amount would mean that the equivalent of approximately 21.5 positions could not be filled.

2. Pay increase cost for 1964 due to Public Law 87-793..... +\$319, 838

The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1962 provided for 2 separate pay raises effective in October 1962 and January 1964. Provision for the cost for fiscal year 1963, from Oct. 14, 1962, to June 30, 1963, is included in a supplemental request (H. Doc. 63). This request is made to provide the balance of the cost for a full year, (\$146,746 is for this purpose); the remainder, \$173,092 is for the cost attributable to the January 1964 provision of the pay act. Following is a table showing the salary costs and the personnel benefits requested.

	Salaries	Personnel benefits	Total
1963 pay cost (3½ months).....	\$139, 292	\$7, 454	\$146, 746
1964 salary increase (6 months).....	161, 993	11, 099	173, 092
Total.....	301, 285	18, 553	319, 838

3. Regular pay above 52-week base..... +\$68, 008

There are 2 days in excess of the 52-week base in fiscal year 1964; no excess days in fiscal year 1963.

4. To provide a full year's cost of the Children's Book Section..... +\$8, 065

Funds to establish this section were provided in the 1963 Appropriation Act for 8 months of the fiscal year. This request is to complete the full-year needs including the pay increase allowed by Public Law 87-793.

5. Binding at Government Printing Office..... +\$25, 300

This increase is twofold: First, bookbinders, pressmen, journeymen, compositors, and maintenance personnel were granted 25 cents an hour increase and laborers 10 cents an hour. Government Printing Office estimates the annual cost for these pay increases at \$7,800 to be passed on to the Library of Congress in the form of increased bills for binding services. Second, there is an urgent need to provide an increase in the manuscript laminating capacity from 45,000 to 90,000 pieces a year and an increase in manuscript repair work. The staff to be added by the Government Printing Office for these purposes would cost the Library \$17,500 annually.

6. Increase in telephone service..... +\$3, 200

Funds for an additional 100 dial lines are requested in order to provide sufficient equipment for the expected requirements of the Library in fiscal 1964. There has been no increase in the allowance for telephone service since fiscal year 1961. New positions granted in fiscal years 1962 and 1963 and the increase in workload has made this additional telephone service necessary.

7. Rental of space..... +\$111, 320

The 1963 appropriation provided 3 months maintenance cost of 85,000 square feet of space at the Naval Weapons Plant. The following table supports the request for full-year needs.

	Annual cost	Appropriated, 1963	Request
85,000 square feet at \$1.50.....	\$127, 500	\$31, 875	\$95, 625
Staff.....	26, 900	11, 205	15, 695
Total.....	154, 400	43, 080	111, 320

8. Rental of equipment..... +\$35, 000

For annual rental cost of a small-scale computer to replace the present electrical accounting machine installation. The computer is expected to increase the currency of reports and information, improve the effectiveness of operations, and permit applications to bibliographic and other activities which are either impossible or too cumbersome with present equipment. Annual rental cost of present electrical accounting machine installation is \$53,000; of a computer installation, \$88,000.

9. Reimbursement to employees compensation fund..... +\$1, 806

To reimburse the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employees' Compensation for benefits and other payments charged to the Library of Congress for fiscal year 1962 in accordance with sec. 209, Public Law 86-767 approved Sept. 13, 1960.

Salaries and expenses, Library of Congress—Continued

Increases:

10. New positions requested (102).....		+662,688
<i>Processing Department (95).—To process current receipts fully and reduce arrearages in the Descriptive Cataloging Division, to keep pace with increasing world production of books. Uncataloged books are not available for reader use.</i>		
10 GS-11; 24 GS-9; and 4 GS-5.....	\$259,052	
Contribution to retirement.....	16,838	
Group life insurance.....	863	
Contribution to health benefits.....	2,310	
Subtotal.....	279,063	
<i>To clear present Subject Cataloging Division arrearage and keep pace with increased descriptive cataloging production. This request is predicated on the approval of the request for positions in Descriptive Cataloging.</i>		
9 GS-11; 10 GS-5.....	118,210	
Contribution to retirement.....	7,684	
Group life insurance.....	394	
Contribution to health benefits.....	1,053	
Subtotal.....	127,341	
<i>To continue the preparation and publication of the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions for which the present financial support by other Federal agencies cannot be continued and which an independent survey has determined to be an essential bibliographic tool.</i>		
1 GS-12; 5 GS-11; 2 GS-9; 2 GS-7; 1 GS-6; 11 GS-5; 3 GS-4; 12 GS-3; and 1 GS-2.....	206,480	
Contribution to Retirement.....	13,421	
Group Life Insurance.....	888	
Contribution to Health Benefits.....	1,840	
Subtotal.....	222,429	
Total, Processing Department.....	628,833	
<i>Reference Department (7).—To prepare special collections for use:</i>		
1 GS-9; 2 GS-5; and 1 GS-4.....	19,947	
Contribution to retirement.....	1,297	
Group life insurance.....	66	
Contribution to health benefits.....	178	
Subtotal.....	21,488	
<i>To improve service to readers.</i>		
3 GS-3.....	11,481	
Contribution to Retirement.....	745	
Group Life Insurance.....	38	
Contribution to Health Benefits.....	102	
Subtotal.....	12,367	
Total, Reference Department.....	33,855	
Total positions listed above (102).....	662,688	
Total increases.....		+1,375,742
Net increase.....		+263,620

QUESTION OF TRANSFER OF LIBRARY

Senator MONRONEY. Dr. Mumford, last year there was introduced into the Congressional Record, in the Senate, memoranda prepared by Douglas W. Bryant, associate director of Harvard University Library on the subject of whether the Library of Congress is not more nearly a national library rather than a library of Congress. Does not the executive branch make extensive use of the Library, and therefore they do not build up their own library.

Mr. MUMFORD. The executive agencies do make extensive use of the Library. But the Library of Congress is the great general library of the Government. The libraries of the executive agencies in general are working collections of, more or less, current materials. They do not attempt to build up very extensive collections of older materials.

They are constantly transferring older materials to us to fill gaps in our collections and that which is not needed to fill gaps is used for exchange purposes with other libraries here and abroad.

USE BY CONGRESS AND EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have any figures indicating how the Library is used by the Congress and by the executive branch?

Mr. MUMFORD. We have figures on the use by the Congress, and, to a limited extent, by the rest of the Government.

Senator MONRONEY. Will you put that in the record?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

(The material referred to follows:)

APPENDIX X

Statistics of reference service 1—Circulation of materials and response to reference inquiries for fiscal year 1962

	Circulation		Reference questions answered		Reference and loan requests by phone				Bibliographies prepared	
	Volumes and other units (for use within the Library)	Loans (outside)	In person	By correspondence	Congress	Government	Other	Total	Number	Number of entries 2
Reference Department Divisions:										
General Reference and Bibliography										
Hispanic			123,413	17,154	1,705	19,720	19,443	40,868	5	2,339
Loan			2,271	1,053	105	1,143	643	1,891	26	9,022
Manuscript		214,601	29,492	28,290	22,559	1,405	3,685	26,649		
Map	98,716	3 351	5,133	2,039	88	1,349	1,590	3,027		
Music	67,487	3 6,189	12,893	1,278	220	1,278	1,767	2,265	2	8,648
Orientalia	34,833	3 1,631	17,624	20,845	1,530	11,812	14,305	27,647	25	283
Prints and photographs	62,809	3 2,800	27,752	1,281	362	12,907	4,250	17,519	13	2,719
P	31,525	3 1,179	25,854	2,286	350	1,915	1,899	4,164	13	217
Motion picture section	4	3 1,732	984	577	72	292	310	674		
Rare book	31,726		8,344	1,062		4,629	4,442	9,071		4,139
Science and technology	518	3 199	7,466	4,473	155	2,831	2,201	5,277	10	32,749
Serial	468,031	3 29,176	57,717	3,172	5,339	12,077	10,099	27,515		3,231
Slave and Central European	39,097	3 588	22,363	1,067	356	14,422	3,922	18,700	8	9,400
Stack and reader	1,019,918									
Microfilm reading room	9,746	3 943	6,900	104	40	887	218	1,145		
Total—1962	1,864,410	214,601	348,176	84,664	32,881	85,667	67,864	186,412	102	72,807
1961	1,771,750	202,010	327,210	88,076	29,548	84,665	69,756	183,969	129	46,376
1960	1,784,380	202,451	325,775	81,439	32,591	86,795	76,399	195,785	77	59,894
Law library	230,794	3 8,394	56,491	1,176	5,240	9,761	5,845	20,846	80	1,757
Law library in Capitol	7,115	2,693	1,573		4,028			4,028		
Processing Department	80		1,270	12,057	817	57,026	27,528	85,371	51	4,773
Grand total, 1962	2,102,399	217,294	407,510	97,897	42,966	152,454	101,237	296,657	233	79,337

																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														</
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

¹ See app. X1 for complete statistics for the Division for the Blind, which are not included here. Also not included here are statistics for the Legislative Reference Service, which answered 99,430 inquiries in fiscal 1962.

2 Includes entries for continuing bibliographies.

Materials selected for loan.

⁴ Legislative Reference Service statistics included.

NOTE.—Items issued by the Loan Division for congressional use totaled 66,800; for other Government libraries, 78,000.

COST OF SEPARATE MEDICAL AND AGRICULTURAL LIBRARIES

Senator MONRONEY. Will you furnish for the record, please, sir, a comparative analysis of the expenditures which the Federal Government is making to maintain separate national libraries in the fields of medicine and agriculture?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have figures?

Mr. MUMFORD. I think we can get them.

(The data to be submitted follow:)

<i>National Library of Medicine</i>	
1962 actual.....	\$3, 284, 000
1963 estimate.....	3, 335, 000
1964 estimate.....	4, 074, 000

<i>National Agricultural Library</i>	
1962 actual.....	\$1, 028, 000
1963 estimate.....	1, 186, 000
1964 estimate ¹	1, 695, 000

¹ Also \$450,000 for plans and specifications for new Library building.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER LIBRARIES

Senator MONRONEY. What is being done to coordinate the activities of the Library of Congress with these two other national libraries which are so designated, the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library?

Mr. MUMFORD. We work constantly in cooperation with these two libraries. The Library of Congress does not undertake to collect in the field of clinical medicine and technical agriculture. There are borderline types of material which we need in connection with material that is not specifically in the fields of medicine and agriculture. We pass on to the National Library of Medicine and to the National Agricultural Library one copy of the copyright deposit within their respective specialized fields. We receive material by way of exchange in these areas that we pass on to them. I serve as a member of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine; so there is a formal relationship there.

We have informal relationships and direct consultation with the staffs of these libraries in respect to acquisitions and service.

Senator MONRONEY. Aside from our hearings, is the National Agricultural Library being moved from its present location down in the Mall to some other location?

Mr. MUMFORD. They have plans for an extension. I do not think its location has been announced.

Mr. ROGERS. I believe they are planning a new building, but this is long range.

Mr. MUMFORD. It would not be moved in the immediate future.

Senator MONRONEY. That is a subject more proper for the agricultural people. I heard they were planning to move.

Is there a duplication of effort and expenditure under the present system?

Mr. MUMFORD. I don't think so. Not any that is not necessary. You mean the dividing of these fields between National Library of Medicine and the National Agriculture Library on the one hand and the Library of Congress on the other?

QUESTION OF DUPLICATION

Senator MONRONEY. Yes, is there an overlapping that causes a waste of Government money and the fact that you may have some books on medicine and on agriculture that would be duplicative of what they are maintaining in their larger and more specialized libraries?

Mr. MUMFORD. I don't think any such duplication would be substantial or very significant in the total cost.

INDEX OF RUSSIAN ACCESSIONS

Senator MONRONEY. Moving forward on the request, we had some discussion on Monthly Index of the Russian Accessions.

I want to again ask, does the National Science Foundation recommend that appropriation?

Mr. MUMFORD. It recommends that the cost of the Monthly Index be transferred to the Library.

Senator MONRONEY. To be paid by somebody else and not by themselves.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is correct.

RETURNS FROM SALE OF INDEX

Senator MONRONEY. You find an almost unanimous choice in the Government in that system. Was any consideration given to charging sufficiently for the index to cover the entire cost of its preparation? I think you said it is \$12 that you charge and then the cards bring in some funds. This could require \$222,000 to fund it. Could you give me an idea of what the total amount brought in from the sale of the index and the sale of the cards now is?

Mr. MUMFORD. It would be a very small part of the total cost. I think it would be absolutely impossible to make it self-supporting on a subscription basis. While it is of tremendous value to a number of people, you could never build up a subscription list large enough to make it self-supporting.

Senator MONRONEY. I refer to the results of the survey which support the continuation of the monthly index and reinstatement of the listing of tables of contents in periodicals previously discontinued. Since this survey was conducted at the request of the National Science Foundation which financed the Monthly Index for fiscal 1963 why doesn't the National Science Foundation plan to continue its support? Of course, it had not read the House report. They plead that they were merely anxious to get it started.

Mr. MUMFORD. They bailed it out for the last year rather than see it suspended, but did not feel that they could do it on a continuing basis.

Senator MONRONEY. I think you told me it had been carried on since about 1948 by other agencies of Government which you did not name.

Mr. MUMFORD. We did receive some support in some years from some other agencies. AEC, NASA, and others. But not enough to be able to carry the work forward.

DUPLICATION OF INDEXING

Senator MONRONEY. Would the survey cover duplicating or similar indexing by other scientific and scholarly institutions?

Mr. MUMFORD. I don't think there is any duplicate indexing of this kind, Mr. Chairman. It is the only tool of its kind that lists the vast amount of Russian material that is coming into the country, both into the Library of Congress and to other libraries.

FOREIGN SUBSCRIBERS

Senator MONRONEY. Would there not be some economy possible if all work of this kind now going on in the free world was better coordinated? In other words, I would assume that if this information is of such great value to the 4,000 individual users found by the survey, it must be that a similar demand exists in other nations in NATO. Has this been explored?

Mr. MUMFORD. Mr. Rogers indicates that there are some foreign subscribers who are using it now.

Senator MONRONEY. You are not able to identify these, whether they are NATO members or not?

Mr. MUMFORD. Only the Government Printing Office would have that.

Senator MONRONEY. They contribute nothing in the way of financing to carry it?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir.

FUNDS AVAILABLE TO LIBRARY

Senator MONRONEY. For the purpose of the record, would you please insert in the hearing record a table which will show other funds which the Library has available to it and the source of these funds.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

(The material referred to follows:)

FUNDS AVAILABLE TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, ALL SOURCES

We present the following summary showing funds available to the Library from all sources, followed by detailed schedules covering funds other than those appropriated directly to the Library.

Total funds available, all sources

Source	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Annual appropriations to the Library of Congress.....	\$17,193,700	¹ \$19,997,280	\$21,152,400
Annual appropriations for Library buildings to Architect of the Capitol (see schedule 1).....	3,847,000	1,069,500	3,711,000
Gift and trust funds (see schedule 2).....	1,441,774	1,388,663	1,376,340
Reimbursement for services performed (see schedule 3).....	35,173	26,302	-----
Working fund advances and allocations (see schedule 4).....	5,147,279	5,771,633	6,307,695
Total.....	27,664,926	28,253,378	32,547,435

¹ Includes \$498,350 pay raise supplemental in H. Doc. 63.

SCHEDULE 1.—*Annual appropriations for library buildings to Architect of the Capitol*

	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Structural and mechanical care.....	\$3,748,000	\$844,500	\$3,522,000
Furniture and furnishings.....	99,000	225,000	189,000
Total.....	3,847,000	1,069,500	3,711,000

SCHEDULE 2.—*Gift and trust funds*

	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Gift fund.....	\$418,401	\$362,323	\$350,000
Income from investments.....	17,506	17,000	17,000
Interest on bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard.....	800	800	800
Interest on permanent loan.....	178,527	178,540	178,540
Service fees.....	826,540	830,000	830,000
Total.....	1,441,774	1,388,663	1,376,340

SCHEDULE 3.—*Reimbursements for services performed*

	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
For reimbursement to Salaries and expenses, Copyright Office: Department of Commerce.....	\$1,581	\$1,273	-----
For reimbursement to Legislative Reference Service:			
House Committee on Appropriations.....	6,246	-----	-----
House Committee on Foreign Affairs.....	-----	4,056	-----
House Committee on Judiciary.....	-----	5,000	-----
Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.....	27,105	11,456	-----
Senate Committee on Armed Services.....	241	-----	-----
Senate Committee on Commerce.....	-----	4,517	-----
Total.....	35,173	26,302	-----

SCHEDULE 4.—Working fund advances and allocations

Source	Project	Purpose	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
Department of the Air Force.	Air research project.	To provide to the Air Force, according to specific requirements, the results of studies based on the examination of materials primarily in the collections of the Library of Congress.	\$2,250,000	\$2,359,240	\$2,465,000
	Aerospace information project.	To exploit foreign language materials, primarily in the collections of the Library of Congress, and to prepare special studies to meet Air Force requirements.	1,662,484	2,084,752	2,985,000
Air Force, Office of Scientific Research.	Science bibliographic project.	To prepare bibliographies in specific subject areas.	96,048	101,230	-----
Air Force, Aeronautical Systems Division.	do.	do.	46,765	59,638	-----
Department of the Army:					
Corps of Engineers.	Cold regions research and engineering.	To prepare a continuing bibliography on the basic properties and applications of snow, ice, and perennially and seasonally frozen ground, based especially on the collections of the Library of Congress. All items carry abstracts. The bibliography is issued in 2 forms—catalog cards and book catalogs.	35,000	36,400	36,400
	Bibliography.	To prepare a bibliography on shaped charges.	-----	3,500	-----
	do.	To prepare a bibliography in a specific subject area.	43,000	46,040	-----
	do.	do.	12,500	5,000	-----
Ballistic Research Laboratory.	Translation services.	To translate and abstract foreign language material.	-----	530	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.	Cyrillic biographic project.	To prepare and issue the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions (beyond the point to which the Library has staff for doing this) in order to provide information regarding the publications received currently in libraries in this country from U.S.S.R. and to prepare biographic data in connection therewith.	429,802	336,077	400,400
	East European accessions index project.	Continuation of the East European Accessions Index.	101,994	-----	-----
	International organizations unit.	To secure and organize information about future international meetings.	43,119	42,324	47,100
	do.	To prepare and publish a world list of future international meetings.	44,149	65,776	80,900
	Bibliography.	To prepare a bibliography in a specific subject area.	21,200	10,000	-----
	do.	Continuation of the compilation by the Library of Congress of a bibliography on air pollution.	12,000	14,063	-----
	Catalog.	For support of editing the National Library of Medicine Catalog.	8,000	8,000	-----
	Survey.	To determine pedagogic utility of the Archive of Hispanic Literature on tape.	4,900	10,550	-----
	National atlas project.	To cover the services of a geographer to head the national atlas project for the Geological Survey.	6,375	20,500	10,250
	Bibliography.	To prepare bibliographies in specific subject areas.	43,000	5,000	-----
	do.	Support of the preparation of a bibliography of foreign abstracting and indexing services.	-----	3,360	-----
Federal Aviation Agency.					
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.					
Department of Interior.					
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.					
National Science Foundation.					

Listing-----	Support of compilation and publication of a monthly world list of future international meetings.	18,500	-----	-----
Guide-----	Support of preparation of a guide to international information facilities.	16,153	10,000	-----
Cyrillic bibliographic project.	Additional support for the Cyrillic bibliographic project.	66,000	199,100	-----
Study-----	Support of a user and value study of the Monthly Index of Russian Abstracts.	-----	21,560	-----
Center-----	To establish a National Scientific and Technical Referral Center.	-----	201,080	200,000
do-----	Support of a Reports Reference Center.	19,891	1,000	-----
Census-----	Support of preparing and publishing a census of worldwide scientific serials.	29,189	20,988	-----
Bibliography-----	Support of preparing an analytical survey and bibliography of scientific directories throughout the world.	28,020	840	-----
Science bibliographic projects.	To prepare bibliographies in specific subject areas.	-----	-----	-----
Oliver Wendell Holmes De-	For the preparation of a history of the Supreme Court.	55,000	52,145	52,145
visive Fund.	For the maintenance of librarians from foreign countries study-	24,490	9,740	-----
International Educational Ex-	ing libraries and library methods and services in the United States.	-----	-----	-----
change activities.	To prepare a union catalog of books sent to the foreign informa-	29,700	30,500	30,500
Oversea information centers,	tion center libraries. This working tool is based on inven-	-----	-----	-----
union catalog.	ories submitted by the foreign libraries and on the record	-----	-----	-----
Bibliography-----	of publications purchased by the Information Center Serv-	-----	-----	-----
-----	ice, and makes use of the experience of the Library of Con-	-----	-----	-----
-----	gress in developing and maintaining union catalogs.	-----	-----	-----
-----	To prepare and publish a bibliography of U.S. authors trans-	-----	12,700	-----
-----	lated into Spanish and Portuguese, since 1964.	-----	-----	-----
Total-----	-----	5,147,279	5,771,633	6,307,695

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Annual appropriations to the Library of Congress.—These are described in the estimates and the justification of the estimates.

Annual appropriations to the Architect of the Capitol.—The two items under this category are appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with 2 U.S.C. 141. However, the requests for funds and actions on the use of such funds are normally initiated by the Library.

Gift and trust funds.—Funds from non-Federal sources are available to the Library in accordance with 2 U.S.C. 154-162 and 31 U.S.C. 725s. Further details on the use made of such funds may be found on pages 919-920 of the appendix to the Budget of the United States, fiscal year 1964. While contributions to the gift and trust funds enable the Library to augment its services, the administration of these funds and of the programs and projects financed thereby is a charge to the annual appropriations.

Reimbursements for services performed.—These are generally for details of personnel and, with minor exceptions, for work done by the Legislative Reference Service staff. Reimbursement is in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 686.

The bulk of the work performed under reimbursable arrangements is for committees of Congress or for congressional commissions. In all instances, work is undertaken at the specific request of the reimbursing agency. In the case of work for committees of Congress, no charge is added for administration of these reimbursable details.

Working fund advances and allocations.—During 1963 about 90 percent of the funds received will be from agencies in the National Defense Establishment, and the remaining 10 percent will for the most part be defense related projects. Projects financed by working funds and allocations require extensive use of the Library's collections or depend upon specialized library skills generally available only at the Library of Congress. These are the basic reasons for operation by the Library rather than by the parent agency.

However, these projects and programs are not of the type which come within the scope of the Library's normal operations and they would not be included in the functions for which a direct appropriation would be requested. They are appropriately operated under working fund arrangements in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 686.

In the case of working fund projects, the Library, by imposing a surcharge, generally 10 percent over and above direct cost, has compensated for the administrative and other burdens of the projects. This surcharge has amounted to between \$460,000 and \$500,000 per annum and has provided for the employment of 85 to 95 persons.

Submitted in accordance with instructions in Report No. 407, 86th Congress, 1st session, legislative branch appropriation bill, 1960:

"Administrative provisions.—The committee has gone along with the request of the Library to drop the limitation on the amount that can be used for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the business of the Library. In so doing, the committee would like the Librarian to report in the justifications each year as to the amounts expended with brief outline of the specifics."

Expenses of attendance at meetings, fiscal year 1963

Dates	Sponsor	Location	Number of Library of Congress staff	Cost
July 1-7, 1962.....	National Education Association.....	Denver, Colo.....	1	\$308.00
Do.....	Gordon Research Conference.....	Hanover, N.H.....	1	149.00
July 8-13, 1962.....	American Association of Workers for the Blind.....	Cleveland, Ohio.....	5	722.00
July 27 to Aug. 12, 1962.....	American Bar Association.....	San Francisco, Calif.....	3	1,620.85
Aug. 15-23, 1962.....	American Farm Economic Association.....	Storrs, Conn.....	1	135.00
Aug. 24-29, 1962.....	American Municipal Association.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	1	78.00
Sept. 1-9, 1962.....	National Congress of American Indians.....	Cherokee, N.C.....	2	360.00
Sept. 2-10, 1962.....	National Tax Association.....	Miami, Fla.....	2	414.00
Sept. 19-24, 1962.....	Manuscript Society.....	New York, N.Y.....	2	264.36
Sept. 25-26, 1962.....	African Affairs Society of America.....	do.....	1	67.00
Sept. 28 to Oct. 4, 1962.....	Society of American Archivists.....	Rochester, N.Y.....	2	306.85
Oct. 3-6, 1962.....	American Records Management Association.....	Atlantic City, N.J.....	1	134.40
Oct. 16-21, 1962.....	American Antiquarian Society.....	Worcester, Mass.....	1	110.00
Oct. 26-28, 1962.....	Society for the History of Discoveries.....	Providence, R.I.....	1	92.50
Oct. 30-31, 1962.....	National Foreign Trade Convention.....	New York, N.Y.....	2	164.00
Nov. 1-2, 1962.....	American Standards Association.....	do.....	1	62.28
Nov. 6-12, 1962.....	American Library Association Executive board.....	Chicago, Ill.....	1	240.00
Nov. 8-11, 1962.....	Southern Historical Association.....	Miami Beach, Fla.....	1	199.00
Nov. 16-19, 1962.....	New York School of Social Research.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	78.00
Dec. 9-16, 1962.....	American Documentation Institute.....	Hollywood, Fla.....	3	870.10
Dec. 20, 1962.....	National Music Council.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	53.28
Dec. 26-30, 1962.....	American Association/Advancement of Science.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	4	294.12
Dec. 26-28, 1962.....	Society for Biblical Literature and Exegesis.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	76.30
Dec. 26-30, 1962.....	American Musicological Society.....	Columbus, Ohio.....	1	139.00
Dec. 27-30, 1962.....	American Historical Association.....	Chicago, Ill.....	1	144.30
Dec. 27-28, 1962.....	American Economic Association.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	5	515.00
Jan. 8-13, 1963.....	Musie Library Association.....	Chicago, Ill.....	2	366.60
Jan. 24-27, 1963.....	Bibliographical Society of America.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	54.58
Jan. 25-28, 1963.....	American Bar Association—Midwinter.....	New Orleans, La.....	1	216.30
Jan. 26 to Feb. 2, 1963.....	American Library Association—Midwinter.....	Chicago, Ill.....	13	3,022.87
Feb. 4-5, 1963.....	American Book Publishers Council.....	New York, N.Y.....	3	236.90
Feb. 11-13, 1963.....	Air Force symposium.....	Dayton, Ohio.....	1	119.00
Feb. 13-15, 1963.....	American Bar Association, copyright office affairs.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	75.30
Feb. 28, 1963.....	Cornell Conference on Management Developments.....	do.....	1	79.58
Mar. 1, 1963.....	Federal Bar Association.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	1	78.00
Mar. 10-13, 1963.....	Music Teachers National Association.....	Chicago, Ill.....	1	146.90
Total actual, July 1, 1962 to Mar. 15, 1963.....				11,993.37
Mar. 25-28, 1963.....	Association for Asian Studies.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	3	210.00
April 1963.....	American Standards Association.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	60.00
Do.....	Antiquarian Book Association.....	do.....	1	75.00
Do.....	American Bar Association.....	Palm Springs, Calif.....	1	432.00
Apr. 1-5, 1963.....	American Chemical Society.....	Los Angeles, Calif.....	1	287.10
Apr. 22-26, 1963.....	Inter-American Bar Association.....	Panama City, Panama.....	1	420.00
Apr. 25-27, 1963.....	International Relations Commission.....	Princeton, N.J.....	1	100.00
May 1-3, 1963.....	Mississippi Valley Foreign Trade.....	New Orleans, La.....	1	235.00
May 2-4, 1963.....	Mississippi Valley Historical Association.....	Omaha, Nebr.....	1	200.00
May 3, 1963.....	Association of Research Libraries.....	Richmond, Va.....	1	35.00
May 6-7, 1963.....	Association of Records Executives and Administrators, Inc.....	New York, N.Y.....	1	137.70
May 14-17, 1963.....	7th Navy science symposium.....	Pensacola, Fla.....	1	200.00
May 15-19, 1963.....	Conference on Early American History.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	1	77.00
May 20-24, 1963.....	American Society of Civil Engineers.....	Milwaukee, Wis.....	1	200.00
June 1963.....	American Bar Association Subcommittee.....	New York, N.Y.....	4	284.00
June 9-13, 1963.....	Special Libraries Association.....	Denver, Colo.....	5	1,380.00
Total estimated, Mar. 16 to June 30, 1963.....				4,332.80
Grand total.....				16,326.17

COSTS RESULTING FROM EXECUTIVE AGENCIES' USE OF LIBRARY

Senator MONRONEY. Considering the number of people and the amount of funds involved in these outside sources, what percentage of the Library of Congress housekeeping costs results from these services which actually are being performed in many instances at the request of the executive department and agencies?

Mr. DAVIDSON. We can have that for the record with the other material.

Senator MONRONEY. The information that is compiled through the use of these transferred funds and gifts must be of great consequence in some instances. Is it available only to the agencies who underwrite these specific programs or do all users of the Library have access to it?

ACCESSIBILITY OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Mr. MUMFORD. I can answer that generally, Mr. Chairman.

A large part of the information is available to the scientific community of the Government.

Senator MONRONEY. Would they have access to special reports which would be done by the researchers of the Library of Congress?

Mr. MUMFORD. They are being listed and are available through the Office of Technical Services. They issue a list of these publications and which ones are available and already in print and of which ones copies may be obtained.

Senator MONRONEY. I don't quite follow you. This is your research group that publishes reports on certain facets of subjects that they have chosen, or that the subjects that have been submitted by agencies of Governments for papers by the Library of Congress.

Mr. MUMFORD. The work we do for other Government agencies, mainly the Defense Department, is done in response to their requirements. But a large part is made available through the Office of Technical Services.

FUNDS TRANSFERRED FROM DEPARTMENTS

Senator MONRONEY. Then does the Department of Defense pay for this research work?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. They transfer funds to the Library of Congress to do the work.

Senator MONRONEY. That will be included in the list of additional funds?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Roughly how many people are working under these outside fund supports? I think you told me you had 3,000 that are working and 2,000 are in the funds appropriated by this bill. So you have roughly a thousand.

Mr. DAVIDSON. 900 altogether from outside funds, including 175 on gift and trust funds.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is not all from the Defense Department.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I would say 90 percent in the case of funds transferred from other Federal agencies.

LOSS OF LIBRARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MUMFORD. Mr. Chairman, at an appropriate time I would like to provide some information with respect to something that was discussed earlier, namely, the loss of personnel in the Library in previous years. In 1944 the Library suffered a loss of 127 people. In 1948, 47 positions. In 1955, 42 positions.

Senator MONRONEY. That was during the war?

Mr. MUMFORD. Not entirely.

Senator MONRONEY. I imagine those positions were held for the people?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. These figures do not refer to vacancies but to the actual number of positions eliminated. So you see we have had quite a bit of ground to make up in recent years for what had been lost years ago.

Senator MONRONEY. You lost a total of about 217 people. This year you are asking for 135 and last year 109.

Mr. MUMFORD. In the meantime the Library has been growing.

MAINTAINING WEAPONS PLANT SPACE

Senator MONRONEY. You have been growing pretty fast along with it in your personnel requests, it seems to me. As I recall, last year the committee gave you funds to renovate the space at the Naval Weapons Plant. That prospect, I believe, you said has slipped and it will be sometime in the future before that can be occupied.

Mr. WELSH. April.

Senator MONRONEY. Of next year?

Mr. WELSH. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. I notice you have \$111,320 in the budget for a full year's maintenance of this space. The amount required for maintenance would depend on when you move on the space and now you have told us that you would not require any of that, is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. We have money for 3 months in the base that will be carried forward. The \$111,000 will not be required to fill out a year.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you view the new work space in the Naval Weapons Plant as a permanent location?

QUESTION OF THIRD BUILDING

Mr. MUMFORD. Until we obtain a third building. We would expect to bring back these operations when the third Library building is built.

Senator MONRONEY. Your long-range hope for the location of the third building is in the place just east of the Old House Office Building, is it not?

Mr. MUMFORD. This is a somewhat controversial issue at the present time, whether the third Library building would be built on Independence Avenue in the space that has been cleared across from the old Library Building, or east of the Library Annex.

As you know, a Madison Memorial Building has been proposed for the space that has been cleared. This has not been settled as yet by the House Building Committee, and the Public Works Committees.

Senator MONRONEY. The Capitol Architect recommended yesterday that we have a nice, deep three-level parking garage and a park on top.

Mr. MUMFORD. If this were done we would definitely need the third building east of the annex to complement the underground space provided.

Senator MONRONEY. You would not wish such a third Library to be underground space.

Mr. MUMFORD. The underground space would be quite acceptable to us as far as it goes. But it would provide only about 24 percent of the space we need. So we would need the other 76 percent in the new building east of the annex.

RENOVATION OF NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

Senator MONRONEY. Will the renovation of the Naval Weapons Plant be in the nature of a permanent-type construction with up-dated air conditioning, lighting, and so on?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. It will be good space even when the Library moves out to a third building. It will still be very valuable space for the Government.

Senator MONRONEY. This will be done by the Architect of the Capitol?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, it is being done by GSA.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Senator MONRONEY. Do you know whether there is any provision in there for fair employment practices and recognition of job opportunities?

Mr. WELSH. Yes, sir; there is. There is the nondiscrimination clause in the contract.

Senator MONRONEY. Are any colored skilled workers being employed?

Mr. WELSH. The contract has not been awarded as yet.

Senator MONRONEY. Is it one of these that has not been awarded?

Mr. WELSH. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. It is one the President could do something about?

Mr. WELSH. Yes, sir. The bids were received on the 24th of May and they are being reviewed now and will be awarded in the near future.

AMOUNT FOR RENOVATION

Senator MONRONEY. What is the amount of renovation?

Mr. WELSH. We have \$1.1 million for the renovation of the space designated for Library occupancy. The actual low bid amount is \$860,000.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you very much.

Senator YOUNG. Would any of these unused funds be used for other purpose or will they be carried over?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. The funds were appropriated last year when it was expected that we would get into the weapons plant earlier and will be returned to the Treasury.

LETTING CONTRACT FOR WORK

Senator MONRONEY. How is it that you are so long in letting the contract?

Mr. MUMFORD. We don't control that. It is in the hands of the General Services Administration. There have been some obstacles. I can't tell you in detail. We have pleaded with them to move things along just as rapidly as possible. They have agreed they would do so. The space that is being renovated for us is a part of a general renovation of that particular building. We have only the first floor. The whole thing, as Mr. Welsh just indicated, it is a much larger operation. They cannot do our space alone.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNING

Senator YOUNG. Does this require architectural design work?

Mr. WELSH. Yes, sir.

May I expand on that for a moment? The initial delay occurred in allocating the space. There were a great number of demands for the space and there was much delay encountered there. The General Services Administration thought it would be more economical to combine all of the work in one contract and therefore save the Government a considerable amount of money. Illustrative of this saving is the fact that our estimate was for \$1.1 million and the actual bid is \$860,000. So the Government has saved some funds by this approach.

Senator MONRONEY. The appropriations were in the General Services appropriation for this repair work?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. It was reimbursed by the Library of Congress to GSA.

Senator MONRONEY. For the first floor?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. I have forgotten how long you propose to use these quarters down there.

Mr. MUMFORD. Until with the additional third building, permanent space becomes available.

Senator MONRONEY. Then it reverts to GSA?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

DIFFERENCES IN TYPES OF CATALOGING

Senator MONRONEY. I note from the justification, pages 22 to 25, your request for 19 new positions for the subject cataloging differentiation is predicated upon an increased production in the Descriptive Cataloging Division, 38 new positions requested. Please explain the distinction between the work performed by the Descriptive Cataloging Division and the Subject Cataloging Division. You mentioned that briefly earlier but I think we should have that as we go through these justifications.

Mr. MUMFORD. I think, Mr. Chairman, if you will look at these catalog cards they will give an indication. The Descriptive Cataloging Division is responsible for establishing the name of the author to see that it does not conflict with a name already in the catalog, to see that we attribute the book to the right person, and to provide a description of the book. Then it goes on to the Subject Cataloging

Division, which examines the book from the standpoint of subject matter, and determines what subject headings shall be assigned to it and what headings will appear in the catalog under which the reader or user will look for the book. This Division also determines the classification of the book, that is, where it will stand on the shelves, how it relates to other books.

NUMBER OF RUSSIAN PUBLICATIONS LISTED

Senator YOUNG. May I ask a question at that point? How many Russian publications are there listed in this Monthly Index of Russian Accessions?

Mr. ROGERS. In 1962, about 30,000 books and issues of periodicals.

Senator YOUNG. Do you have to have an index card for each one of these?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. We don't catalog each item separately. If it is a separate book we do. But a magazine article——

CIRCULATION OF RUSSIAN MATERIAL

Senator YOUNG. Do the Russians have to list their publications with some Federal agency?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Can the Russians circulate anything they want without the permission of our Government?

Mr. MUMFORD. I am not sure I understand your question, Senator. We receive the material and it is available to any governmental agency that wishes to use it here.

Senator YOUNG. They don't have to list their publications they are circulating with anyone in the United States?

Mr. COFFIN. Sir, any agent of a foreign government distributing foreign propaganda material in the United States must register, as I understand it, with the Department of Justice and must send copies of the propaganda material to the Department of Justice.

Also, they are supposed to send two copies of such publications to the Library of Congress.

QUESTION OF KEEPING RUSSIAN PUBLICATIONS

Senator YOUNG. Do you keep copies of all these Russian publications?

Mr. COFFIN. Some of the publications which are sent under this Foreign Agents Registration Act are pretty lightweight and we don't keep those for more than about a year. We select those pieces that seem to be more important for permanent retention and add them to our collection. The Monthly Index of Russian Accessions lists materials which we at the Library of Congress have received by exchange, by purchase, by gift, and, in some instances, by transfer from other U.S. Government agencies. It also lists such materials which have been received by some of the research libraries in this country and reported by them to the Library of Congress for listing in this publication. In the early pages of the copy which you have, I believe you will find lists of libraries that cooperate with the Library of Congress in this endeavor.

MATERIAL SENT TO RUSSIA

Senator YOUNG. What restrictions are imposed on our sending like material to Russia, do you know?

Mr. COFFIN. We don't send security classified material. This goes without saying. Some of the agencies have materials that are issued for use solely within their agencies. They don't send these to the U.S.S.R. or to the satellite countries.

Senator MONRONEY. Did you have any questions, Mr. Chairman? Chairman HAYDEN. No.

GRADES OF CATALOGERS

Senator MONRONEY. Going back to the Cataloging Divisions, are all the catalogers that you are contemplating hiring at GS-11A and GS-9A ratings going to be graduate librarians?

Mr. MUMFORD. Practically all of them, Mr. Chairman. When unusual foreign languages are required, sometimes we are not able to recruit a person who is a graduate of a library school. In that case, we have to train the person in cataloging techniques. Cataloging is a rather complex operation. When you look at these cards it may appear to be a simple operation. But when you have a catalog with 10 million cards in it, and you are receiving new material all the time, it is very important that one author be differentiated from another, that the book be attributed to the right person, and that an adequate description of the book be given. The rules for cataloging of books occupy a considerable manual. One has to have some training, either in a library school or through a considerable period of experience. We might not be able to find someone easily from a library school who knew Arabic or some of the unusual languages and vernaculars. By and large, however, catalogers are graduates of library schools.

JOB DESCRIPTIONS REQUESTED

Senator MONRONEY. Would you provide for the record the job descriptions for catalogers, shelf listers and any other specialist of this nature? The term "shelf lister" is particularly one that is seldom seen and it might be helpful if the record clarified the distinction between descriptive catalogers and subject catalogers.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

(The material referred to follows:)

Optional Form 8 July 1959 U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION Chapter 12, Federal Personnel Manual 5008-103		1. Check one: Dept? ☐ Field ☐		2. Official headquarters:		4. Agency position No. <u>6707</u>	
POSITION DESCRIPTION		3. Reason for submission: (a) If this position replaces another (i. e., a change of duties in an existing position), identify such position by title, allocation (service, series, grade), and position number New Position		5. C. S. C. certification No.		6. Date of certification	
		(b) Other (specify):		7. Date received from C. S. C.			
8. CLASSIFICATION ACTION							
ALLOCATION BY		CLASS TITLE OF POSITION		CLASS Service Series Grade		INITIALS DATE	
a. Civil Service Commission							
b. Department, agency, or establishment		Librarian (Cataloging)		GS 1410		11 7/1/62	
c. Bureau		Librarian (Cataloging)		GS 1410		11 9/14/62	
d. Field office		Subject to i. a. action					
e. Recommended by initiating office							
9. Organizational title of position (if any) <u>Cataloger</u>				10. Name of employee (if vacancy, specify V-1, 2, 5, or 4) <u>See Page 5</u>			
11. Department, agency, or establishment <u>Library of Congress</u>		e. Third subdivision <u>Foreign Languages Section</u>					
a. First subdivision <u>Processing Department</u>		d. Fourth subdivision					
b. Second subdivision <u>Descriptive Cataloging Division</u>		e. Fifth subdivision					
12. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of my position		13. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this position <u>William Banks Grant</u> (Signature of immediate supervisor)		6/27/62 (Date)			
(Signature of employee)		(Date)		Title: <u>Head, Foreign Languages Section</u>			
14. Certification by head of bureau, division, field office, or designated representative <u>Officalding</u> (Signature)		3 May 62 (Date)		15. Certification by department, agency, or establishment (Signature) (Date)			
Title: <u>Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division</u>		Title:					
16. Description of duties and responsibilities							

SUPERVISION RECEIVED

The Cataloger serves under the general supervision of the Head of the Section and under the technical guidance of one of three unit supervisors. Assignment of selected materials for cataloging from a unit supervisor reflects the incumbent's level of proficiency and special area of competence (linguistic and type of material). These materials are usually recognized to contain problems inherent in the nature or form of the publications, or problems related to the interpretation of rules governing descriptive cataloging. Other assignments are made by a unit supervisor which reflect the incumbent's ability to participate effectively in establishing cataloging patterns for materials presenting unusual technical problems.

Within a framework of prescribed guidelines (chiefly, ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, the Division Manual, cataloging memoranda, etc.), the incumbent devises his own methods and set precedents for cataloging materials, e.g., develops procedures for conducting research, and gauges effect of possible analytical approaches to materials in light of various rules for cataloging, etc.

Completed work, i.e., manuscript cards and authority cards, is reviewed for form, style, and adherence to Library of Congress cataloging policy by a unit supervisor. Any questions concerning technical content of the cards are solved in consultation with a unit supervisor or the Head of the Section. All authority cards prepared are reviewed by the Head of the Section and the Principal Cataloger. Manuscript cards for serials cataloged are reviewed by the Head of the ~~Serials~~ Section, instead of section supervisory personnel.

The incumbent seeks guidance on matters concerning cataloging policy from a unit supervisor or the Head of the Section.

MAJOR DUTIES

The Foreign Languages Section is responsible for the descriptive cataloging of monographic publications, and some serial publications, in all foreign languages except the Far Eastern and Slavic. This includes, in addition to the usual types of monographs and serials, theses from foreign institutions, foreign government documents, works from a government using a foreign language other than a Far Eastern or Slavic as the official language regardless of the language of the text, and works from a government represented in the Library of Congress catalogs with headings in foreign languages other than Far Eastern and Slavic regardless of the language of the text. Depending on his language capabilities, the incumbent is assigned to one of three language units in the Section, i.e., the Romance, Germanic, or Miscellaneous. As the need arises, an incumbent with multi-language capabilities is assigned to more than one language unit.

A Cataloger at this level performs two tasks in cataloging individual works. The first is to choose the person or corporate body bearing intellectual responsibility for the content of the work, to choose necessary added entries,

and to determine the proper form of names chosen. The second is to organize significant bibliographic data relating to the work in such fashion as to distinguish it from all other works entered in the catalog. When all pertinent features concerning the work have been analyzed and organized, the information secured is recorded on a manuscript card which becomes the basis for a printed main entry card. The main entry card and any added entry cards deemed necessary to provide secondary avenues of approach to the work are integrated in the catalog after they are printed.

1. Descriptive Cataloging

(The following describes procedures for cataloging monographs. For duties assigned in serial cataloging see position number in the Serials Section of the Division.) The material cataloged is characterized as most difficult to catalog and very often presents unusually complex problems.*

The incumbent performs three types of cataloging for these materials: full, limited, and collective (2A). Full cataloging (i.e., cataloging in accordance with those rules prescribed in ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, and other rules prescribed by the Division Office) is performed for such materials as basic reference and research tools, scholarly works, etc. Limited cataloging (i.e., cataloging which, in accordance with Department policy, has limitations placed on the research involved in establishing personal names, the number of added entries made, and the amount of descriptive data incorporated in the entry) is performed for such materials as trade publications, minor publications of government and other corporate bodies, etc. Collective cataloging is performed for materials important as a group, but which are not individually significant. For such material selected information is recorded which presents a common denominator for the entire group of materials cataloged.

At this level, the incumbent very often catalogs materials which contain unique problems peculiar to a particular type of publication. The incumbent often develops a pattern for the application of rules for cataloging these materials, providing a consultative service to other catalogers attempting to follow the pattern. The incumbent is expected to act as an expert in solving bibliographic problems. He works closely with those on the supervisory level in the Section to resolve cataloging conflicts. Through the aid tendered to other catalogers, through the consistently sound application of cataloging procedures and rules, and through the expert cataloging performed, the incumbent has considerable impact on the development of a systematic catalog. The following steps are taken in performing original cataloging which results in a printed LC card in relation to material assigned for cataloging:

*e.g. (a) authorship is usually not obvious and generally involves considerable interpretation of rules to determine choice; (b) personal names, if established, usually are in conflicting form on the work cataloged; (c) corporate names are usually not established, but, if established, are received in constantly changing form in publications; (d) usually there are complex problems involved in physical description either in regard to constructing notes to describe a single work or in relating, bibliographically, several works.

a. Determination of Choice and Form of Entries

The incumbent is concerned with identifying the person or corporate body responsible for the work. This process involves choosing a main entry, which is generally the author of the work, added entries, and verifying or establishing the proper form of entries chosen. The guide for this process is the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. These rules are subject to interpretation. The process for determining choice and form of entries is as follows:

1. Analyzes the material to determine the proper main entry, the need for added entries, and all variations in form under which each entry could possibly be established in the Official Catalog. Often part of the text must be read to accomplish this, in addition to an examination of the title page.
2. Searches the main entry, and added entries decided upon, in the Official Catalog. If the searching report forwarded from the Preliminary Cataloging Section indicates some or all of the entries are established, this information must be verified. When it is determined, after searching under all possible variations in form, that certain entries have not been established in the Official Catalog, these entries must be established.
3. All entries established are recorded on authority cards which are prepared for every person, corporate body, government jurisdiction, geographical entity, or other body used for the first time as a main or secondary heading in the Official Catalog. Needed cross references and see also reference are devised and recorded on the card. All sources consulted in establishing names are cited on the card. Authority card are prepared for works entered under title, when extensive research has been performed.
4. Establishes on authority cards main and added entries for personal names on a "no conflict" basis. These names are established in the form given in the work cataloged without further search, provided that, as given in the work cataloged, the name conforms to ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, and is not so similar to another name previously established as to give suspicion that both names refer to the same person. When establishing a common name, some attempt is made to supply the first given name, if it is represented in the work cataloged by an initial or abbreviation. (The "no conflict rule" does not apply to corporate names).
5. Performs research to determine the latest or correct form of a name for a corporate body used as a main or added entry, or for a personal name, if conflict exists in the Official Catalog. Research performed ranges from a careful perusal of work in hand to searching in the Official Catalog and other catalogs in the Library of Congress, searching through bibliographies of American and foreign works, examining biographical dictionaries, examining encyclopedias, consulting directories and other printed sources of all types, examining copyright applications, contacting persons in other sections and divisions within the Library for information, contacting persons in other government agencies for information, or sending

form letters to authors and publishers requesting information. At this level, intensive research is characteristic, and usually goes beyond that characterized above.

6. Establishes for the Subject Cataloging Division names of persons, places, or institutions, (even if not a main or added entry), if a name is, in effect, the subject of a work or forms a significant part of a work.

b. Elements of Bibliographic Description

The incumbent is concerned with recording certain significant features of the work cataloged in an organized manner. To accomplish this, the incumbent follows rules outlined in LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging and rules in other Division procedural and policy guides. The rules are general in nature and require interpretation. The process for organizing and recording bibliographic description is as follows:

1. Body of the Entry - Examines and verifies information recorded by Preliminary Catalogers including the title (often in recording title the works of voluminous authors and titles translated from foreign works must be recognized, so that cards representing variant or translated editions of the same work are filed in proper sequence behind the original work), the author statement, the edition statement, and the imprint.

2. Collation - Examines and verifies information recorded by the Preliminary Catalogers concerning the extent of the work in pages or volumes. Indicates the existence of various types of illustrative matter. Measures the size of the work.

3. Prepares notes amplifying the formalized description presented in the collation. Notes aid in the identification of the work and often show bibliographic relationships with other works. Notes often require original phrasing within a prescribed format.

4. Research is performed, occasionally, to supply missing bibliographic information, or to verify existing information.

2. Cooperative Cataloging

a. Edits cataloging copy received from cooperating institutions, making authority cards for those names not established in the Official Catalog, and insuring conformity with established rules and procedures for choice and form of entry, and for bibliographic description. Drafts inquiries or explanations of changes made, with respect to copy edited, to be sent to the contributing library.

b. Adapts cooperative copy when books, or other materials, are supplied along with the copy (or when later received by LC), comparing the two to insure conformity in all essential details.

3. Recataloging

a. Recatalogs materials when other publications of a given author or additional volumes of a given publication present later forms of names (personal or corporate); when changes in rules for cataloging dictate such recataloging; when errors in original cataloging are discovered; when revisions in cataloging are necessary before the cards are reprinted, etc.

4. Revision

a. As assigned, revises (examination of the manuscript card, any authority cards prepared, and material cataloged) the work of a cataloger functioning at a lower level of proficiency. The revision provides initial control over the quality of the cataloging produced and aids in the development of the cataloger whose work is revised.

5. Correspondence

a. Answers, as assigned, queries directed to the Library by card subscribers and others, concerning entries chosen, form of entries, description of material, etc.

6. Performs other related duties as assigned.

INCUMBENT

SIGNATURE

DATE

Hazel M. Griffin

Hazel M. Griffin

June 27, 1962

Martha E. Huley

Martha E. Huley

April 27, 1962

Nicoletta C. Marketos

Nicoletta Marketos

Apr. 27, 1962

Josephine Sachtjen

Josephine Sachtjen

April 30, 1962

Dorothy Stehle

Dorothy Stehle

27 Apr 62

Optional Form 8 July 1959 U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION Chapter P2, Federal Personnel Manual 508-103		1. ☒ Department Field ☐ 2. Official headquarters: Washington, D.C.		4. Agency position No. 6780	
POSITION DESCRIPTION		3. Reason for submission: (a) If this position replaces another (i. e., a change of duties in an existing position), identify such position by title, allocation (series, grade), and position number New Position		5. C. S. C. certification No.	
		(b) Other (specify)		6. Date of certification	
8. CLASSIFICATION ACTION		7. Date received from C. S. C.			
ALLOCATION BY		CLASS TITLE OF POSITION		CLASS Service Series Grade INITIALS DATE	
a. Civil Service Commission					
b. Department, agency, or establishment		Librarian (Cataloging)		GS 1410 9 2:4 5/1/62	
c. Bureau		Librarian (Cataloging)		GS 1410 9 9 June 5/1/62	
d. Field office		Subject to i.a. action			
e. Recommended by initiating office					
9. Organizational title of position (if any) Cataloger				10. Name of employee (if vacancy, specify V-1, 2, 3, or 4) See Page 5	
11. Department, agency, or establishment Library of Congress		c. Third subdivision Foreign Languages Section			
a. First subdivision Processing Department		d. Fourth subdivision			
b. Second subdivision Descriptive Cataloging Division		e. Fifth subdivision			
12. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of my position: (Signature of employee) (Date)		13. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this position: Anne Burke Grant 5/1/62 (Signature of immediate supervisor) (Date)			
14. Certification by head of bureau, division, field office, or designated representative (Signature) (Date) Title: Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division		15. Certification by department, agency, or establishment (Signature) (Date) Title:			
16. Description of duties and responsibilities					

SUPERVISION RECEIVED

The Cataloger serves under the general supervision of the Head of the Section and under the technical supervision of one of three unit supervisors. Assignment of selected materials for cataloging from a unit supervisor reflects the incumbent's level of proficiency and special area of competence (linguistic and type of material). These materials are often recognized to contain problems inherent in the nature or form of the publications, or problems related to the interpretation of rules governing descriptive cataloging. Selected materials are also assigned by a unit supervisor which develop the incumbent's capacity to catalog the most difficult and complex materials.

Within a framework of prescribed guidelines (chiefly, ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, the Division Manual, Cataloging memoranda, etc.), the incumbent devises his own methods for cataloging assigned materials, e.g., works out procedures for conducting research, and evaluates possible methods for analyzing different categories of materials in light of various rules for cataloging, etc.

Completed work, i.e., manuscript cards and authority cards, is reviewed for form, content, general accuracy, and conformance to Division procedures and Library of Congress cataloging policies by a unit supervisor. All authority cards prepared are reviewed by the Head of the Section and the Principal Cataloger. Manuscript cards for serials cataloged are reviewed by the Head of the Serials Section instead of Section supervisory personnel.

The incumbent seeks guidance on difficult technical problems from a Cataloger at a higher level, a unit supervisor, or the Head of the Section, the latter two, particularly, in regard to matters concerning cataloging policy.

MAJOR DUTIES

The Foreign Languages Section is responsible for the descriptive cataloging of monographic publications, and some serial publications, in all foreign languages except the Far Eastern and Slavic. This includes, in addition to the usual types of monographs and serials, theses from foreign institutions, foreign government documents, works from a government using a foreign language other than a Far Eastern or Slavic as the official language regardless of the language of the text, and works from a government represented in the Library of Congress catalogs with headings in foreign languages other than Far Eastern and Slavic regardless of the language of the text. Depending on his language capabilities, the incumbent is assigned to one of three language units in the Section, i.e., the Romance, Germanic, or Miscellaneous. As the need arises, an incumbent with multi-language capabilities is assigned to more than one language unit.

A Cataloger at this level performs two tasks in cataloging individual works. The first is to choose the person or corporate body bearing intellectual responsibility for the content of the work, to choose necessary added entries, and to determine the proper form of names chosen. The second is to organize

significant bibliographic data relating to the work in such fashion as to distinguish it from all other works entered in the catalog. When all pertinent features concerning the work have been analyzed and organized, the information secured is recorded on a manuscript card which becomes the basis for a printed main entry card. The main entry card and any added entry cards deemed necessary to provide secondary avenues of approach to the work are integrated in the catalog after they are printed.

1. Descriptive Cataloging

(The following describes procedures for cataloging monographs. For duties assigned in serial cataloging see position number _____ in the Serials Section of the Division.) The material cataloged is characterized as moderately difficult to most difficult to catalog. *

The incumbent performs three types of cataloging for these materials: full, limited, and collective (2A). Full cataloging (i.e., cataloging in accordance with those rules prescribed in ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, and other rules prescribed by the Division Office) is performed for such materials as basic reference and research tools, scholarly works, etc. Limited cataloging (i.e., cataloging which, in accordance with Departmental policy, has limitations placed on the research involved in establishing personal names, the number of added entries made, and the amount of descriptive data incorporated in the entry) is performed for such materials as trade publications, minor publications of government and other corporate bodies, etc. Collective cataloging is performed for materials important as a group, but which are not individually significant. For such material selected information is recorded which presents a common denominator for the entire group of materials cataloged.

At this level, the Cataloger is expected to exercise considerable judgment in the application of rules for descriptive cataloging, and to perform consistently in such fashion as to contribute materially to the development of a systematic catalog. The following steps are taken in performing original cataloging which results in a printed LC card in relation to material assigned for cataloging:

a. Determination of Choice and Form of Entries

The incumbent is concerned with identifying the person or corporate body responsible for the work. This process involves choosing a main entry, which is generally the author of the work, added entries, and verifying or

* e.g. (a) often authorship is not obvious or allows for considerable choice;
(b) personal or corporate names are often not established or are in varying forms;
(c) usually there are complications involved in physical description.

establishing the proper form of entries chosen. The guide for this process is the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. These rules are subject to interpretation. The process for determining choice and form of entries is as follows:

1. Analyzes the material to determine the proper main entry, the need for added entries, and all variations in form under which each entry could possibly be established in the Official Catalog. Often part of the text must be read to accomplish this, in addition to an examination of the title page.
2. Searches the main entry, and added entries decided upon, in the Official Catalog. If the searching report forwarded from the Preliminary Cataloging Section indicates some or all of the entries are established, this information must be verified. When it is determined, after searching under all possible variations in form, that certain entries have not been established in the Official Catalog, these entries must be established.
3. All entries established are recorded on authority cards which are prepared for every person, corporate body, government jurisdiction, geographical entity, or other body used for the first time as a main or secondary heading in the Official Catalog. Needed cross references and see also references are devised and recorded on the card. All sources consulted in establishing names are cited on the card. Authority cards are prepared for works entered under title, when extensive research has been performed.
4. Establishes on authority cards main and added entries for personal names on a "no conflict" basis. These names are established in the form given in the work cataloged without further search, provided that, as given in the work cataloged, the name conforms to ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, and is not so similar to another name previously established as to give suspicion that both names refer to the same person. When establishing a common name, some attempt is made to supply the first given name, if it is represented in the work cataloged by an initial or abbreviation. (The "no conflict rule" does not apply to corporate names).
5. Performs research to determine the latest or correct form of a name for a corporate body used as a main or added entry, or for a personal name, if conflict exists in the Official Catalog. Research performed ranges from a careful perusal of the work in hand to searching in the Official Catalog and other catalogs in the Library of Congress, searching through bibliographies of American and foreign works, examining biographical dictionaries, examining encyclopedias, consulting directories and other printed sources of all types, examining copyright applications, contacting persons in other sections and divisions within the Library for information, contacting persons in other government agencies for information, or sending form letters to authors and publishers requesting information. Generally, at this level, research is extensive, and is conducted to establish not only the correct form of names, but involves choice of various names.

6. Establishes for the Subject Cataloging Division names of persons, places, or institutions, (even if not a main or added entry), if a name is, in effect, the subject of a work or forms a significant part of a work.

b. Elements of Bibliographic Description

The incumbent is concerned with recording certain significant features of the work cataloged in an organized manner. To accomplish this, the incumbent follows rules outlined in LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging and rules in other Division procedural and policy guides. The rules are general in nature and require interpretation. The process for organizing and recording bibliographic description is as follows:

1. Body of the Entry - Examines and verifies information recorded by Preliminary Catalogers including the title (often in recording titles the works of voluminous authors and titles translated from foreign works must be recognized, so that cards representing variant or translated editions of the same work are filed in proper sequence behind the original work), the author statement, the edition statement, and the imprint.

2. Collation - Examines and verifies information recorded by the Preliminary Catalogers concerning the extent of the work in pages or volumes. Indicates the existence of various types of illustrative matter. Measures the size of the work.

3. Prepares notes amplifying the formalized description presented in the collation. Notes aid in the identification of the work and often show bibliographic relationships with other works. Notes often require original phrasing within a prescribed format.

4. Research is performed, occasionally, to supply missing bibliographic information, or to verify existing information.

2. Cooperative Cataloging

a. Edits cataloging copy received from cooperating institutions, making authority cards for those names not established in the Official Catalog, and insuring conformity with established rules and procedures for choice and form of entry, and for bibliographic description. Drafts inquiries or explanations of changes made, with respect to copy edited, to be sent to the contributing library.

b. Adapts cooperative copy when books, or other materials, are supplied along with the copy (or when later received by LC), comparing the two to insure conformity in all essential details.

3. Recataloging

a. Recatalogs materials when other publications of a given author or additional volumes of a given publication present later forms of names (personal or corporate); when changes in rules for cataloging dictate such recataloging;

when errors in original cataloging are discovered; when revisions in cataloging are necessary before the cards are reprinted, etc.

4. Revision

a. As assigned, revises (examination of the manuscript card, any authority cards prepared, and material cataloged) the work of a cataloger functioning at a lower level of proficiency. The revision provides initial control over the quality of the cataloging produced and aids in the development of the cataloger whose work is revised.

5. Correspondence

a. Answers, as assigned, queries directed to the Library by card subscribers and others, concerning entries chosen, form of entries, description of material, etc.

6. Performs other related duties as assigned.

INCUMBENT

SIGNATURE

DATE

Hilda Rayson

Hilda L. Rayson

30 Apr 62

Benny R. Tucker

Benny R. Tucker

27 Apr 62

Kay D. Guiles

Kay D. Guiles

27 Apr 62

Sarah M. Hambrick

Sarah M. Hambrick

27 Apr 62

Judith B. Orszlan

Judith B. Orszlan

Apr 27, 62

Anna Smislova

Anna Smislova

April 30, 62

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
February 1953
U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
Chapter P2, Federal Personnel Manual

POSITION DESCRIPTION

1. Check one:
Dept ☒ Field ☐ 2. Official headquarters: Washington, D. C.

3. Reason for submission:
(a) If this position replaces another (i. e., a change of duties in an existing position), identify such position by title, allocation (service, series, grade), and position number
New position
(b) Other (specify):

4. Agency position No. 4781
5. C. S. C. certification No.
6. Date of certification OCT 23 1957
7. Date received from C. S. C.

8. CLASSIFICATION ACTION

ALLOCATION BY	CLASS TITLE OF POSITION	CLASS			INITIALS	DATE
		Revision	Series	Grade		
a. Civil Service Commission						
b. Department, agency, or establishment	<u>Librarian</u>	<u>GS</u>	<u>1410</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>ms</u>	<u>12-23-57</u>
c. Bureau	<u>Librarian</u>	<u>GS</u>	<u>1410</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>ms</u>	<u>10/18/57</u>
d. Field office	<u>Subject to i. s. action</u>					
e. Recommended by Initiating office						

9. Organizational title of position (if any)
Subject Cataloger

10. Name of employee (If vacancy, specify V-1, 2, 3, or 4)
Vacancy

11. Department, agency, or establishment
Library of Congress

a. First subdivision
Processing Department

b. Second subdivision
Subject Cataloging Division

12. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this position

(Signature of employee) _____ (Date) OCT 11 1957

14. Certification by head of bureau, division, field office, or designated representative
Title: Chief, Subject Cataloging Division

15. Certification by department, agency, or establishment
(Signature) _____ (Date) _____

16. Description of duties and responsibilities (See Guide to Position Classifiers, Employees, and Supervisors for the Preparation of Position Descriptions, Standard Form No. 78A)

1. Nature and Purpose of Work

A. Introduction

This position is located in the Subject Catalogers Section of the Subject Cataloging Division. Members of the Section classify and assign subject headings to works being added to the Library's collections, and develop the Library's classification schedules and subject heading list as required by new topics and changing terminology.

**See page 2

The incumbent's principal work assignments are: as to language, Chinese, or Japanese, and Korean; as to subject fields, humanities and social sciences.

B. (1) For works in the assigned languages and subject fields:

- a. determines the subject content of the material received;
- b. assigns class numbers on the basis of the content to integrate the material in the classified collections of the Library;
- c. assigns the subject headings under which titles will be entered in the catalogs;
- d. edits the subject headings on cooperative copy supplied by other libraries;
- e. recommends the establishment of new class numbers and subject headings;
- f. investigates and drafts replies to questions relating to classification and subject headings.

For works in the assigned languages but in other subject fields:

- a. in consultation with the subject cataloger in the special field, interprets the content of the work for his determination of the classification and subject headings.

2. Scope and Effect of Work

- A. The efficiency of the Library's direct service to readers depends in large measure on the skill with which subject catalogers make the subject resources of the Library accessible by means of accurate and consistent application of the classification schedules and of the subject heading list to newly cataloged titles. These two approaches determine, respectively, the arrangement of materials in the stacks and reading rooms, and the display of subject resources in the card catalogs.
- B. The usefulness of the Library's printed catalog cards to other libraries and of its Catalog series (especially Books: Subjects) as national and international bibliographical tools, and as keys to the resources of American libraries is directly dependent on the quality of the work of members of the Section.
- C. The classification numbers assigned, developed and published by the Division are used by many libraries in the United States and foreign countries.

3. Supervision and Guidance Received.

- A. The work is done under the general supervision of the Principal Cataloger in cooperation with other subject catalogers having principal responsibility for various subjects.

Subject Cataloging Division

Subject Catalogers Section
Librarian (Cataloger) GS-9
Subject Cataloger

- B. New subject headings and new class numbers are reviewed in the weekly meeting of the Editors, Assistant Chief and Chief, where consideration is given to the coordination of new numbers and headings in one field with numbers and headings in related fields for which other catalogers have responsibility.
- C. Only very general guides, Haykin's Subject Headings, A Practical Guide and Merrill's Code for Classifiers (largely unsatisfactory for the Library of Congress Classification) are available. Effective application of principles and practices to the particular problems of individual special subjects depends on experience.

4. Mental Demands

- A. Ability to analyze material quickly and determine the classification and subject headings which are applicable on the basis of the Library's principles and practices. Exercise of good judgment in evaluating the need for new class numbers and subject headings and ability to carry on basic research in developing them.

5. Personal Work Contacts:

- A. with the incumbent's reviser on current work;
- B. with other subject catalogers in special fields;
- C. with the editors or assistant editors on new class numbers and headings;
- D. with the shelflisters on application of the tables of the classification applicable to the assigned languages and subjects.

12/10
11/11
** An incumbent's principal work assignment is made on the basis of language skill and subject competence according to the work load of the Section.

402 4/12/54

Standard Form No. 75 February 1956 UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION POSITION DESCRIPTION		1. Check one: Dept. ☒ Field ☐ Washington, D.C.		4. Agency position No. <u>5916</u>	
3. Reason for submission: (a) If this position replaces another (i.e., a change of duties in an existing position), identify such position by title, allocation (service, series, grade), and position number New Position*		5. G. S. C. certification No.		6. Date of certification 4	
		7. Date received from G. S. C.			
8. CLASSIFICATION ACTION Reorganization		(b) Other (specify)			

ALLOCATION BY	CLASS TITLE OF POSITION	CLASS			INITIALS	DATE
		Service	Series	Grade		
a. Civil Service Commission						
b. Department, agency, or establishment	Library Assistant	GS	1411	5	<i>me</i>	2/4/55
c. Bureau	Library Assistant	GS	1411	5	<i>ywc</i>	12/6/54
d. Field office	Subject to i.a. action					
e. Recommended by initiating office	Class. Officer	GS	1411	5	<i>Eef</i>	12-14-54
9. Organizational title of position (if any) Shelflisters		10. Name of employee (if vacancy, specify V-1, 2, 3, or 4) See attached sheet				
11. Department, agency, or establishment Library of Congress		e. Third subdivision Shelflisting Section				
a. First subdivision Processing Department		d. Fourth subdivision General Unit				
b. Second subdivision Subject Cataloging Division		e. Fifth subdivision				
12. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of my position		13. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this position <i>Elizabeth B. Lockwood</i> 12-20-54 (Signature of immediate supervisor) (Date) <i>ECM</i>				
14. Certification by head of bureau, division, field office, or designated representative <i>Michael S. Longell</i> Dec 3 - 1954 (Signature) (Date)		Title: Supervisor, General Unit				
15. Certification by department, agency, or establishment <i>Robert M. McElwee, Jr.</i> 12-16-54 (Signature) (Date)		Title: Director of Personnel				
16. Description of duties and responsibilities (See Guide to Position Classifiers, Employees, and Supervisors for the Preparation of Position Descriptions, Standard Form No. 76A)						

Under the general supervision of the Supervisor of the General Unit shelflists (i.e., extends the classification and assigns book numbers) books and other non-serial publications in a wide variety of subject classes in any language in the Roman or Cyrillic alphabets or others as assigned:

1. On the basis of the appropriate Classification Schedule and reference to the Shelflist, the shelflisters determines the extension of the classification and the book number. Upon receipt of books with master catalog cards indicating subject headings and main class number, the shelflisters verifies whether the class number assigned is consistent with the subject headings so as to detect possible transcription or other similar errors on the part of the Subject Cataloger.

2. As required, sets up schemes for the secondary subarrangements of publications which frequently require the interpretation and application of subclassification arrangements

according to topic, region, form or date in addition to the application of rules of author notation. For example, in LD (Education-Schools) it is necessary to establish a group of numbers for one school, and in B (Philosophy) a group of numbers is assigned for the works of one philosopher. Rules concerning variations in editions, translations, open entries, criticisms of another book (placed after the original), issues edited by other authors or by or about the same author, collected works, separate works, and other bibliographical distinctions are applied by the shelflist in connection with determination of the subclassification and book number.

3. Completes transcription of the number on the master catalog card, the shelflist entry, other preliminary cards, and the book. Lists in the shelflist record each item added to the Library's classified collections. Reviews the Shelflist record for the inclusion of bibliographical data such as variation of title, edition notes, errata slips, etc., note that book is unbound, assignment to reference and other special collections.

Files the preliminary shelflist card of record in class order.

4. Reshelflists publications which have been recataloged and reclassified.

5. Adapts printed cards to replace the preliminary shelflist record, transcribing all pertinent shelflist information to the permanent record and cancelling the corresponding preliminary card.

6. Reports monthly the number of titles and volumes shelflisted by class for the official statistics of material in the Library's classified collections.

7. As assigned, performs other duties in the Section including substituting at the control desk and adding copies to the Shelflist. Occasionally, under the general supervision of the Assistant Editor of Classification Schedules, annotates the Library of Congress Classification Schedules, transcribing in ink in the official schedules, from edited master cards, all newly adopted classification additions and changes. Exercises a degree of judgment reflecting understanding of the classification schemes in placing items correctly so that subordination and relationship are clearly indicated. After annotating schedules, files the master cards in the permanent record of the Library of Congress classification additions and changes.

8. As assigned, performs work in other units of the Shelflisting Section to learn the shelflisting of serials and documents.

*In lieu of GS-1411-4-374, 375, 376, 377, 380, 381, 382, 383, 1475, and GS-1411-5-108

Optional Form 8 July 1959 U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION Chapter F2, Federal Personnel Manual 5008-103		1. "Work unit" Dept ☒ Field ☐		2. Official headquarters: Washington, D.C.		4. Agency No. <u>6679</u> <u>2145</u>	
POSITION DESCRIPTION		3. Reason for submission: (a) If this position replaces another (i.e., a change of duties in an existing position), identify such position by title, new position number, and old position number. Redescription of		5. C. S. C. certification No.		6. Date of certification	
		(b) Other (specify) GS-1410-5-2145		7. Date received from C. S. C.			
8. CLASSIFICATION ACTION							
ALLOCATION BY		CLASS TITLE OF POSITION		CLASS Service Series Grade		INITIALS DATE	
a. Civil Service Commission							
b. Department, agency, or establishment		Librarian (Cataloging)		GS 1410		5 mlf 12/24/61	
c. Bureau		Librarian (Cataloging)		GS 1410		5 ju 9/19/61	
d. Field office		Subject to i. a. action					
e. Recommended by initiating office							
9. Organizational title of position (if any) <u>Searcher-Cataloger</u>				10. Name of employee (If vacancy, specify V-1, 2, 3, or 4) <u>See Page 3</u>			
11. Department, agency, or establishment <u>Library of Congress</u>				c. Third subdivision <u>Preliminary Cataloging Section</u>			
a. First subdivision <u>Processing Department</u>				d. Fourth subdivision			
b. Second subdivision <u>Descriptive Cataloging Division</u>				e. Fifth subdivision			
12. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of my position <u>((See Page 3))</u> (Signature of employee) (Date) <u>Asst</u>				13. This is a complete and accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this position <u>Elizabeth H. Hunt</u> <u>Preliminary Cataloging Section</u> (Signature of immediate supervisor) (Date) <u>OCT 31 1961</u>			
14. Certification by head of bureau, division, field office, or designated representative <u>Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division</u> (Signature) (Date) <u>2/16/61</u>				15. Certification by department, agency, or establishment <u>Supervisor of Searching</u> (Signature) (Date)			
16. Description of duties and responsibilities				Title:			

SUPERVISION RECEIVED

The incumbent serves under the general supervision of the Head of the Section and under the direct supervision of the Assistant Head when cataloging and the Supervisor of Searching when searching. The incumbent is trained in his duties by the Assistant Head and the Supervisor of Searching, who assign work, review or revise completed assignments for technical accuracy and completeness, advise on technical problems and evaluate performance for the information of the Section Head. The Revisers assist in training the incumbent and in reviewing or revising the completed work.

MAJOR DUTIES

To the Preliminary Cataloging Section is assigned the initial preparation of catalog entries for all monographs in all languages using the Latin alphabet, except the Slavic languages, for the purpose of providing basic control over materials received in the Library. The materials assigned to the Searcher-Cataloger are the daily receipts, except those which present unusually complex problems of authorship or bibliographic description. Publications with a high cataloging priority which will result in prompt review of the entry by a descriptive cataloger are, in general, assigned to the Searcher-Cataloger. The functions performed on this material by the Searcher-Cataloger are the following:

1. Searching

a. Analyzes each item to determine the individual or corporate organization having authorship responsibility for the publication, using as a guide the ALA. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries.

b. Searches in the Official Catalog to ascertain if each author is established and records the information for use in cataloging. Interprets the bibliographical data in the book and on the entries in the appropriate catalogs to determine the status of the book in relation to the collections (new title, another edition, a duplicate, an added volume, a title cataloged by a cooperating library). Ascertains and records items of information essential to the subsequent processing of the book. For example, to assist the Selection Officer, the Searcher-Cataloger determines and records the variations between the edition searched and the most similar edition in the collections or the fact that the original or other language translations are in the collections. To assist the descriptive cataloger, he identifies name problems. To facilitate distribution, he differentiates among items covered by an

existing serial entry or form card, a volume to be added to an entry for a multi-volume monograph, or an item to be cataloged by a dash entry on an existing card, etc. To aid in the disposal of duplicates, he distinguishes among items with special assignments, those to be selected by a deputy of the Selection Officer, duplicates in process, or duplicates in the classified collections, etc. Generalized guidance is provided by the Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, and the Section and Division manuals, but many points, especially those relating to past procedures, are not covered in written instructions.

c. Suggests a main entry for new material if there is a choice of entry, in accordance with the ALA. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, departmental and divisional directives and the cataloging pattern found in the Official Catalog.

2. Cataloging:

a. Interprets the bibliographical data in the book, identifying title, subtitle, author statements and other statements defining intellectual responsibility, edition statements, imprint, pagination, series, etc.

b. Organizes these data into a catalog entry as prescribed by the Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging. Prepares an entry in accordance with these rules, the rules for capitalization in the GPO Style Manual, and other pertinent directives. Adds symbols to indicate number and distribution of process cards and special legends, such as the statements indicating that a book is not to be acquired for the collections, as specified in the division manual or in special instructions. For P4 entries adds P4 class and book numbers.

3. Performs related duties as assigned.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Senator MONRONEY. The "Copyright Office" is the next appropriation item. The sum requested is \$1,794,000, an increase of \$120,440 over the current year appropriation. I notice you are requesting six new positions for this Office. I will include in the record at this point several pages from the justification.

(The justification follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Salaries and expenses, Copyright Office

1963 regular bill.....	\$1,619,700
Supplemental for pay increases, Public Law 87-793.....	53,860
1963 adjusted.....	1,673,560
1964 estimate.....	1,794,000
Net increase.....	120,440

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES

Increases:

- Ingrade increases and other anticipated increases in salary costs..... +19,205
Of this amount approximately 75 percent is for ingrade increases and 25 percent for reallocations.
- Pay increase cost for 1964 due to Public Law 87-793..... +53,604

The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1962 provided for 2 separate pay rises effective in October 1962 and January 1964. Provision for the cost for fiscal year 1963, from Oct. 14, 1962, to June 30, 1963, is included in a supplemental request. This request is made to provide the balance of the cost for a full year (\$23,159 is for this purpose); the remainder, \$30,445, is for the cost attributable to the January 1964 provision of the pay act. Following is a table showing the salary costs and the personnel benefits requested.

	Salaries	Personnel benefits	Total
1963 pay cost (3½ months).....	\$21,678	\$1,481	\$23,159
1964 salary increase (6 months).....	28,498	1,947	30,445
Total.....	50,176	3,428	53,604

- Regular pay above 52-week base..... +11,866
There are 2 days in excess of the 52-week base in fiscal year 1964; no excess days in 1963

- New positions requested (6)..... +35,765
To provide assistance in handling legal problems resulting from the revision of the copyright law, and to meet the increase in workload on legal problems.

2 GS-11.....	\$16,100
Contribution to retirement.....	1,148
Group life insurance.....	54
Contribution to health benefits.....	100
Subtotal.....	17,402

To augment the staffs of the Cataloging and Service Divisions to meet increase in registrations which have risen from 243,926 in 1960, the year of the last increase in staff, to an estimated 262,419 in 1963.

2 GS-5, 1 GS-4, and 1 GS-3.....	17,097
Contribution to retirement.....	1,010
Group life insurance.....	56
Contribution to health benefits.....	200

Subtotal..... 18,363

Total, positions requested (6)..... 35,765

Total, increases requested..... +120,440

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under the provisions of the copyright statute, the Copyright Office is responsible for—

Examining and registering claims to copyright and renewal copyright,
Recording assignments and related documents,
Supplying copyright data to the public,
Collecting and maintaining accounts on copyright fees,

Fully indexing all materials received through application of the copyright statute and printing complete catalogs for each class of copyright entries.

Copyright operations result in cash receipts to the Federal Government. In addition, when the value of materials transferred to the permanent collections of the Library is added to cash receipts, these operations produce income which approximates their cost, as is shown in the following table:

	Fiscal 1962 (actual)	Items
Income:		
Fees applied.....	\$1,043,587	-----
Estimated value of materials transferred to the Library of Congress:		
Books at \$5.20 per copy.....	300,560	(57,800)
Periodicals at \$0.33 per copy.....	46,077	(189,629)
Motion pictures at \$65 per reel.....	135,590	(2,086)
Music, scores, etc., at \$3.25 per copy.....	70,619	(21,729)
Maps, at \$6.50 per copy.....	26,806	(4,124)
Prints, etc., at \$6.50 per copy.....	1,020	(157)
Subtotal, estimated value of materials.....	580,672	-----
Total income.....	1,624,259	(225,526)
Cost:		
Salaries.....	1,396,187	-----
Other costs.....	198,021	-----
Total costs.....	1,594,208	-----

Percent

Percent, total income to cost..... 102
Percent, fees applied to cost..... 65

The following table compares income and cost for the fiscal years 1955-62:

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Income:								
Fees applied.....	\$881,017	\$881,612	\$892,612	\$945,231	\$979,941	\$975,192	\$1,009,679	\$1,043,587
Estimated value of materials transferred to the Library.....	374,690	392,561	542,389	546,313	548,169	551,077	604,013	580,672
Total.....	1,255,707	1,274,173	1,435,001	1,491,544	1,528,110	1,526,269	1,613,692	1,624,259
Cost:								
Salaries.....	1,035,724	1,153,065	1,088,140	1,183,189	1,226,871	1,280,185	1,390,073	1,396,187
Other costs.....	86,979	85,410	88,522	143,316	170,010	169,196	192,542	198,021
Total.....	1,122,703	1,238,475	1,176,662	1,326,505	1,396,881	1,449,381	1,582,615	1,594,208
Percent total income compared to cost.....	112	103	122	112	109	105	102	102
Percent fees as applied to costs.....	78	71	76	71	70	67	64	65

The volume of business of the Copyright Office is determined by the productivity of authors, by the activities of publishers, by legal developments, and by requests for copyright data. The Copyright Office cannot control the volume of work it must process; it must provide prompt and efficient service to the individuals, corporations, and associations concerned with copyright, and to other Government agencies.

The number and complexity of legal problems which must be considered in the processing of claims to copyright continues to increase. The problems arising from the related manufacturing and importation provisions of the copyright law are more numerous and varied than they have been in recent years. The Office also feels the impact of technological improvements in book manufacturing techniques which have posed new questions of registrability under the manufacturing clause. Novel and complex questions pertaining to the registrability of various sorts of designs and works of art, of works written by Government employees or financed by Government funds, and of programs for use in automatic data processing machines, continue to increase.

New legal considerations and developments inevitably bring additional problems and heavier workload, both with respect to the examination and registration of claims and to the related searching and reference work.

New positions requested

The overall workload of the Copyright Office is predicated primarily on the number of registrations made. Although it is estimated that copyright registrations will have increased from 243,926 in 1960 to 262,419 in 1963 (18,493 or 7.5 percent), the Copyright Office has received no new positions since 1960 to meet this increase.

The growth in registrations is reflected in the following table:

Fiscal year:	Registrations
1958	238,935
1959	241,735
1960	243,926
1961	247,014
1962	254,776
1963 (estimated)	262,419
1964 (estimated)	270,292

Six positions are requested to meet the current increased workload and the further anticipated increase; including the two attorney positions which are needed to keep up with current legal problems, the analysis of proposed legislation, and assist in the general legal work of the Office.

The additional positions requested are:

Register's Office: 2 GS-11 attorneys, at \$8,050	\$16,100
Cataloging Division: 2 GS-5 catalogers, at \$4,576	9,152
Service Division:	
1 GS-4 file supervisor	4,118
1 GS-3 arranger-filer	3,827
Total	33,197
Personnel benefits	2,568
Total, 6 positions	35,765

The average salary of the above positions is \$5,525.

The divisions, functions, staff, and principal workload of the Copyright Office are as follows:

Division	Function	1961 staff	1962 staff	1963 staff	Principal workload 1961	Principal workload 1962
Service-----	Receiving, assembling, routing, and filing of mail, deposits, applications, and catalog cards and accounting for fees.	72	72	72	Received and dispatched 540,389 pieces of mail, assembled and routed materials related to 277,337 cases (247,014 registrations), filed about 1,000,000 catalog cards, deposits and pieces of correspondence, accounted for \$1,078,992 in gross fees, refunded \$42,173 in fees to remitters and turned \$1,009,679 in earned fees over to Treasury for coverage into miscellaneous receipts.	Received and dispatched 552,719 pieces of mail, assembled and routed materials related to 282,659 cases (254,776 registrations), filed about 1,000,000 catalog cards, deposits and pieces of correspondence, accounted for \$1,111,706 in gross fees, refunded \$40,479 in fees to remitters and turned \$1,043,587 in earned fees over to Treasury for coverage into miscellaneous receipts.
Examining-----	Examining all applications, deposits, and assignments to see that they satisfy the requirements of the copyright law.	62	62	62	Examined 277,337 cases, issued 247,014 registration certificates, 13,280 of which were for foreign works, recorded 8,427 assignments and other documents, rejected 6,344 claims, and prepared 34,606 letters relating to copyright cases.	Examined 282,659 cases, issued 254,776 registration certificates, 13,436 of which were for foreign works, recorded 8,415 assignments and other documents, rejected 6,338 claims, and prepared 33,858 letters relating to copyright cases.
Cataloging-----	Cataloging of all registrations and the compilation and publication of complete and indexed catalogs of these registrations.	64	64	64	Cataloged 247,014 registrations, prepared about 1,500,000 catalog cards, and compiled and published 16 catalogs. The catalog entries are made available in part to the Library for its general operations.	Cataloged 254,776 registrations, prepared about 1,500,000 catalog cards, and compiled and published 16 catalogs. The catalog entries are made available in part to the Library for its general operations.
Reference-----	Providing data to the public on the provisions of the copyright law and compliance therewith, and the policies and procedures of the Office.	28	28	28	Searched 71,285 titles, prepared 20,412 letters and search reports, and as a result of compliance procedures secured 12,852 registrations and \$54,142 in fees and deposits valued at \$206,756.	Searched 91,967 titles, prepared 22,845 letters and search reports, and as a result of compliance procedures secured 11,290 registrations and \$48,042 in fees and deposits valued at \$199,865.
Office of the Register-----	Direction of all copyright operations.	21	21	21	Handled various legal problems arising in connection with the administration of the copyright law, conducted studies relating to revision of the law, and prepared a report for consideration of the Congress.	Handled various legal problems arising in connection with the administration of the copyright law, conducted studies relating to revision of the law, and submitted a report for consideration of the Congress.
	Total, Copyright Office staff.	247	247	247		

Revision of the copyright law

The Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law submitted to Congress on July 10, 1961, has been circulated widely for comments and suggestions. Much time and effort has been devoted to issuing and distributing the report. Meetings have been held and are continuing with the general revision panel, copyright specialists, attorneys, industry and Government representatives, bar association committees, and other groups concerned with copyright. As a result of these meetings the Copyright Office has received and analyzed a very large number of comments. Most of these are being printed in a House document and are being considered in the drafting of a bill for a new copyright law. The Office is actively working on the drafting of a bill.

REASON FOR PERSONNEL REQUESTS

Senator MONRONEY. Please advise the committee why you feel you need these additional positions and something about how your income compares with the cost of the operation of the Copyright Office.

Mr. MUMFORD. In general, most of those additional positions are based on the workload about which I spoke earlier and the fact that there has been no increase in the Copyright Office staff since 1960. The other is involved with the complexities of the legal problems that arise in the Copyright Office. I would be glad to have the Register speak to that.

INCREASE IN APPLICATIONS

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. We have asked for six positions. Two of them in the Cataloging Division at GS-5, two in the Service Division, one GS-4 and one GS-3. These are to try to bring these operations up to strength. There has been no increase since 1960. There has been an 11-percent increase in the number of applications and materials handled.

REWRITING COPYRIGHT LAW

The other two positions were two GS-11 attorneys. We are now involved in trying to rewrite the entire law.

In July 1961, we issued the Report of the Register of Copyrights on General¹ Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law, summarizing the present law and pointing out the problems to be considered in revising the statute. The report was based on 34 separate studies of the most important issues involved in general revision. During the fall of 1961, and the spring of 1962, we held four all-day meetings of a panel of experts to discuss the report. We also participated in a 2-day symposium on the report at New York University, and in 4 days of meetings on the report's detailed recommendations preceding the annual meeting of the American Bar Association. The transcript of the four panel sessions and the various comments received on the report have now been printed by the House Judiciary Committee.

Beginning in January 1963, we scheduled further meetings of the panel of experts to discuss specific draft sections and alternative provisions for the new law. We have held three meetings so far, and have now scheduled two more for June and August. We expect that, in order to discuss all of the sections of a complete revision bill, there will have to be several more sessions of the panel.

A glance at the transcripts of the panel meetings indicates the difficulties involved in attempting to draft a new law, and the complicated interrelationships among the various sections. It is our feeling that these meetings serve a very useful purpose in exploring the different points of view and in reaching toward compromise solutions. We also hope that, by resolving a number of issues at this stage, the panel meetings will limit the time necessary for legislative hearings when a draft bill is introduced. In the meantime, Congress has enacted legislation extending until December 31, 1965, renewal copyrights that were due to expire in the next few years. Hearings have been held on a jukebox bill and a design bill; in both cases we recommended that these bills be considered in advance of general revision.

In summary, our progress on this important task is somewhat slow and painful. However, we feel that we are making real headway, and we hope to present a completed draft bill to the Congress in 1964.

There is a real burden on our top staff on the legal end in both helping prepare the new law and in answering questions, because the old law is more and more difficult to administer. It was passed in 1909 and we have had a great many changes since then.

NEW COPYRIGHT DEVELOPMENTS

Senator MONRONEY. International matters have greatly increased the copyright importance abroad, have they not?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. That is right, although that has not been as heavily reflected in our work. We have become more involved in international affairs. But this work relates mainly to the revision of our own law.

Mr. MUMFORD. The developments with respect to recordings, radio and television, have arisen since the 1909 law was passed.

AMOUNT OF COST RECOVERED

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. I think, Mr. Chairman, you asked for the comparative figures.

Senator MONRONEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. If you include only the dollar value of fees received by the Copyright Office—

Senator MONRONEY. That includes trademark?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. No, just copyright. The trademark operations is in the Patent Office in the Department of Commerce. This is just copyrights. We are down to about 64 or 65 percent. If you include the value of materials—

Senator MONRONEY. You come within 64 or 65 percent of covering your entire cost.

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. That is right, in fees alone. If you include the value of the materials we receive which are taken over by the Library—not the total volume of material we receive but those actually selected and used by the Library—then we are still at about 100 percent of the total cost of running the operation. That figure will gradually go down as salary increases and other costs go up.

COPYRIGHT FEES

Senator MONRONEY. When were the fees last raised?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. In 1948.

Senator MONRONEY. Do they vary by the size of the manuscript?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. No, sir. They are \$4 for original applications except in the case of labels where they are \$6, and \$2 for renewal

Senator MONRONEY. That is a print or label for a bottle?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. Or a label for a can of sardines.

Senator MONRONEY. How about a nameplate on an automobile?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. We won't register that. We won't register names alone.

Senator MONRONEY. How about pictures?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. Yes. Those are registerable.

Senator MONRONEY. Are movies registerable?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. How about television?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. Television which is prepared in the form of completed scripts or film is registerable.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that \$4?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. It seems the value of these things have become rather fantastic and we should begin to prepare to cover our entire cost.

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. At the request of the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, a fee bill has been prepared, H.R. 5136, which would raise the fees.

Senator MONRONEY. By what percent?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. It would raise the \$4 fee to \$6 pretty much across the board and bring the total fees to about 80 percent of the cost of operation in fees alone and bring the fees plus the value of deposits used by the Library to about 110 percent.

Senator MONRONEY. That, however, adds nothing to the actual overhead of the Library of Congress for space, heat, or services.

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. So you would be in raising this barely covering perhaps the out-of-pocket costs but not the incremental costs?

Mr. KAMINSTEIN. That is right, sir.

SPECIAL CURRENCY PROGRAM

Senator MONRONEY. Under the special currency program for the collection and distribution of library materials, you are requesting \$978,000, and this is an increase of \$298,100 over the current year appropriation. Pertinent pages from the justification will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The justification follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program) Library of Congress

1963 regular bill.....	\$678,000
Supplemental for pay increases, Public Law 87-793.....	1,900
1963 adjusted.....	679,900
1964 estimate.....	978,000
Net increase.....	298,100

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES

1. Acquisition of books and other library materials.....	+179,000
The increased amount will permit new book-purchasing programs in Burma, Indonesia, and Israel for a period of 6 months and the initiation of a program to distribute highly selective sets of current books in English published in India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic to 300 U.S. college and university libraries.	
2. Bibliographic control.....	+7,000
A program similar to the present program in India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic will be initiated in Burma, Indonesia, and Israel to prepare bibliographic entries in card and list form to aid the Library of Congress and other recipient libraries in their cataloging programs. This program will also serve to make known to libraries not participating directly in the program the books acquired and available in the United States.	
3. Operation of centers.....	+82,000
The additional amount requested will permit the establishment and equipping of centers in Burma, Indonesia, and Israel and the operation of these centers for a period of 6 months.	
4. Program support (U.S. dollars).....	+30,100
The increase in dollar support will provide for payment of 6 months' salaries and fringe benefits for the oversea directors of the 3 new centers; for in-grade increases in present salaries; for increases due to the pay raise, and for the positions of secretary and file clerk in the Office of the Coordinator.	
Total increase.....	+298,100

FISCAL SITUATION

Senator MONRONEY. You have told us a good deal about this program. Is there anything further that you would like to add? I believe, for the purpose of the record again, we should make it clear that while we require dollars appropriated these go into the Treasury and substitute for currency which is spent by the Library. So it does not represent any overall out-of-pocket cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. MUMFORD. Mr. Rogers had given special attention to this program and I would be glad to have him give a further statement on it, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have one prepared that you could insert?

Mr. ROGERS. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Please give it.

BENEFITS OF PROGRAM

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to reemphasize the success of the program from the standpoint of the participating libraries throughout the country and the very great acclaim the program has received from the scholars who have benefited from the program. Also I would like to reemphasize the contribution that is being made by the participating libraries to the cataloging effort.

They are putting up \$150,000 in cold cash to finance this program which is of benefit to them but also helps the Library of Congress very considerably.

Mr. MUMFORD. I think we should also emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the value of this program to our national interests, because we are getting a great deal of material in these countries and learning more about them that we would not be able to get otherwise.

Senator MONRONEY. You mentioned, in your earlier statement, that we intend to do some printing of books abroad.

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. The preparation of some bibliographic lists, but not printing in the usual sense.

Mr. ROGERS. Sir, these are accession lists similar to the Russian one that you saw earlier. These were prepared for Pakistan, India, and the United Arab Republic.

Senator MONRONEY. Those are all prepared out of dollars paid for by the local currencies?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY OTHER LIBRARIES

Senator MONRONEY. Do you really feel that the contribution being made by the other libraries around the country for this program is sufficient?

Mr. MUMFORD. I think they are certainly putting a great deal into it, not only the money they pay for the materials but, as I mentioned earlier, in putting \$150,000 into cataloging. It is of great value to us at the Library of Congress. I think this is a very large and important contribution.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Senator MONRONEY. The Legislative Reference Service, which we discussed earlier in your main statement, is requesting an appropriation for \$2,143,000, an increase of \$182,180 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year. The budget estimate includes funds for 7 new positions to give this office a total of 222 positions. Pages 70 through 72 of the justification will be included in the record at this point.

(The justification follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Salaries and expenses, Legislative Reference Service

1963 regular bill.....	\$1,870,000
Supplemental for pay increases, Public Law 87-793.....	90,820
1963 adjusted.....	1,960,820
1964 estimate.....	2,143,000
Net increase.....	182,180

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES

1. Ingrade increases and other anticipated increases in salary costs.....				+27,723
Of this amount, approximately 75 percent is for ingrade increases and 25 percent for reallocations.				
2. Pay increase cost for 1964 due to Public Law 87-793.....				+87,739
The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1962 provided for two separate pay raises effective in October 1962, and January 1964. Provision for the cost for fiscal year 1963, from October 14, 1962, to June 30, 1963, is included in a supplemental request. This request is made to provide the balance of the cost for a full year (\$45,561 is for this purpose); the remainder, \$42,178, is for the cost attributable to the January 1964 provision of the Pay Act. Following is a table showing the salary costs and the personnel benefits requested.				
	Salaries	Personnel benefits	Total	
1963 pay cost (3½ months).....	\$42,765	\$2,796	\$45,561	
1964 salary increase (6 months).....	39,480	2,698	42,178	
Total.....	82,245	5,494	87,739	
3. Regular pay above 52-week base.....				+15,636
There are 2 days in excess of the 52-week base in fiscal year 1964; no excess days in 1963.				
4. Printing and reproduction.....				+6,000
This request is to provide funds for the procurement of prepared research materials. In fiscal year 1957 it was decided that sending prepared materials in some instances in answer to congressional inquiries would save manpower sufficient to offset the cost of these materials. However, since fiscal year 1958, there has been an increase of 107 percent in the number of congressional requests answered by sending prepared material. The cost can no longer be absorbed.				
5. Supplies and materials.....				+6,000
Due to an increase in staff (31.9 percent) and also an increase in the number of inquiries (46.6 percent) since 1958 (the last year additional funds were approved for supplies and photocopying), it is necessary to request this increase. The use of photocopies has grown along with these increases, and it is no longer possible to absorb this cost.				
6. New positions (7).....				+39,082
To provide adequate staff, due to a continuing increase in workload which has risen from 84,195 inquiries in 1961 to 99,430 in 1962, an estimated 108,000 in 1963, and an estimated 115,000 in 1964. The overall increase in inquiries from 1961 to 1964 estimated at 37 percent with a staff increase, including the seven new positions requested, of 7 percent.				
1 GS-8; 4 GS-7; 1 GS-4, and 1 GS-3.....			\$36,255	
Contribution to retirement.....			2,356	
Group Life Insurance.....			121	
Contribution to health benefits.....			350	
Total net increase.....			39,082	+182,180

HISTORY OF SERVICE

Senator MONRONEY. Would you please put in for the benefit of the Congress the number of positions that the Legislative Reference Service has had since its establishment in 1947 by each year?

Mr. ELSBREE. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Number of budgeted positions for Legislative Reference Service, fiscal year 1947 through 1964

	Positions		Position
1947-----	131	1956-----	158
1948-----	113	1957-----	158
1949-----	117	1958-----	163
1950-----	151	1959-----	171
1951-----	151	1960-----	180
1952-----	151	1961-----	¹ 208
1953-----	151	1962-----	¹ 208
1954-----	151	1963-----	¹ 215
1955-----	144	1964 (estimated)-----	¹ 222

¹ Includes 10 part-time positions equivalent to 5 full-time positions.

CATALOG CARD DISTRIBUTION

Senator MONRONEY. I think my other question about the need for this was fully explained in your previous testimony on this matter.

For salaries and expenses, distribution of catalog cards, budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 is in the amount of \$3,077,000, an increase of 322,630 over the current appropriations.

Pages 77 through 79 of the justification will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The justification follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Salaries and expenses, distribution of catalog cards

1963 regular bill-----	\$2,700,700
Supplemental for pay increases, Public Law 87-793-----	53,670
1963 adjusted-----	2,754,370
1964 estimate-----	3,077,000
Net increase-----	322,630

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES

- Ingrade increases and other anticipated increases in salary costs----- +20,089
Of this amount, it is expected that 60 percent will be needed for ingrade increases and 40 percent for reallocations.
- Pay-increase cost for 1964 due to Public Law 87-793----- +55,297
The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1962 provided for 2 separate pay raises effective in October 1962 and January 1964. Provision for the cost for fiscal year 1963, from Oct. 14, 1962, to June 30, 1963, is included in a supplemental request. This request is made to provide the balance of the cost for a full year (\$27,369 is for this purpose); the remainder \$27,928, is for the cost attributable to the January 1964 provision of the Pay Act.

Following is a table showing the salary costs and the personnel benefits requested.

	Salaries	Personnel benefits	Total
1963 pay cost (3½ months)-----	\$25,619	\$1,750	\$27,369
1964 salary increase (6 months)-----	26,142	1,786	27,928
Total-----	51,761	3,536	55,297

- Regular pay above 52-week base----- +13,548
There are 2 days in excess of the 52-week base in fiscal year 1964; no excess days in 1963.

Salaries and expenses, distribution of catalog cards—Con.

4. Printing.....		+\$139,000
<i>Pay increases at Government Printing Office, \$11,000.—Compositors at the Government Printing Office were granted a 25-cent-per-hour increase effective in May 1962; pressmen, 25 cents per hour effective in August 1962, and laborers, 10 cents an hour effective in September 1962. These increases in salary will be passed on to the Library in the form of increased bills for printing.</i>		
<i>Card printing, \$100,000.—This increase will provide for 5,000,000 additional cards to be printed at a cost of 2 cents each.</i>		
<i>Printing the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions, \$28,000. The cost of printing the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions is estimated at \$28,000. It is proposed that this cost be included under the self-supporting Distribution of Catalog Cards appropriation as is the cost of other of the Library's technical publications. (The cost of positions and other objects of expenditure for the MIRA project are included under the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Library of Congress.")</i>		
5. New positions (18).....		+94,696
<i>To finance the increased staff required for the expanded National Union Catalog and other catalogs in book form. These catalogs are self-supporting.</i>		
1 GS-10; 4 GS-9; 5 GS-5; 1 GS-4 and 7 GS-3.....	\$87,796	
Contribution to retirement.....	5,707	
Group life insurance.....	293	
Contribution to health benefits.....	900	
Total.....	94,696	
Net increase.....		+322,630

COST COVERED BY INCOME

Senator MONRONEY. This is another one of these items where you are asking for an increase of 18 new positions for this office. Please proceed with your justification for these positions and bring the committee up to date on the question of how your income from the sale of these cards compares with the cost of the operation. You have given most of that but I believe you said much of this is covered by the sale of the catalog cards.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes; it is being covered entirely at the present time. In fact, the law requires us to sell these cards at cost plus 10 percent.

During 1963 we expect to return 105 percent of the appropriation. Later it will probably be necessary to raise the price of cards slightly but we expect to continue to return more than a hundred percent of the appropriation.

Senator MONRONEY. When was the last time that the card costs were raised?

Mr. WELSH. 1958, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Does this include funds sufficient to cover your mailing costs as well?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Postage?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

BOOKS IN GENERAL COLLECTION

Senator MONRONEY. For books for the general collection you are requesting \$670,000, an increase of \$100,000 over the current appropriation. For books for the law library you are requesting \$110,000, the same as for the current year appropriation.

(The justification follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Books for the general collections, Library of Congress

1963 regular bill.....	\$570,000
1964 estimate.....	670,000
Net increase.....	+100,000

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES

To enable the Library to fulfill its mission of acquiring materials in all areas and subjects of current interests, to meet continuing increases in prices, and fill gaps in collections discovered as a result of acquisitions surveys and to obtain increased materials generated by newly developed countries.....

+100,000

GENERAL STATEMENT

This appropriation provides for the purchase of materials for the Library's general collections, which must be comprehensive and current in order to meet the needs of the Congress and other Federal agencies, and the general research community. The Government must have available full information concerning the physical, social, political, and economic conditions of all countries, as well as the most up-to-date coverage in the field of science and technology. The Library's acquisitions program thus should involve the worldwide procurement of those current and noncurrent publications essential to meet this need. Although additional materials come to the Library through copyright deposit, transfer from Federal agencies, gift, and domestic and international exchange, it is the material acquired through this appropriation that supplements these other sources of library material in a most important way, enabling the Library to provide essential information at the time when it is most critically needed. In 1962, 72.8 percent of this appropriation was applied to foreign acquisitions.

The Library of Congress acquisitions policy is based on the concept of attempting to obtain important materials currently as they are published. There are several reasons for this: To have the most up-to-date research information available for the Congress and other Government agencies; to obtain materials which are often printed in limited quantities and in distant areas before such materials go out of print and become unavailable; and to avoid as much as possible the considerably higher costs involved in purchasing reference materials that have been missed. Regardless of the excellence of an acquisitions program, some essential materials do not make themselves currently known. This is primarily true in countries that lack either an adequate announcement system for their publications or a well-organized book dealer system that might have served to inform the Library of these materials at an earlier date. Acquisition trips by area specialists turn up many such materials. A need for book funds is also created by new subject areas of responsibility, the growth in importance of specialized research work, and, of course, the fundamental need to complete long-established collections in those areas where our acquisitions policy is one of comprehensive coverage.

Increasing book costs, increasing publishing output, increasing area coverage connected with newly established nations, increasing coverage in depth of a multitude of newly discovered or expanded scientific and technical fields have all been well documented in recent years. Examples of some of these increases are shown in the following tables:

	Fiscal 1960	Fiscal 1962	Percent difference
Current materials—Average price per piece:			
Books.....	\$2.15	\$2.77	+28.8
Serials and periodicals.....	.35	.45	+28.6
All receipts.....	.56	.81	+44.6
Current materials by major area—Average price per piece:			
Books:			
United States.....	4.89	6.27	+28.2
England.....	3.64	3.83	+5.2
West Germany.....	4.72	5.36	+13.5
France.....	4.18	5.43	+29.9
Japan.....	2.03	2.39	+17.7
U.S.S.R.....	.86	.96	+11.6
East Germany.....	.88	1.65	+87.5
Serials and periodicals:			
United States.....	.68	.81	+19.1
England.....	.59	.96	+62.7
West Germany.....	.61	1.80	+195.1
Italy.....	.31	.38	+22.5
Japan.....	.37	.68	+83.8
U.S.S.R.....	.31	.58	+87.1
East Germany.....	.23	.40	+73.9

NEWLY INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES, 1950-62¹

Africa and Mediterranean:
 Algeria
 Burundi
 Cameroon
 Central African Republic
 Republic of Chad
 Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville)
 Republic of the Congo (Léopoldville)
 Cyprus
 Republic of Dahomey
 Gabon Republic
 Ghana
 Guinea
 Republic of the Ivory Coast
 Libya
 Malagasy Republic
 Republic of Mali
 Islamic Republic of Mauritania
 Morocco
 Republic of the Niger
 Nigeria
 Rwanda

Africa and Mediterranean—Continued
 Republic of Senegal
 Sierra Leone
 Somalia
 Sudan
 Tanganyika
 Togo
 Tunisia
 Uganda
 Republic of the Upper Volta
 Asia and Oceania:
 Cambodia
 Kuwait
 Laos
 Federation of Malaya
 Islamic Republic of Pakistan
 Republic of Vietnam (North)
 Republic of Vietnam (South)
 Western Samoa
 Western Hemisphere:
 Jamaica
 Trinidad-Tobago

¹ It is necessary to increase coverage of most of these countries because new national status invariably results in an increase of official and other publications.

The significance of the foregoing is that experience to date with obligations and expenditures of fiscal year 1963 funds for books for the general collections indicates that all are being utilized at a quicker rate than ever before. If this situation continues, it might lead to impairment of the Library's policy of comprehensive coverage of important current publishing output.

The amounts allotted to the great university libraries for acquisitions purposes illustrate the combined trends of rising costs, increased publishing output, and increased area coverage which the Library of Congress also faces.

Expenditures for books and other library materials in dollars and percent change from base year 1958-59

	1958-59 amount	1959-60		1960-61		1961-62		Estimated, 1962-63	
		Amount	Percent change	Amount	Percent change	Amount	Percent change	Amount	Percent change
California-Berkeley.....	\$451,902	\$631,205	+39.7	\$803,371	+77.7	\$889,663	+96.8	\$1,148,381	+154.1
California-Los Angeles.....	367,472	476,390	+29.6	841,937	+129.1	948,862	+156.6	1,031,500	+180.7
Columbia.....	352,297	423,093	+20.1	432,347	+22.7	451,711	+28.2	640,024	+81.7
Harvard.....	638,417	728,151	+14.0	755,789	+18.4	849,307	+33.0	920,000	+44.1
Illinois.....	481,552	613,478	+27.4	705,415	+46.4	630,106	+30.8	586,226	+21.7
Yale.....	563,663	670,562	+19.0	620,903	+10.1	775,908	+37.6	847,000	+50.2

LAW LIBRARY

JUSTIFICATION

Books for the Law Library, Library of Congress

1963 regular bill.....	\$110,000
1964 estimate.....	110,000
Net increase.....	0

Senator MONRONEY. This additional \$100,000 was explained earlier as a need for keeping in advance of availability of books worth while for additions to the Library, I believe. And the rising cost of the books.

Mr. MUMFORD. That is correct. It can be summarized by saying that increasing book costs, increasing publication output, increasing

area of coverage connected with newly established nations. Increasing coverage in depth of a multitude of newly discovered ever-expanding scientific and technical fields all have been well documented in recent years. These are the factors that enter into this.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND

Senator MONRONEY. For books for the blind you are requesting \$1,902,000, an increase of \$8,090 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

(The justification follows:)

JUSTIFICATION

Salaries and expenses, books for the blind

1963 regular bill.....	\$1,884,700
Supplemental for pay increases, Public Law 87-793.....	9,210
1963 adjusted.....	1,893,910
1964 estimates.....	1,902,000
Net increase.....	8,090

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Decreases:	
Repair of machines.....	-28,000

Due to the generosity of the Telephone Pioneers of America, who have donated their services in the repair and maintenance of talking book machines, a savings of \$28,000 in fiscal year 1964 is anticipated.

Increases:

1. Ingrade increases and other anticipated increases in salary costs.....	+3,310
Of this amount approximately 75 percent is for ingrade increases and 25 percent for reallocations.	
2. Pay increase cost for 1964 due to Public Law 87-793.....	+8,090
The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1962 provided for 2 separate pay raises effective in October 1962, and January 1964. Provision for the cost for fiscal year 1963, from October 14, 1962 to June 30, 1963, is included in a supplemental request. This request is made to provide the balance of the cost for a full year (\$3,690 is for this purpose); the remainder, \$4,400 is for the cost attributable to the January 1964, provision of the pay act.	

Following is a table showing the salary costs and the personnel benefits requested.

	Salaries	Personnel benefits	Total
1963 pay cost (3½ months).....	\$3,454	\$236	\$3,690
1964 salary increase (6 months).....	4,118	282	4,400
Total.....	7,572	518	8,090

3. Regular pay above 52-week base.....	+1,584
There are 2 days in excess of the 52-week base in fiscal year 1964; no excess days in 1963.	
4. To establish braille music program.....	+23,106
To acquire music books and scores for blind persons (at an estimated cost of \$12,166) and to provide the following staff, in accordance with Public Law 87-765 approved Oct. 9, 1962.	
1 GS-7 and 1 GS-5.....	\$10,130
Contribution to retirement.....	676
Group life insurance.....	34
Contribution to health benefits.....	100
Total.....	10,940
Total increases.....	+36,090
Net increases.....	+8,090

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Division for the Blind is responsible for administering a national program to provide reading materials for the blind of the United States, its territories, and insular possessions. In discharge of this responsibility it executes two closely related operations:

First, it provides books in raised characters (braille) and talking books (books in recorded form) together with the reproducers (machines to play the records). The books are distributed to 31 regional libraries throughout the country which assume responsibility for their custody and circulation to the individual blind

within specific areas. The reproducers are distributed to qualified blind readers by 54 State agencies for the blind.

Second, it maintains one of the 31 regional libraries, which provides complete services to approximately 800 readers in the District of Columbia. In addition, the Division offers braille service to Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and a national service of a unique collection of braille books and books recorded on magnetic tape not available in the regional libraries.

The reading materials are available for loan without charge to residents of the United States, its territories, and insular possessions, whose central visual acuity is 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting glasses or whose field of vision at its widest diameter subtends an angular distance of no greater than 20°.

Since the reading tastes of the blind are essentially indistinguishable from those of sighted readers, it is the policy of the Division for the Blind to provide in embossed and talking book forms a balanced collection of current and noncurrent books, both fiction and nonfiction. The execution of this policy is subject to such necessary limitations as those related to the bulk, cost, durability, and similar characteristics of the reading media employed. The selection of books is made by the Library of Congress after consultation with advisory groups, librarians, literary critics, and blind readers. The books are purchased by the Library from nonprofitmaking institutions whose activities are concerned primarily with the blind.

The Division for the Blind also conducts a general reference service on matters pertaining to the interest and welfare of the blind, and a bibliographic service for blind readers of the Nation. To meet the demand for "single-copy" braille books, the Library conducts a program for organizing the services of sighted volunteers, instructing them in braille transcription, training blind persons in braille proofreading; and binding and finishing the transcribed books.

In fiscal year 1962 there were enrolled 1,133 new students and 551 certificates were awarded. The Division prepares manuals and other instructional materials used in this program.

Technological developments.—Technological developments in sound recording have accelerated the rate of obsolescence of talking book records as well as talking book machines. The adoption of a single diamond microgroove needle on machines has increased expenditures for needles but should reduce damage to recordings and prolong the life of the talking books. Motors with more than one speed are included in recent machine models in recognition of technological developments which have permitted recording all talking book records ordered after January 1, 1963, at the speed of 16½ revolutions per minute, which results in economies in purchase of records, shipping costs and handling by blind readers.

Justification of decreases and increases requested.—It is noted that the increase of \$28,000 to initiate the braille music program and to meet the cost of within-grade increases and the 2 extra days in 1964 is offset by a corresponding reduction in repair of machines.

Repair of machines, \$28,000 decrease.—As a community service project the Telephone Pioneers of America have undertaken the repair and maintenance of talking book machines in most of the States. This has resulted in faster repair service at less cost. Necessary parts, or reimbursements for their costs, are provided by the Division for the Blind. Labor costs are free except in areas where the pioneers are not active or cannot handle the full workload. For fiscal year 1964, a saving of \$28,000 is anticipated.

Braille music program, \$23,106 increase.—Public Law 87-765, approved October 9, 1962, authorized the Librarian of Congress to establish and maintain a library of braille music. The Division for the Blind has begun to acquire such materials. However, to continue acquiring music books and materials for blind persons will require an additional \$12,166 for fiscal year 1964. In addition, two new positions will be required as follows:

1 GS-7 reference librarian, braille.....	\$5, 554
1 GS-5 braille instructor.....	4, 576
Total.....	10, 130
Personnel benefits.....	810
Total, 2 positions.....	10, 940

1 GS-7 reference librarian, braille.—To survey availability of braille musical scores and books, recommend acquisition of appropriate items, catalog, classify and arrange for the loan of such material to blind persons. To determine needs

of materials not available and recommend the special preparation of appropriate items.

1 GS-5 braille instructor.—To instruct volunteer braille transcribers in the braille musical notation. To proofread, when necessary, scores prepared by volunteers. To identify and catalog music scores which are received without printed identification.

Within-grade increases-----	\$3,310
2 extra days-----	1,584
Total-----	4,894

BRaille MUSIC PROGRAM

Senator MONRONEY. I notice you are requesting funds for two additional positions to establish a braille music program. Please tell the committee something about this entire program as well as the new music program.

Mr. MUMFORD. Until the law was recently enacted authorizing the provision of music in braille, we had no such materials available to blind people. With this new law we feel an obligation to undertake to provide a collection, and it is necessary to have some additional help in order to do this.

Senator MONRONEY. Is the sheet music published in braille?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, it would be in scores and sheet music.

Mr. BASLER. We would prepare this material in braille and make it available to the blind readers who are studying music through braille throughout the country; that is, through the various regional libraries just as we make available any other braille material.

Senator MONRONEY. These go out through the State libraries, do they not?

STATE BRAILLE MUSIC LIBRARIES

Mr. BASLER. For the most part, yes. Not every State has a library, but adjacent States sometimes use the service from one State library.

Senator MONRONEY. This acts as a central depository and then you circulate these to the State libraries. They request the service from you and they go to the State libraries.

Mr. MUMFORD. There are 31 centers throughout the country which provide the service. We provide the material to those centers, and they in turn serve the geographic area that has been allocated to them.

CONTENT OF "BOOKS FOR BLIND" CATEGORY

Senator MONRONEY. On the books for the blind, is this the talking books?

Mr. MUMFORD. It includes both the talking books and braille.

Senator MONRONEY. Is this program increasing in use?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. The number of blind people who are making use of it is steadily increasing. It is now in the neighborhood of 80,000 blind people throughout the country.

Senator MONRONEY. What portion is in printed braille and what is in talking books?

Mr. MUMFORD. I think we have some figures in here. About 10,000 users of braille.

Mr. BASLER. In 1962 it was 11,686 braille readers; 66,369 talking-book users.

EXPERIMENTS WITH TAPE

Senator MONRONEY. Are those now recorded on disks or on tape?

Mr. MUMFORD. Mainly on disks. We are carrying on some experimental and developmental work on the tape so as to determine whether it may be a feasible medium for this purpose. We have some prototypes actually in use at the present time. But we have not yet reached the point where we can make a determination that for the future this is a better way of doing it.

Senator MONRONEY. Can the blind actually thread the tapes and play them themselves or would they have to have a sighted person to handle that?

Mr. MUMFORD. No; the tapes would be in a cassette which the blind person could operate himself.

Senator MONRONEY. It would have to be that way whether it was the record or the tape; is that correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

TELEPHONE PIONEERS DONATING SERVICES

Senator MONRONEY. I was intrigued by your reference to Telephone Pioneers of America who donate their services to repair talking-book machines, saving some \$28,000 estimated for the fiscal year 1964.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. This has been a very commendable thing which this group has undertaken to do. It is not only useful in terms of dollars but it enables a blind person to get his machine repaired much more quickly than if it were sent to a central point for repair.

Senator MONRONEY. Usually these people are located somewhere in the State where the blind person lives?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. These are furnished free?

PROVISION OF MACHINES AND RECORDS

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. The machines and records are provided free to the users.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have a long waiting list on these?

Mr. MUMFORD. No. We have machines available fairly quickly now to any blind person who can qualify. The records are there in his regional center as soon as he gets the machine. There is no waiting list for machines at present, is there, Dr. Basler?

Mr. BASLER. No appreciable waiting list for machines. Occasionally as new machines are manufactured a State agency may get behind on deliveries. But we have been able to supply practically all requests within a reasonable length of time.

RECURRING COSTS, PAY INCREASES

Senator MONRONEY. In relation to your recurring costs on your pay increases, you carry forward these amounts. Have you been able to absorb? Has the pay bill anticipated any of these increases?

Mr. MUMFORD. We absorbed some of the first pay increase and the 5 percent which was made mandatory. We do not anticipate that we can absorb the January 1964 increase because we do not anticipate we would have the savings we had in 1963.

Senator MONRONEY. You are aware that the postal services and Federal Employee Salary Act of 1962, section 1007, directed that the cost of the increase be absorbed to the fullest extent possible. You do not anticipate any savings from unfilled jobs or delay in filling jobs that will help you to make up some of this cost?

Mr. MUMFORD. Whatever we might have would be required for in-grade increases and reallocations. The amounts that we have requested for reallocations in recent years has not been sufficient to cover all of the reallocations that have been made. We are required by law to classify people in accordance with the standards of the Civil Service Commission.

REVIEW OF POSITIONS FOR CLASSIFICATION

Many of the positions in the Library had not been reviewed for classification for a number of years. We are now completing a cycle of review. It has hit us hard as far as reallocations are concerned. So we would not anticipate that we would have excess savings available to absorb any of the pay increase.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Senator MONRONEY. The sum requested for salaries and expenses, organizing and microfilming papers of the President, is \$112,800, the same amount as the current year appropriation. This is also true of preservation of American motion pictures where you requested \$60,600, the same amount as the current year appropriation. Pertinent pages for the justification will be included in the record and you may proceed to tell us about these items.

(The justification follows:)

*Salaries and expenses, organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents,
Library of Congress*

1963 regular bill.....	\$112, 800
1964 estimate.....	112, 800
Net increase.....	0

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 85-147 (71 Stat. 363), approved August 16, 1957, authorized \$720,000 to be appropriated to arrange, index, and microfilm the papers of the Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress. The purpose is to preserve their contents and to make them more readily available for research.

For fiscal year 1964, \$112,800 is requested which is the same amount requested for fiscal year 1963. This amount is required to continue the present staff which will concentrate on indexing, and to provide negative and positive service copies of the material arranged and indexed, publication of indexes by photo-offset in editions of 1,000 copies each, and for incidental expenses.

Estimate of work to be completed through fiscal year 1963

President	Estimated number of items (1963 figures)	Arranging or re-arranging (items)	Micro-filmed (items)	Films released (items)	Indexed (items)	Published (items)
Washington-----	72,900	72,900	20,000	0	72,900	0
Madison-----	11,550	550	0	0	100	0
Monroe-----	13,821	13,821	13,821	13,821	13,821	0
Jackson-----	26,373	18,000	18,000	0	373	0
Van Buren-----	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	(2)	0
W. H. Harrison-----	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984
Tyler-----	11,410	11,410	11,410	11,410	11,410	11,410
Taylor-----	1,631	1,631	1,631	1,631	1,631	1,631
Pierce-----	12,340	12,340	12,340	12,340	12,340	12,340
Lincoln-----	114,724	114,724	114,724	114,724	114,724	114,724
Johnson-----	123,477	123,477	123,477	123,477	123,477	123,477
Grant-----	100,000	100,000	100,000	0	2,000	0
Arthur-----	11,413	11,413	11,413	11,413	11,413	11,413
Cleveland-----	116,691	116,691	116,691	116,691	25,000	0
B. Harrison-----	88,289	88,289	88,289	0	44,000	0
McKinley-----	131,000	131,000	131,000	0	131,000	0
Taft-----	776,190	400,000	227,500	0	70,000	0
Coolidge-----	178,600	178,600	178,600	0	0	0
Total (18)-----	1,556,893	1,161,330	935,380	171,991	394,173	44,979

PLANNED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964

Washington-----	72,900	(3)	52,900	72,900	(3)	72,900
Madison-----	11,550	11,000	11,550	11,550	11,550	0
Jackson-----	26,373	8,373	8,373	26,373	26,000	0
B. Harrison-----	88,289	(3)	(3)	0	20,000	0
McKinley-----	131,000	(3)	(3)	131,000	(3)	131,000
Taft-----	776,190	100,000	0	0	150,000	0

1 Actual figure.

2 No index to be published.

3 Reported above.

Salaries and expenses, preservation of American motion pictures, Library of Congress

1963 regular bill-----	\$60,600
1964 estimate-----	\$60,600
Net increase-----	0

GENERAL STATEMENT

In the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, there was included \$60,000 to enable the Librarian of Congress to initiate a program for the conversion to safety base film some of the unique collections in the Library, specifically the George Kleine collection on nitrate film (collected by Edison's distributor during the period 1900 to 1910), and the paper prints of early American motion pictures (submitted as evidence for copyright between the years 1894 and 1912). This program was continued with appropriations of \$60,000, in fiscal year 1960 and 1961, and with \$60,600 in fiscal years 1962 and 1963. The conversion of the Kleine collection was completed in 1960, and the conversion of the paper prints will be completed during fiscal year 1963.

Justification for continuation of the preservation program for motion pictures

Some 28 million feet of 35-millimeter perishable nitrate motion picture film is stored in vaults at Suitland, Md. This film includes U.S. copyright selections, German, Japanese, French, and Italian films, mainly newsreels, documentaries, and features, representing a wealth of information not available in any other form. Over 15 million feet of this 35-millimeter film is considered desirable to convert to safety base film. The U.S. material constitutes a unique resource for the study of American history, and important foreign film to be preserved consists of material of technical or historical significance not duplicated elsewhere. Since nitrate film constantly deteriorates, and also presents a custodial and service problem due to its highly explosive nature, steps must be taken to preserve the collection.

With the \$60,000 request for 1964 to continue the motion picture preservation program, approximately 468,300 feet of 35-millimeter film could be converted. It will be necessary to continue one position at a cost of \$4,400 to prepare the film for the laboratory, maintain appropriate records, and perform other clerical duties incident to the program.

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN MOTION PICTURES

Mr. MUMFORD. As the text in this statement indicates, Mr. Chairman, this program was begun under the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1959 to enable us to convert to safety base film some of the unique collections in the Library, and the paper prints of the early American motion pictures that were submitted for copyright between the years 1894 and 1912.

As you know, during that period, motion pictures on film could not be copyrighted. Many producers submitted paper prints instead which could be copyrighted. This conversion job is designed to preserve these items for the use of the future historian and scholar who is concerned with the documentary material of that period. The conversion of the Kleine collection was completed in 1960, and conversion of the paper prints will be completed during fiscal year 1963. In addition, we have some 28 million feet of perishable nitrate motion picture film stored in vaults in Suitland. This includes U.S. copyright collections, German, Japanese, French, and Italian films, mainly newsreels, documentaries and features. We estimate that over 15 million feet of this film is considered desirable for preservation and should be converted to safety film. We would like to continue this conversion program. We consider it very important. Otherwise, the film is going to deteriorate and eventually be lost.

REPRODUCING MOTION PICTURES

Senator MONRONEY. Will this be in numbers of copies sufficient where it can be shown at places outside the Library outside of Washington?

Mr. MUMFORD. The general distribution of films for screening is not contemplated in this program, but the material that is in the public domain—not under copyright—is available if someone wishes to obtain footage.

Senator MONRONEY. Through the Library?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. The actual reproduction is done at the laboratory down at the Department of Agriculture. We don't have the facilities.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you charge for that?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. This is the way it works: If a person wants to use some footage from our collection, he agrees to provide us with a similar amount of footage for material that has not yet been converted to safety film. So we are able to convert a small amount in this manner.

Senator MONRONEY. You are not asking for any increase in either the preservation of American motion pictures or in the microfilming of the papers of the President.

Mr. MUMFORD. No. It simply allows us to continue the program. I might mention that Senator Kuchel was very much interested in the program for preservation of motion pictures and helped to initiate the original program in asking this committee to approve an amount back in 1960.

Senator MONRONEY. The custom now of the President to remove his papers to a library, such as President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, makes it necessary for us to microfilm the papers of the President before they are removed or after they are removed.

PURPOSE OF MICROFILMING PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS

Mr. MUMFORD. The purpose of this program of organizing and microfilming the papers was twofold. To provide for preservation of them in the event of any national emergency or disaster because a copy of the film could be deposited somewhere else. There would undoubtedly be a number of copies of the film. And to make them more widely available. Other libraries may purchase positive copies from the negative we make, and scholars throughout the country can have easy access to the material.

Senator MONRONEY. For the history and continuity of our Government, the fact that you are microfilming these papers makes it possible in one place in the country, namely, the Library of Congress for scholars to study the papers of those that would otherwise have been removed to distant points.

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. We only arrange to microfilm those which we have in our own collections.

MICROFILMING OTHER LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

Senator MONRONEY. What about microfilming the other papers that are now in the Presidential libraries?

Mr. MUMFORD. The program did not contemplate that. We are not undertaking any steps in that direction. It would be a very great undertaking. There are, I think, between 5 and 6 million pieces in the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park and over 3 million in the Truman Library at Independence. It would be a tremendous and expensive proposition, but it would be desirable to have microfilms available to other libraries, yes.

Senator MONRONEY. I mean for the Library of Congress to have microfilm, too, in one place?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes; it would be very desirable to have microfilm copies of those collections.

Senator MONRONEY. The time may come when we will have 20 libraries scattered around the country and yet a student wishing to study one phase of a Presidential administration would have to travel on a rather large scale to get these papers. They are not available anywhere else in Washington.

Mr. MUMFORD. No.

Senator MONRONEY. Nor any place else in the country?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. It could represent a very important facet of the period of time in which these Presidents have served?

Mr. MUMFORD. That is true.

RAMP FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Senator MONRONEY. I have been asked by Senator Bartlett to make the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, I have today been informed that the Library of Congress plans to construct a small ramp on the east side of its main building for the use

of handicapped persons in wheelchairs or on crutches. This is good news. For too long the Library has been one of the few public buildings in Washington without easy access for handicapped persons. With the cultural and research opportunities of the Library, it is well that the handicapped will no longer find it difficult to share in these benefits.

I congratulate the Library for its action in building this ramp.

We all share in that improvement in the service that will enable cripples to come to the Library in person and to do their work or their study or their pleasure reading there.

NO DISCRIMINATION IN JOBS

May I ask what job opportunities have been open in the past year to colored persons in the Library?

Mr. MUMFORD. Mr. Chairman, the job opportunities are open at all times to Negroes in the Library in accordance with their qualifications. It is our policy not to tolerate any discrimination in respect to race or creed or otherwise. We have had a nondiscrimination program promulgated in general orders for a long time. Following the establishment of the President's program in the executive agencies, we set up a somewhat parallel machinery for dealing with any complaints regarding discrimination if anyone felt had been discriminated against. I appointed a fair employment practice officer and anyone—I should go back one step and mention our procedure in filling vacancies. We post vacancies. Anyone on the staff or outside of the staff may apply if he feels he is qualified. Under the law we are charged to appoint persons purely on the basis of fitness for the positions. If anyone feels that he has been discriminated against he may go to the fair employment practice officer, discuss it, and the fair employment practice officer may investigate with the supervisor who made the recommendation on the appointment. If need be, a board may be set up to hear the appeal of the person. This was done without a separate position or money being appropriated for a separate position. In order to spread out the potential workload, I have appointed three fair employment practice officers, including a Negro as one of them. So we have a machinery for handling any complaints or alleged grievances in this respect. We have enunciated and reiterated our policy of nondiscrimination in every respect.

UPGRADING OPPORTUNITIES FOR QUALIFIED NEGROES

Senator MONRONEY. Regarding your program of upgrading opportunity for jobs of Negro applicants has it been handled so that more of our well educated, qualified Negro college graduates have an opportunity to qualify for the better jobs?

Mr. MUMFORD. If they have the technical qualifications, yes.

Senator MONRONEY. But do have a habit of promoting from within those who have been with the Library, do you not?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. If we have people qualified within the Library we promote from within. If someone is better qualified, much better qualified, from the outside it may be desirable to appoint someone from the outside. We have made a study also of our practice and I might indicate some figures to you. This study revealed that 24.9 percent of the Library staff members are Negroes. The study which the President's Committee made on this matter showed that 13 percent of employees in all agencies were Negroes. So we

have a much larger percentage than the average of governmental agencies.

Senator MONRONEY. Could you give me the average grade of this 24.9?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. I am interested in the upgrading because this I feel the Government has fallen down tremendously in offering opportunities for colored people while opening our colleges to them. In many departments and lines of governmental activity we find that promotions are generally limited to those who are already employed. Therefore, if you have no large numbers in the skills or in the higher levels it is very hard to promote under this system someone of a race which is not properly represented.

PERCENTAGES OF NEGROES IN VARIOUS GRADES

Mr. MUMFORD. The figures indicate from our study that for all agencies in the Government in the grades GS-1 to 4, the percentage is 18.2. In the Library of Congress it is 36.6. From grades GS-5 to 11—

Senator MONRONEY. One to four would be the low grades?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. The percentage?

Mr. MUMFORD. For all the agencies is 18.2.

Senator MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. MUMFORD. And the Library of Congress, 36.6.

Senator MONRONEY. This carries out somewhat your percentage over the other agencies?

Mr. ROGERS. No, sir; because this is the percentage of our staff in grades 1 to 4.

Senator MONRONEY. That 18 percent is your staff?

Mr. MUMFORD. No; that is all agencies.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, they have a smaller percentage than you have in the low grades.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, sir. If you would let us explain after we have gone through grades 1 through 18 I think we can explain this.

Senator MONRONEY. Very well.

Mr. MUMFORD. In grades GS-5 to 11 for all agencies, the percentage is 5.5. For the Library of Congress, it is 12.9. For GS-12 to 18, for all agencies it is 0.8 percent, and for the Library of Congress it is 0.9 percent.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, you will see that if you add up these percentages for either other agencies of the Government or for the Library you get much less than a hundred percent. The reason for this is that, both in the Government as a whole and in the Library of Congress, only a part of the Negroes are in classified positions.

Senator MONRONEY. Others are wage board positions?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir.

COUNSELING SERVICE

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have a counseling service to counsel with the ambitious and qualified and well-educated colored people as to how they can prepare themselves for advancement?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. They may consult our personnel office. We have an employee relations staff there to assist them. Of course, they may consult either one of the three fair employment practice officers.

Senator MONRONEY. I am talking about before the discrimination occurs to prepare them for the qualifications necessary.

Mr. MUMFORD. The personnel office would do that.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, for the want of a degree or for want of specialized training in a language, they would not be eligible. Whereas if they could be counseled a year or two ahead of time they could prepare themselves in night schools for better job opportunities.

Mr. MUMFORD. This is not formalized into calling someone in, that is, a regular instructional program. Any time an employee might ask, "How could I prepare myself for further advancement?" we would undertake to tell him or give an indication of what he needed either in the personnel office or through the fair employment practice officers. Also, our posting system provides a constant reminder of the qualifications required for various positions.

Senator MONRONEY. But this still does not meet quite what I am driving at. I think you need an affirmative program if we are going to improve opportunities for their advancement. I think it is at the core of much of the tensions we are beginning to have in racial affairs. It is the feeling that too many of the better jobs are too difficult or not available because of lack of qualification so that these men cannot step into these openings—men or women.

TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. MUMFORD. I think quite a bit of what you might have in mind might also be comprehended under our training program. We do have a training officer who arranges for seminars and meetings with individuals, and in some cases the Library may send someone to take a course.

Senator MONRONEY. Are you doing that for any of the colored people that are employed?

Mr. MUMFORD. I don't know specifically, but there is nothing to prevent their participation in the training programs and I feel sure that they have been included in at least some of our training.

Senator MONRONEY. You have 2,000 employees on appropriated funds, and you have roughly 25 percent Negroes on the Library staff.

Would that be correct?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. That would include, I presume, your janitorial workers.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes. The charwomen would make a sizable percentage of the group.

Mr. ROGERS. Twenty percent of the Negroes at the Library are in classified positions?

Senator MONRONEY. This would mean that they would be doing white-collar work.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. These grades 1 to 4 are classified, too?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

FEW APPLICANTS FOR SUPERGRADE POSITIONS

Senator MONRONEY. The biggest percentage would be in the 1 to 4 which you would normally expect larger numbers. In your 5 to 12 you have shown good progress in the fact that 12.9 percent are in those higher level jobs. It is only when you reach the 12 to 18 that this number goes down to less than 1 percent.

Mr. MUMFORD. From 12 to 18 we have relatively few applicants for such positions from Negroes who have the qualifications required.

Mr. ROGERS. We have made diligent efforts to find qualified Negroes for higher grades. It is just about impossible to find them.

Senator MONRONEY. Do they know you are looking for them, that there are opportunities? There are not very much Negro librarians.

Mr. MUMFORD. I think, for example, we have tried very hard on the attorneys. Dr. Elsbree has made special efforts.

Mr. ELSBREE. I wouldn't say every conceivable effort, but we really tried very hard. The competition to get attorneys is very keen.

Senator MONRONEY. There is a limited number as there is a limited number of doctors who are colored. In the school field I think perhaps they have gone further and there are greater numbers that are qualified. While they may be teaching in a college or may be teaching in a colored college or a high school, they may have certainly masters degrees and in some cases doctorates that would qualify them if they knew of these opportunities.

For instance, in your cataloging function.

Mr. STEVENS. My brother, who is a librarian, is presently a director of libraries in a Negro university. He has trouble in this Negro university in recruiting qualified library staff either Negro or white. There is simply a general shortage throughout the country in the academic world of librarians both white and Negro, but especially of Negro librarians.

CIRCULATION JOBS

Senator MONRONEY. Would you not say this is a good job opportunity for young Negro scholars to find openings that would eventually pay salaries that would be better than those available in most of the States for colored college graduates.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir; very definitely.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you circularize beyond Washington prospects for openings of these better classified jobs and higher classifications?

Mr. MUMFORD. They are publicized and circularized in our information bulletin.

Senator MONRONEY. By the Library?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. You do not rely strictly on civil service?

Mr. MUMFORD. No.

Mr. ROGERS. This bulletin goes all over the country and carries a list of our vacancies. Also we make a special effort to recruit outstanding graduates of library schools, and we are canvassing the schools that are training primarily Negroes for library work as well as those whose student body may be predominantly white.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE BILL

Senator MONRONEY. On another subject, would you submit a letter, Dr. Mumford, for the record giving your comments on the amounts in the House bill reported today?

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. So we will have that before us when we start the markup.

(The information requested is as follows:)

THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963.

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: In accordance with your instructions that we submit a letter summarizing the action by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives with respect to the Library of Congress budget estimates for fiscal 1964, I am pleased to offer the following analysis of the effect of the House committee action:

(1) The cost of continuing and improving the publication Monthly Index of Russian Accessions in the amount of \$258,000 (representing \$230,000 in personal services costs carried under the appropriation heading "Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses," and \$28,000 for printing costs carried under the heading "Distribution of Catalog Cards") is "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, National Science Foundation.'" We are pleased that provision has been made for continuing this unique and highly important index. We invite your attention, however, to the fact that the National Science Foundation in fiscal 1963 has been funding this activity as an emergency measure to give the Library of Congress an opportunity to seek a direct appropriation. Prior to 1963, the cost of preparing and publishing this index was shared by several Government agencies but primarily by one agency, which has been obliged to withdraw its support.

(2) With respect to the Library's request for 57 positions for the Descriptive and Subject Cataloging Divisions to make it possible to stay abreast of the current processing workload and to make moderate inroads into the processing arrearages which now amount to 166 man-years of work, the House committee makes provision for \$100,000 of the \$424,000 requested and indicates that the Library might employ "a portion—perhaps 20—of the additional employees sought" to permit it to make a start on this important effort. The committee expresses its willingness "to give sympathetic consideration in the next budget to full implementation of the plan as outlined in the hearings * * *." In order to facilitate the recruitment of the necessary staff, which will be a difficult task, the Library would be grateful if it were authorized to fill up to 57 positions, thereby removing the limitation indicated in the report of approximately 20 positions. By controlling appointments and by giving due consideration to the availability of space to become available in the Naval Weapons Plant, the Library would make certain that it would not exceed available funds, and it would seek annualization of the positions in the 1965 budget.

(3) The House committee has recommended five of the six positions requested for the Copyright Office. The Library will endeavor to meet the workload with the positions allowed.

(4) The House committee recommends \$80,000 of the requested \$100,000 increase for books for the general collection. This recommendation is greatly appreciated, but we feel obliged to state that the \$100,000 increase requested was a minimum figure, and we hope that the Senate committee will approve the total amount. The greatness of the Library as well as its ability to give service depends to a most important degree on the publications that can be purchased to supplement those that are obtained from sources other than purchase.

(5) A reduction of \$10,600 is recommended by the House committee from the \$60,600 requested under the appropriation "Preservation of American motion pictures." The reduced amount would require the lengthening of the period—now estimated at 30 years—required to finish this program.

Other than the above modifications and with the exception of continuing the obligation to absorb certain costs of the Pay Act of 1962, the House committee recommends approval of the Library's estimates.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

Senator MONRONEY. If there are no further questions, would you have any further comment, or any of your staff?

Mr. MUMFORD. No, sir. Except to thank you for your patience and sympathetic listening to our presentation.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you very much for your appearance here.

The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock tomorrow, at which time we will hear the officers of the Senate on the Senate appropriations.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., Thursday, June 6, 1963, the committee was recessed, to be reconvened at 2 p.m., Friday, June 7, 1964.)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964

FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 1963

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m., pursuant to recess, in room 1223, New Senate Office Building, Hon. A. S. Mike Monroney (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Monroney, Hayden, Byrd, and Young.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

DISBURSING OFFICE OF THE SENATE

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. BRENKWORTH, FINANCIAL CLERK, U.S. SENATE

BUDGET ESTIMATE

Senator MONRONEY. The Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations will resume its hearing.

The next subject will be the testimony of the disbursing officer of the Senate, Mr. Brenkworth, who will testify as to the requirements for the Senate.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the budget estimates submitted for the fiscal year 1964 total \$31,427,215, an increase of \$564,665 over the appropriations for the current year.

REASONS FOR INCREASE

This increase is accounted for by, first, \$564,380 for the full fiscal year cost of the 1962 Pay Act; secondly, a \$900 increase to cover the annual payroll obligations of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; third; by \$37,970 to provide the full year cost of the increased allowances authorized by Public Law 88-25 for the clerk hire allowances of the Senators from Georgia, California, and Washington, resulting from population increases in those States; by \$845 for payment to the employees' compensation fund, which has increased from the prior year billing, \$1,220, to the current year billing of \$2,065; and by \$28,070 to provide the funds necessary for two new positions authorized by resolution for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

These increases total \$632,165, and are offset by three nonrecurring items, the gratuities, totaling \$67,500, resulting in a net increase of \$564,665.

DETAIL OF INCREASES

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to use the committee's table to detail these appropriation items, individually, indicating the increases in each area.

COMPENSATION OF VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS

The first item on the table is for compensation of the Vice President and Senators, \$2,471,140; no increase.

Senator MONRONEY. These are all statutory allowances?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, they are. They represent the amounts necessary to pay the salaries provided by law plus the agency contributions necessary.

Senator MONRONEY. The agencies' contributions necessary? By that you mean the payments for the Government's portion of the retirement and of the health program?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. And life insurance, as provided by law.

Senator MONRONEY. Yes. That must be attached, as I understand it, by law, to the same payroll account from which the Member is paid, or the employee is paid.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, the law requires that it be paid from the appropriations from which the salary is paid, making it a related payroll cost.

Senator MONRONEY. Then, of course, the Member of Congress or the employee, in this case the Member, would be compensated, but then will he be paying a portion of his compensation for his retirement?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct.

RETIREMENT AND HEALTH PROGRAMS

Senator MONRONEY. In the case of the retirement program, it is what percent, now?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Seven and a half percent for members.

Senator MONRONEY. Seven and one-half percent for members. I see.

On the health program, what percent?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. There is a specified amount to be contributed, based on either single coverage or family coverage. It varies.

Senator MONRONEY. Ordinarily, though, the employee's contribution is generally two-thirds and the Government's one-third? Is that right?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. On the health benefits plan, it is approximately two-thirds that the employee pays as a deduction from his salary, and approximately one-third is contributed by the Government.

Senator MONRONEY. Yes.

LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. BRENKWORTH. In the case of life insurance, it is exactly one-half of what the employee pays.

Senator MONRONEY. One-half?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. One-half of what the employee pays. The deduction for life insurance is 54 cents per thousand of coverage, and the Government contributes 27 cents per thousand, coverage.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be two-thirds to one-third?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is right, but as far as the retirement is concerned, it is an equal amount.

Senator MONRONEY. But that is being paid now, and I think it is a very good thing it is, to keep it current. Whereas we used to be asked for huge block sums, to contribute to the civil service retirement fund itself, now each agency of Government, and particularly those on the Hill which we are discussing, pay their half on a regular annual basis, or monthly basis.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. On a monthly basis, as we make payments of salary, we pay the contributions plus deductions, to the retirement fund, life insurance fund, and health benefit fund.

Senator MONRONEY. You may proceed.

MILEAGE COSTS

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The next item is for mileage of the President of the Senate and Senators; no change; \$58,370.

Senator MONRONEY. That is a constant figure also fixed by law?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. It is.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES, VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS

The next item is expense allowances of the Vice President and majority and minority leaders of the Senate, \$14,000, no change.

Senator MONRONEY. That is divided up how?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. \$10,000 to the Vice President, and \$2,000 each to the leaders.

Senator MONRONEY. That is the majority and minority leaders; no other level of leadership?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. These are the only expense allowances we have in the Senate at this time.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The next appropriation is for salaries, officers and employees. This is one appropriation, although it is listed under 11 different categories. These are limitations within one appropriation. The total amount being requested is \$20,517,475, and represents an increase of \$476,395 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The majority of this amount represents the full fiscal year revision for the cost of the Pay Act of 1962.

Going down these individually: On the first item, the Office of the Vice President, the entire increase is to cover the cost of the pay act.

The next item is for the Chaplain of the Senate, a \$180 increase and this also is the pay act.

The next item is the Office of the Secretary, an increase of \$14,250. This is the pay act again.

Senator MONRONEY. Did you say that is the pay act in its total? Or are there additional requirements?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. This is the full fiscal year revision, no changes in positions whatever.

Senator MONRONEY. And number of employees?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. No change.

COMMITTEES AND CONFERENCES

Under the next heading we have committee employees, an increase of \$52,725. This also represents the full-year pay act.

Conference of the majority, an increase of \$1,580; the pay act again. Conference of the minority, the same amount; the pay act.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANCE

Under administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, we have an increase of \$344,390; \$37,970 of this amount represents the funds needed for the full-year payment of increased clerk hire allowances to the Senators from the States of California, Georgia, and Washington, due to the increase in population, as authorized in Public Law 88-25. The balance represents the amount needed for the full year at the increased pay cost.

SERGEANT AT ARMS, SECRETARIES, AND WHIPS

The Office of the Sergeant-at-Arms: We have \$51,275, and this, once again, is the increased pay cost.

In the offices of the secretaries to the majority and the minority—Senator MONRONEY. No new employment in that figure?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. No; exactly the same number of positions at the same salaries.

Under the offices of the secretaries for the majority and the minority, \$2,580, which is the pay act again.

For the offices of the majority and minority whips, \$580. Once again, it is the pay act.

REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Under the heading "Official reporters of debates," we have a \$4,615 increase, the pay act increase.

This completes the item on "Salaries, officers, and employees."

INCREASES FOR STATES INCREASING IN POPULATION

Senator MONRONEY. Is the total increase practically all due to the pay act, excepting for those States which increased in population and received additional personnel?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. And it was what?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. \$37,970 for the six Senators from the three States involved.

Senator MONRONEY. Six offices, then, reflected?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. So the total increase was \$476,395, all excepting those particular jobs we have just mentioned being due to the pay increase?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. All right.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Under the heading of "Contingent expenses of the Senate," the first item is "Legislative reorganization."

Here we have an increase of \$2,880, which represents the funds needed for the pay act, full fiscal year.

Under the "Senate policy committees, \$7,590, representing the funds necessary for the full fiscal year under the pay act.

This is for two committees, not one; for the majority and the minority policy committees.

This will increase the amount, the estimate, for 1964, to \$175,585 for each of these committees.

AUTOMOBILES AND MAINTENANCE

Under "Automobiles and maintenance," we have an increase of \$540, representing the funds necessary for the increased pay cost.

Senator MONRONEY. That is a \$36,000 item for this year, and it will go up to what?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. \$37,840.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you have an addition for last year? from \$1,300? What is that item for?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That was the 70 percent necessary to pay the increased pay costs for the 8½ months in 1963 under that act. The additional \$540 represents the funds necessary to pay the full year pay cost instead of the 8½ months.

Senator MONRONEY. This is the President pro tem and the Vice President?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The Vice President, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders.

FURNITURE

Senator MONRONEY. The next item is furniture?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Furniture. The estimate is \$31,190, which is the same as the current year; no increase.

Senator MONRONEY. Where does this furniture go? This is different from the furniture in the Senate Office Buildings, is it not?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I believe this is mostly for furniture in the Capitol, in the rooms in the Capitol area.

Mr. Duke's office handles this, and Mr. Cheatham can answer your question better than I.

Senator MONRONEY. We will reach him later.

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The next item is for inquiries and investigations, an increase of \$74,750, the full fiscal year revision for the increased pay costs.

The estimate for the coming year, \$4,025,760, over the appropriation for the current year of \$3,951,010.

Senator MONRONEY. This money, \$4,025,760—these are the expenses of inquiries and investigations voted and authorized at the beginning of each legislative session by the Senate itself. Is that correct?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. And this goes to both the standing committees and some of the special committees?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Any investigation or inquiry which is authorized by the Senate is charged to this appropriation.

Senator YOUNG. May I ask a question?

How does this compare with the amount for fiscal 1963?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. An increase of \$74,750.

Senator MONRONEY. Due to the pay act?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Due to the pay act. That is right, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Is this calculated on the amount voted at the beginning of this session?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The actual amount for the increased pay cost was rated on the payrolls at the time the increase went into effect.

These committees budget through the Rules Committee. I presume that, in the budget they submitted in January, they increased their requests where they felt it was necessary to cover the increased pay costs. The actual amount we have estimated here is based on the actual payroll in effect at the time this increase went into effect.

The authorizations for the current session—this is on a calendar year basis, of course, not a fiscal year—reflect a decrease over the prior session's authorizations by \$132,000 for the 12-month period.

You will recall that we had a little difficulty at the beginning of the session in reauthorizing, and, by special resolution, the old authorizations were continued through the month of February. Most of the committees had sufficient funds to cover the cost of the extra month's operation.

The actual authorization of funds for February was \$103,200 for the committees that were short, and could not meet their payroll for an additional month.

This appropriation is actually rated below the authorizations that are made in the beginning of the Congress. This is due to the fact that our experience indicates that the expenditure rate is less than the authorization rate. At the present time it is running about 83 percent.

There is no way of determining in advance what this rate will be, and what we try and do here is keep enough money in this appropriation to meet the obligations through at least a 12-month period as far as payrolls are concerned.

Beyond that, if we incur any deficiencies, we have to take the necessary action to acquire the funds.

AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS

Senator MONRONEY. How about your agency contributions? This is a very heavy payroll, \$4 million. In fact, it runs almost double the payroll of the Members of the Senate.

Do the agency payments for retirement and for the life insurance programs and others come out of this fund?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. So the \$4,025,760 does include agency contributions?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Agency contributions are charged to each of these payrolls, Senator, as they come through.

Senator MONRONEY. Since this involves a good many employees, does this include their contribution to retirement?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The deductions that they make are withheld from their salaries.

Senator MONRONEY. The Senate must match that deduction?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. For retirement; yes. This becomes a full payroll charge against the \$4 million.

Senator MONRONEY. And the rate they are charged for their retirement is the same as the Senate is charged?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. It is not. It is 6½ percent for retirement.

Senator MONRONEY. Why is that difference? Are the benefits less?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Generally, no. It is the same basic law. The members are entitled to a higher percentage, 2½ percent, as opposed to a 2½- or 2-percent formula for the employees. I presume this is the reason for the higher payment.

Senator MONRONEY. You may continue.

FOLDING DOCUMENTS

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The next appropriation is for folding documents. Here we have an increase of \$700 to an estimate of \$36,700. And this, of course, represents the increased pay cost again.

This is an hourly payroll, and the rate is fixed by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, who handles this appropriation. The increased rate was granted to all employees on this roll. It is currently \$2.03 per hour.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you know how many employees are involved in this?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. At the current time, there are about five or six. This is a payroll that fluctuates a great deal as the need arises for people to do this work.

Mr. Cheatham is here. I am sure he can answer any questions you have on that.

MAIL TRANSPORTATION

The next appropriation is for mail transportation. There is no change in this \$16,560.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The next appropriation is for miscellaneous items, an increase of \$49,655. This is based on the increase of \$845 to reimburse the Bureau of Employee Compensation fund as requested on their billing; \$11,240 for the full fiscal year pay act on the resolution payroll; \$28,070 for

the two new positions authorized by resolution from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and \$9,500 for the Senate restaurant subsidy; totaling \$49,655.

SENATE RESTAURANTS

Senator YOUNG. For the restaurant subsidy?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir; an increase.

Senator YOUNG. What is the total subsidy?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The appropriation this year is \$106,500. The estimate is \$116,000.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be, for the deficit for the operation of the Senate restaurant and all the other restaurant facilities, here, for the year, \$116,000?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. This is an item that I think gives this committee major concern. At one time, when this was under a leased operation, the losses were considerably less than this, were they not?

PRIOR MANAGEMENT

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Prior to the transfer of the restaurant to the Architect, it was on a contract basis with Nation Wide Food Service, and the appropriations were \$85,000 for each year, and they included the contract fee that was paid to Nation Wide.

Senator MONRONEY. I think there has been a table prepared giving the losses over a period of years from the 1960 fiscal year, in which the total cost, including the \$20,000 contract fee, equipment and maintenance, was \$25,787, and the net operating loss was \$41,559, for a total loss of \$67,346 for that year.

Now, I presume that the contract fee was not included in the items that were reimbursable. In other words, this was charged off to a part of the operating loss.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Under Nation Wide, two payments were made periodically. The first was the contract fee. And secondly, if they sustained a loss, the subsidy payment was made to them. If they had a profit in any operating period, it was returned to this appropriation to offset the losses.

Senator MONRONEY. The 1961 fiscal year contract fee was \$15,000. Equipment and maintenance, \$416. Net operating loss, \$67,415, for a total loss, under the contract management, of \$82,831. Is that correct?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. 1962—was that the year that we went under the Architect of the Capitol's management and ran it is a governmental operation?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The first month of that fiscal year was a transition month, and it was continued under Nation Wide Food Services. The Architect of the Capitol operated the restaurant for the 11 remaining months of the fiscal year.

Senator MONRONEY. The net loss was \$85,000, I believe, in the 1962 fiscal year.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I do not know, Senator. My records do not show anything on the operation after that point.

Senator MONRONEY. This is what we have there. The 1963 fiscal year, \$106,500, and the budget estimate, possible loss in 1964 fiscal year, is \$116,000 loss.

UNJUSTIFIED LOSSES

This is a loss that I do not think the Federal budget should have to stand. It is obvious that you cannot make money for the restaurant with the one-meal-per-day operation. Also, that you cannot make money in the restaurants during periods when the Senate is out of session.

But certainly some adjustments must be made, I feel, perhaps in two ways: One, increasing the cost of the food, as much as we would hate to do that; and secondly, in cutting down on the extraordinary services that can be quite expensive.

CAPITOL DINING ROOM

In looking over the operation by months, the large amounts of losses in the past appear to have been in operating the Capitol dining rooms, which show \$90,464.61 deficit for the operation of the Capitol dining rooms.

The snack bar shows a profit of \$1,788. The coffeeshop shows a profit of \$7,677. The new small dining room in the New Senate Building, New Senate Office Building, the Senators' dining room, shows a \$3,506 profit. And the carryout window shows a profit of \$11,185.

Yet the \$90,464 loss in the Capitol dining room and the cafeteria loss of \$25,625—those two losses are what make up the accumulated deficit, which, for the fiscal year up to February 28, totaled \$91,932.56.

AUTUMN MONTHS' LOSSES

I would like to call the attention of the committee members who are here to the fact that the deficits ran extremely large due to a decision that was made to keep the Capitol dining rooms open through October, November, and December. The losses in October were \$16,100, for November \$17,849, and for December \$21,576.

Senator YOUNG. This is a loss that can hardly be justified, in view of the salaries of Senators and their employees.

Senator MONRONEY. And the visitors, who use actually half of the cafeteria, at least, and other governmental employees who use our facilities here. But, certainly, with the rate of pay and the standards maintained in the payroll here, I do not think we should accept this as a permanent continuing subsidy of meals for Capitol Hill.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION FOR LOSS PROBLEMS

And I would expect—since the losses appear to be in the neighborhood of, from the budget estimate, at least, \$116,000—that an increase in the cost of the food, plus a reduction in some of the extra service, by closing down the big Capitol dining rooms during the time that Congress is out of session, would result in stopping a great part of this loss.

You see, the restaurant in this building that could remain open does operate at a profit. The carryout windows could remain. Even the cafeteria, which does not lose as much money, could operate.

We could reduce the losses also by an increase, perhaps, of 5 percent, or if necessary 10 percent, in the cost of the service of the food.

Senator YOUNG. The worst part of it is that we are going in the direction of a bigger deficit, instead of a smaller one.

Senator MONRONEY. And as the Members know, we serve three meals a day very often, always two meals a day, in the Capitol dining rooms and in the cafeteria.

I just hope we can consider that later on. I think the operator of the restaurant is here, is he not?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, he is, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. All Mr. Brenkworth does is keep the books. But we will go into this at greater length when we get to the restaurant operator.

And I have also asked Senator Byrd of West Virginia, who is chairman of the Legislative Committee, when he returns from the inspection of the District schools that he is now making, to be here to participate in this.

This was the miscellaneous items that you were on, that this \$116,000 is a part of?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

ADDITIONAL PAY COSTS

Senator MONRONEY. What other items are in this?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The remainder of the increase are accounted for by the \$845 increased payment to the employees' compensation fund—

Senator MONRONEY. How much?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. \$845. An additional \$11,240 for the full fiscal year pay act costs on the resolution payroll positions.

Senator MONRONEY. \$11,240?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. How much of that is attributable to the restaurant?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. None. None of this is attributable to the restaurant.

PAYROLLS AFFECTED

Senator MONRONEY. What payrolls does this affect? I think you have already accounted for the Senators, and also for the committee employees.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir. These are a number of positions that have been authorized by resolution of the Senate and have been carried on the miscellaneous items payroll. There are positions for the Secretary of the Senate, who has four under this heading. The Sergeant-at-arms of the Senate has 13. There are two positions for the majority leader, two positions for the minority leader, and a number of positions permanently authorized by resolution for committees of the Senate, and a certain number that have been authorized temporarily, for 1 year only, for committees of the Senate.

Now, this payroll totaled \$491,501.07 for the positions alone, the agency contributions are an additional expense and the amount necessary to pay the increased pay cost for the full fiscal year for these positions, in total, is \$11,240.

NEW POSITIONS

In addition to this, we have had two new positions which were authorized by resolution this year, two more than we have had previously, and for this an additional \$28,070 is required.

Senator MONRONEY. To whom do these positions go?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Senator MONRONEY. They were added in addition to the committee employees that are carried above in item No. 8? Is that correct?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. Why can we not unify this, if they are going to be committee employees, and have them carried in one account?

AUTHORIZATION OF POSITIONS

They are authorized by resolution of the Senate?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. Does the resolution direct that they be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct Senator. And of course the item in which the general salaries, as specified by the Reorganization Act, are paid from is the appropriations salaries, officers and employees, which is not a contingent fund item. This is specified by law.

Now, in order to carry additional employees for the standing committees, we would have to amend the law to put them under the other heading.

POSITIONS FINANCED FROM "MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS"

Senator MONRONEY. Will you submit for the record the positions that are carried in miscellaneous item, and the date that the resolutions authorizing these positions were passed?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

(The information referred to follows:)

Position and authority	Office	Gross salary
RESOLUTION ROLL		
Assistant in Secretary's Office, under S. Res. 419, agreed to Jan. 28, 1931, as amended.	Secretary-----	\$6,085.68
Assistant executive clerk, under S. Res. 372, agreed to Dec. 18, 1930, as amended.	do-----	5,045.5
Laborer in Secretary's Office, under S. Res. 340, agreed to Dec. 3, 1930, as amended.	do-----	4,525.43
Laborer in Secretary's Office, under S. Res. 204, agreed to June 16, 1938, as amended.	do-----	4,052.75
Telephone operator, under S. Res. 428, agreed to Feb. 17, 1931, as amended.	Sergeant at Arms-----	4,655.47
Page in Press Gallery, under S. Res. 62, agreed to Dec. 15, 1931, as amended.	do-----	4,525.43
Page in library, under S. Res. 83, agreed to Dec. 17, 1931, as amended.	do-----	4,525.43
Laborer, under S. Res. 453, agreed to Feb. 26, 1931, as amended.	do-----	4,167.47
Do-----	do-----	4,167.47
Special employee, under S. Res. 44, agreed to Apr. 11, 1933.	do-----	3,157.28
Special employee, under S. Res. 44, agreed to Apr. 11, 1933.	do-----	3,157.28
Do-----	do-----	3,157.28
Do-----	do-----	3,157.28
Special employee, under S. Res. 212, agreed to Feb. 15, 1954.	do-----	3,157.28
Do-----	do-----	3,157.28
Do-----	do-----	3,157.28
Do-----	do-----	3,157.28
Research assistant to the majority leader, under S. Res. 158, Dec. 9, 1941, and Public Law 86-30.	Majority leader-----	18,772.09
Clerk to the majority leader, under S. Res. 240, agreed to Jan. 24, 1952.	do-----	6,215.70

Position and authority	Office	Gross salary
RESOLUTION ROLL—Continued		
Research assistant to the minority leader, under S. Res. 158, Dec. 9, 1941, and Public Law 86-30.	Minority leader.....	\$18,772.09
Clerk to the minority leader, under S. Res. 240, agreed to Jan. 24, 1952.	do.....	6,215.70
COMMITTEE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZATIONS		
PERMANENT		
PSM, S. Res. 30, Feb. 2, 1959.....	Foreign Relations.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
PSM, S. Res. 247, Feb. 7, 1962.....	do.....	17,305.31
CA, S. Res. 30, Feb. 2, 1959.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
PSM, S. Res. 355, Aug. 18, 1958.....	Government Operations.....	17,305.31
PSM, S. Res. 66, Feb. 17, 1949.....	Judiciary.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
CA, S. Res. 66, Feb. 17, 1949.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
PSM, S. Res. 342, July 28, 1958.....	Rules.....	17,305.31
TEMPORARY		
PSM, S. Res. 95, Mar. 14, 1963.....	Labor and Public Welfare.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
Do.....	do.....	17,305.31
ACC, S. Res. 95, Mar. 14, 1963.....	do.....	17,305.31
CA, S. Res. 95, Mar. 14, 1963.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
Do.....	do.....	8,816.15
CA, S. Res. 20, Mar. 14, 1963.....	Post Office and Civil Service.	8,816.15
Total.....		517,622.53

Senator MONRONEY. I believe you said the Sergeant at Arms had some employees on there?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. And also the Secretary of the Senate?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. They have a payroll of their own, do they not?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, they do.

Senator MONRONEY. Which is included in line 12?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

PLACING POSITIONS IN REGULAR ACCOUNTS

Senator MONRONEY. Would this have to be an authorization to place them under the regular accounts of the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. All that would be necessary would be to put a proviso in miscellaneous items repealing these resolutions and create the positions in the proper headings under "Salaries, officers and employees," which would effect a transfer.

Senator MONRONEY. Was the theory of putting it in the miscellaneous account that they would be temporary in nature, and if they were put into statutory law they would go on forever?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I believe—and these go back to the early 1930's; some of the resolutions being agreed to in 1930 and 1931—that originally these positions were created by resolution, with the intention that the positions would be created in the proper place in the act, but this was never done. They were just retained as resolution roll employees from that point on.

FURTHER MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Senator MONRONEY. The gratuity expenses on funerals—is that a miscellaneous item, too?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. What are some of the others?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Payments from this appropriation are the resolution payroll, office rental in the home States of Senators, the allowances provided by law, office expenses in the home States of Senators, as provided by law, Senators' transportation to the State, as provided by law, mileage of Senators' employees.

We have a gratuity reserve: mechanical equipment and repair; telephone and telegraph items; the subsidy to the restaurant; the \$10,000 emergency fund for the official reporters; the payment to the employees' compensation fund; and then the general miscellaneous items, such as janitorial supplies, cleaning supplies, and things of that nature.

POSTAGE

Senator MONRONEY. The next item, item 24, postage—you are asking for \$55,975. Have you calculated the additional cost resulting from the act last year of increasing the cost of postage?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, I have, Senator. Based on fiscal 1962, which is the last full fiscal year we have available at the moment, we have determined that the issues amounted to 75 percent in airmail stamps, 20 percent in special delivery, and 5 percent returned unused.

The rate of increase authorized on the airmail is 14 percent. To apply this would mean an increase of \$60 in each allowance in order to equalize for the increased postage rate. It would be necessary to increase the allowances from \$550 per Senator to \$610, with a total cost in the appropriation of \$6,060.

Senator MONRONEY. This figure comes out, then, at \$55,975?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. No. I have not included this in the estimate for this reason. The last time we had an increase similar to this in the Postal Rate Act this committee decided it would not increase the allowances, so I felt it was a matter that should be brought to the attention of the committee for its action.

Senator MONRONEY. Most of this, you say, 75 percent, is airmail, and 20 percent is special delivery?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That was the situation in fiscal 1962.

Senator MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that in most offices a good deal of telegraph expense is saved, oftentimes, by overnight airmail and special delivery, that would otherwise have to go by telegraph, which would be 10 times as expensive, perhaps, as airmail stamps and special deliveries?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I can see where a savings might result from the increased allowance; yes, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. But it would add how much?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. \$6,060 to increase the allowances, each Senator and the Vice President to \$610 instead of \$550, an increase of \$60 per member.

Senator MONRONEY. That would raise the appropriation to——

Mr. BRENKWORTH. \$61,610.

STATIONERY ACCOUNT

Senator MONRONEY. The next account, the stationery account, is \$195,000. That is unchanged?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Unchanged.

Senator MONRONEY. That is divided among each member, is it?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct. The \$1,800 allowance to each member and \$13,200 for stationery for committees and offices of the Senate.

Senator MONRONEY. And that is supplied by the Government Printing Office. Is that correct?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. No, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. I mean the stationery room buys the stationery from the Government Printing Office.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I imagine they may purchase some paper from the Government Printing Office, but I think the bulk of it is purchased from commercial people. I believe they get some of their supplies from the General Services Administration, also. Paper, I believe, does come from the Government Printing Office.

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator MONRONEY. Next, No. 26, "Communications"?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. This is the additional allowance that has been authorized by this appropriation, whereby each Senator at the end of the fiscal year, if he has incurred an expense over and above the allowances provided generally and paid for from miscellaneous items, may submit a voucher and request a reimbursement of not to exceed \$150 per fiscal year.

Senator YOUNG. What is the total telephone bill?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I could not tell you at this point, Senator. It is over a million dollars.

Actually, Mr. Duke, the Sergeant at Arms, maintains all of the record accounts on telephones and telegrams. I am sure that Mr. Cheatham can supply that information for you currently.

CHARTERED WIRES

Senator MONRONEY. The General Service Agency has established a set of long-distance leased wires. Has there been any arrangement or study made to see if as a part of that service they lease them for the full 24-hour period?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I could not give you any information on that, Senator. You would have to check that with Mr. Duke, again, who handles that item.

Senator MONRONEY. A saving might be made by using leased wires, as to some of the communications that the committees and the Senators require.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

I believe the next items are the items for "Legislative counsel." Would you explain this item?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, sir. This is for the office of the legislative counsel, necessary salaries and expenses. The increase is \$4,910. And this, once again, is the increased pay cost.

Then, we find three nonrecurring items, the gratuities, of \$67,500.

ABSORPTION OF PAY COSTS

Senator MONRONEY. Going to the legislative counsel and other items, since most of these next appropriations go forward from the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1, 1963, I understood in the testimony on the supplemental appropriation bill we were absorbing out of other funds on hand a substantial portion of last year's pay increase cost. Is that correct?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. No, sir. We did effect a reduction of 5 percent down the line, wherever we could. This was absorbed for 1963, but the full fiscal year amount is being put in for the next year.

Senator MONRONEY. That is what I am trying to develop. I am trying to find out what we absorbed in 1963. We have to put it in for 1963?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Five percent was absorbed down the line, with the exception of that one item in salaries where we did not think it could be absorbed without creating difficulty. As far as absorbing is concerned, this is something that depends upon the chairmen of these committees, and others who are doing the hiring.

Where you authorize a position at a certain salary, the only way you can absorb anything, if the law says this is what should be paid to that person, is to not put somebody in the position, and if you do that, you are not going to have the people you need to do the job.

Senator MONRONEY. You did absorb, though, because there was not immediate rehiring?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Because we were coming to the close of a fiscal year, there had been enough vacancies and unused allowances to permit this absorption in the current fiscal year. But to project this to the next fiscal year is a little too difficult. There is no way of determining whether or not you are going to be able to make ends meet, if you do that.

Actually, what is provided here, especially in the main appropriation, which is salaries, officers, and employees, is the actual amount necessary to pay the salaries as provided. We have an absorption here of almost a million dollars for agency contributions, which we have never had any funds appropriated for. This is a major absorption.

To go beyond that I think would put us in a dangerous position, as far as meeting our payrolls are concerned, for the month of June, and perhaps even May in coming years.

REVERSION TO TREASURY

Now, any funds that are not utilized—if a position is vacant for a week or a month—this money can never be picked up and reused. It is going back to the Treasury.

Senator MONRONEY. How soon does it revert to the Treasury?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. At the end of 2 years following the fiscal year for which appropriated.

Senator MONRONEY. There are things that come in, are there not, so that you have to hold it over for that long, because of the filing of the accounts on rentals and other things?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Not on salary items; just on the expense obligations, because you have a delay in voucher processing. The obligations incurred may not come in for 2 or 3 months, and therefore they are paid during the next fiscal year. In some cases it has been longer.

As far as salaries are concerned, that is cut and dried. At the end of June 30, we know what we have expended and what our balance is.

JOINT ITEMS

Senator MONRONEY. You may take the next item.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Under the heading "Joint items"—and this is a new heading this year—

Senator MONRONEY. How was this carried before?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was never budgeted for. It was put in as an independent item in the bill.

The Joint Economic Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Printing, were all under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate." They still bear that heading, but are carried in the bill as joint items, being carried in the House first. They are already in the bill as reported by the House.

"Statement of appropriations" is an item which is submitted by the House of Representatives, part of which is disbursed by our side.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Senator MONRONEY. There are several increases like that covering the Committee on Nonessential Government Expenditures. This is for the pay increases voted last year?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Not all of this, Senator.

Of this \$900 was placed in the estimate to cover an annual deficit. This is an appropriation which is available until expended, and has been since the inception of the joint committee.

They have a very small balance, \$2,000 or \$3,000, at the present time, that they are carrying over, and they have been absorbing a deficit in their payroll obligations for the past year or so.

Since we are now budgeting for this, submitting an estimate, and this balance has gone down so low, I have increased this, at the request of Senator Byrd, so that we would have an appropriation equal to the payroll cost for a full year. This is to preserve the balance that he presently is carrying forward to cover any contingencies that might occur in the future.

Of this \$600 is the increase pay cost; \$900 is the annualization of the account.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The next item is Joint Economic Committee. We budgeted an increase of \$5,140, with an estimate of \$265,730, for this appropriation.

Senator MONRONEY. Who fixes the total amount that they receive? Is it fixed by resolution, joint resolution of the Senate and House?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. I believe originally, when this committee was created, there was a maximum amount which could be appropriated for its operation, but this amount as increased by the pay acts, and the agency contribution authorizations, is equal to this \$265,000, if not higher than it.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, there is no statutory dollar limitation, because that has been expanded?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. The statutory dollar limitation has been increased, by increased charges from the pay acts, and so forth, practically speaking.

LETTER FROM SENATOR DOUGLAS

Senator MONRONEY. In the legislative appropriation bill, 1964, in a letter from Senator Paul H. Douglas to the chairman of the committee, it says:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of March 1, I am pleased to submit herewith the data you requested concerning the 1964 budget request of the Joint Economic Committee. A budget request of \$265,130 is based on the 1964 appropriation of \$250,000 plus an allowance on a full-year basis for the pay increase enacted in October.

The committee in reviewing its program believes that a smaller appropriation would be adequate for fiscal year 1964. We reduced the estimated payroll from \$232,602 to \$211,325, and miscellaneous expenses from \$28,543 to \$23,675, making a total estimated saving of \$30,000 from the original budget request of \$265,730. We are requesting an appropriation of \$235,000 for fiscal 1964, rather than the amount specified in the President's budget.

This I think is probably one of the best pieces of news that we have heard, and it shows that the Congress and its chairmen, like Senator Douglas, are watching the housekeeping costs and eager to keep them reduced for the Senate as well as for other agencies of Government.

So this would result in a lowering of the amount from the \$265,730 in the budget request, would it not?

Mr. BRENKWORTH. Yes, it would.

OTHER JOINT COMMITTEES

Senator MONRONEY. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—I suppose this is a very active committee and one of high technical skills being required.

In the Joint Committee on Printing, this is an increase, I presume, from our regular funds, due to the payroll increase.

Mr. BRENKWORTH. That is correct, Senator.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Senator MONRONEY. Now, each year for a great many years, the last item, "Statement of appropriations" is in the table for \$4,000.

As I understand it, the estimate is \$8,000, one-half for the House and one-half for the Senate, and this has been the case for many years.

The House bill reported yesterday fixes the sum at \$13,000. What is the reason for this increase?

Mr. BRENK WORTH. Senator, I am not familiar with the reason for it. I noticed that they increased it to \$13,000.

This traditionally is an appropriation, or an estimate, rather, which is submitted by the House of Representatives. The payments are made by authorization of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

In prior years it has been one-half to the Senate and one-half to the House. I believe in 1 or 2 years it was \$10,000—\$6,000 to the House and \$4,000 to the Senate. In recent years, however, it has been \$8,000, one-half to the Senate and one-half to the House.

I do not know whether this increase of \$5,000 is all for the House, or whether part of it is for the Senate.

Perhaps Senator Hayden, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is here, might be able to shed some light on this point.

REASON FOR INCREASE

Senator HAYDEN. My recollection is that the chairman of the House committee, Chairman Cannon, suggested this increase. I think he felt if he should raise the amount for the House men, we should have opportunity of having the same rate for the Senate men; and I concurred with Chairman Cannon that the increase proposed by the House should also be given to the Senate men.

Senator MONRONEY. So we will communicate with the committee of the House and determine that for sure.

This, then, is the amount of all the items coming under your department that would be required?

Mr. BRENK WORTH. Yes, sir.

SERGEANT AT ARMS

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. CHEATHAM, OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS, SENATE

Senator MONRONEY. We will take you now, Mr. Cheatham. We are glad to have you here.

The committee is in receipt of a letter from Mr. Joseph C. Duke, Sergeant at Arms, recommending a new Assistant Doorkeeper's place in lieu of one regular Doorkeeper's job.

The letter also recommends an increase of \$1,500 in the revolving fund of the Senate Post Office.

I would be glad to hear from you, Mr. Cheatham, on these items.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am William S. Cheatham, Administrative Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Mr. Joseph C. Duke.

Mr. Chairman, the change in one Doorkeeper position is to cure what we think is a serious inequity.

DOORKEEPER POSITION

The regular Doorkeeper position has a base salary of \$2,100, with a gross of \$5,305. Mr. Duke proposes to abolish that position and in lieu thereof create a supervisory Doorkeeper position with a base of \$2,580 and a gross of \$6,345, which would make a gross or total increase of \$1,040.

Now, in justification for this, sir:

The incumbent in the present regular position for the past 2 years has been serving in the supervisory capacity.

Year after year we find that the number of tourists, not only those taken around by the guides but those who tour the building and visit the Senate on their own, becomes larger successively.

For instance, during the peak months of the tourist season last year—and it is apparently the same way this year—anywhere from between 8,000 and 20,000 persons a day would go in and out of the Senate gallery.

The doors of the Senate gallery are spread on three different corridors, so that the one supervisor on the gallery level is not able to observe all of the gallery doors. There are nine gallery doors and one checkroom to operate.

So we have had to use the man involved for some time now as a supervisor.

Further, when the peakloads are at the heaviest, we have long waiting lines of people seeking to get into the gallery. And in an effort to reduce the waiting time, in the past 3 years we have rotated some of the galleries every 15 minutes. This creates an extra burden of supervision—trying to keep abreast of the galleries in which seats are becoming vacant and trying to get the guests to whom Senators have given gallery cards from the front of the long waiting line on the principal floor and upstairs into seats.

So Mr. Duke urges, and we think the committee will agree, that since this incumbent has been performing these duties with added responsibilities for approximately 2 years, it is high time his salary be increased commensurate with other supervisory Doorkeeper positions.

TOTAL COST OF JOB

Senator MONRONEY. And the total cost of this is \$1,000 for this job?

Mr. CHEATHAM. \$1,040.

Senator MONRONEY. An ordinary Doorkeeper position is to be abolished and the same man would go off that payroll, and be placed on another at a thousand dollars a year higher salary because of the performance of supervising requirements.

Mr. CHEATHAM. We would propose language in the bill to abolish one position and in lieu thereof create the other one.

SENATE POST OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

As to the post office revolving fund, this is for the maintenance of an adequate supply of stamps, postal cards, and other such materials, which are sold and used in servicing at the post office windows.

That is a mere matter of arithmetic. The first class postage, as of the first of this year, went up from 4 cents to 5 cents, a 25-percent increase.

Our present revolving fund is \$5,985.

We propose and request that the committee increase that fund by \$1,500.

That is 25 percent of the present amount of the fund.

Since January, we found it necessary, almost every day, to send down to the city post office twice a day to buy stamps and other items in order to run through the entire working day of our Senate post office and supply the demands made by Senators, committees, and clerks and even people coming in off the street.

It is very uneconomical to send a clerk to the city post office twice a day. If we are given this extra \$1,500, it will not be spent. We purchase from the city post office and resell here recouping the money and keep turning it over.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, it is necessary that you have the same number of stamps in the revolving fund?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Absolutely.

Senator HAYDEN. Would you not be better off if you had a little more money to work on?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a nice suggestion, and maybe as time goes on—

Senator HAYDEN. You would lose nothing by the transaction.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Well, if the committee feels it would be better for the fund to have a slight cushion, and have an additional \$2,000, it won't be spent. The clerks that handle it are bonded, and insurance covers it against robbery and other risks. You may have a good idea, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MONRONEY. The committee will give that consideration, and it might be wise to raise it above the \$1,500, because it is money not being spent. It is just working inventory.

Mr. CHEATHAM. That is right, sir.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE—SENATE RECORDING STUDIO

Senator MONRONEY. The committee is in receipt of a letter from Mr. Duke, Sergeant at Arms, recommending the salary of the administrative officer of the Senate Recording Studio be increased from a gross of \$10,116 per annum to a gross salary of \$13,920 per annum, annually, a total increase of \$3,804 per year.

Would you like to elaborate on that?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Yes, sir.

When the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch appropriation bill for fiscal 1957 decided to separate the then joint studio for recording film and tape of the Members of both Houses, and with cooperation of the Senate committee, created separate studios, one for the Senate and one for the House, this became a new facility for the Sergeant at Arms to operate. He did not have any jurisdiction over the joint studio.

Mr. Duke found that the administrative officer, who is not a technician—he does not help in producing the shows—must serve as the overall manager of the studio for the Sergeant at Arms. The salaries are very far apart at present, as between the amount paid the director of the technical side and that paid the administrative officer. There is a difference of \$5,609 while their responsibilities are approaching equality.

EQUALIZING SALARIES, VARIOUS POSITIONS

I would like to make another comparison, if the committee please. In the fiscal 1957 bill, this committee considered and found that a number of other Senate staff positions should be paid equally. It decided that the Postmaster, under the Sergeant at Arms; the Stationer, the Superintendent of the Document Room and the Librarian, all three under the Secretary of the Senate; and a year later that the Superintendent of the Service Department, also under the Sergeant at Arms, should all receive salaries having a base pay of \$6,060.

Mr. Duke today feels that this position of administrative officer in the recording studio is of equal quality duty and responsibilitywise with those other aforementioned five positions that already are being paid \$6,060 base.

Senator MONRONEY. Did this man get an increase at the time we voted the legislative increases?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Yes, sir; everyone did, including these other five named positions and the studio's technical director.

Senator MONRONEY. He would be having that last year, and then this \$3,804 this year.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Well, may I say, Mr. Chairman, we asked this committee to make this increase adoption last year, as one of our most serious inequities. However, this committee, in its own good wisdom, decided to put all of its influence into helping obtain the longevity pay for certain Senate employees not to consider any raises for individuals.

Senator MONRONEY. I understood that this gentleman also received some longevity increase, did he not?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Yes, sir; he did, but so did the other five named positions and the studio's technical director.

Senator MONRONEY. What was the amount of that increase?

Mr. CHEATHAM. \$390.06.

The administrative officer handles substantial sums of money each year whereas some of the five persons now receiving a base of \$6,060 do not handle any money or funds.

Senator MONRONEY. Every time we get into these increases, we find dozens of others that have to be adjusted because we adjust one. I notice we have a letter from the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with reference to increasing the salary of the Senate Postmaster.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Mr. Duke opposes that.

Senator MONRONEY. Then we have from the photographers an urgent need for increasing the salary of the head of the Photographers Gallery.

I think for the purpose of making further inquiry into the deficit in the restaurant, in the cafeterias, and lunch counters, we might excuse you at this time and come back to you later.

How many more requests do you have?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Those are all of our requests, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to make a statement as to the Postmaster since you have mentioned a request for an increase.

JOB TITLES OUT OF DATE

Senator MONRONEY. Some of the job titles of your employees working for the Senate, it seems to me, are out of date and really are not descriptive of their duties. An example of this is the Wagonmaster and the Assistant Wagonmaster.

I think there are some others.

Would you please go over the list for the committee and make some suggestions as to how to bring into either the jet age or the space age the proper nomenclature for Wagonmaster and Assistant Wagonmaster and anything else that might be so defined?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Some of those are worthy of historic sentiment but we will strive to bring them up to date.

Senator MONRONEY. You will submit to us your suggestions and identifications of some of these titles.

Do you handle the assignment of the police force?

Mr. CHEATHAM. The police appointed for the Senate are under the supervision of Mr. Duke, and he is also a member, and chairman each odd year, of the Capitol Police Board, which consists of the two Sergeants at Arms and the Architect.

COMMENT ON POLICE APPEARANCE

Senator MONRONEY. The following comments have been made to a member of this committee, and I quote:

The International Capital at Washington, D.C., has vested in the congressional area, both on the Senate and House sides and Congressional Plaza, a conglomeration of the worst dressed policemen on any area. Walk through the area, and you will see policemen in blouses, crouched in undignified positions, unalert in appearance.

When you consider that we are now encouraging our European cousins and friends from all over the world to visit us, can we not spruce up this crowd of policemen so that they will look a little like uniformed people in every capital of the world?

What do you have to say about these comments? This comes from letters from Members that are leaders in the Senate, and they do feel a sense of frustration, that in the most beautiful capital in the world and probably the most important, we have a miscellaneity of uniforms both in the police and to a degree in the elevator operators and other attendants. But I believe they have sharpened up their dress appearances to a marked degree.

Mr. CHEATHAM. As I understand your question, Mr. Chairman, this comment was made by a constituent to a Senator who in turn referred it to the committee? It was not the comment of the Senator himself?

Senator MONRONEY. But the Senator makes it up good and strong: "He is right about our Capitol Police. There is no reason in the world"—this is signed by Senator Hubert Humphrey, assistant majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

He says: "He is right about our Capitol Police. There is no reason in the world that with all of the visitors coming to the Capitol our policemen shouldn't look a little better. Furthermore, our doormen and elevator operators ought to be dressed so they don't look like the tourists. Hubert Humphrey."

Mr. CHEATHAM. Everything in life may have a little room for improvement. I don't like to disagree with our good friend Senator

Humphrey, but we think on the whole our policemen on the Senate side present an excellent appearance. You give us a fund for providing uniforms. Those uniforms are kept in good repair. When they become too seedy they are condemned and given to our laborers to wear on the job for rough work.

UNIFORMS FURNISHED

Senator MONRONEY. You furnish them to the policemen?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Our annual police funds include enough for acquisition, repair, cleaning, and laundering of articles of police uniforms.

Senator MONRONEY. At the Capitol? And the cleaning is ordered by the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. CHEATHAM. They are ordered cleaned or laundered under the supervision of the Chief of Police. Men have a clean shirt daily.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, they come on duty in their regular street clothes and change to the uniforms furnished and maintained by the Capitol Police Force?

INSPECTION OF POLICE

Mr. CHEATHAM. That is correct, sir. On the Senate side, at each rollcall, the men are not assembled in just a group in the guardroom. They are all lined up, with ample space between. Officers from the Chief down to the Sergeants, depending upon who is in charge of a shift and who is supervising rollcall, inspect each man personally and individually. If a man needs a haircut, he is told to go and get one. Or if the shops are not open, to have one before he comes back for the next shift. If his shoes are not shined, he is told to go shine his shoes.

The Chief does everything possible to make the uniforms fit the men in the finest building in the finest Government of the world.

Senator MONRONEY. There is always room for improvement, and particularly if we are furnishing the uniforms and the cleaning and pressing, they should be maintained in a high state of sartorial perfection.

Mr. CHEATHAM. They are virtually so kept on the Senate side. We even have a sufficient number of sizes, except in rare cases when some Member sends us a man who lacks the stature or the physique to be a policeman, and then the Chief has a tailor work on the uniform.

DISCIPLINING POLICEMEN

Senator MONRONEY. You do not feel there is any hesitancy in this fabulous patronage system of ours, that the Chief must not correct somebody's policeman?

Mr. CHEATHAM. No, sir; the Chief is a good disciplinarian. Most Senators will not countenance misbehavior on the part of those they sponsor. Their files contain lists of other young men that would love to come here and serve properly.

Senator MONRONEY. These young men that I have run onto, and the older men, all have the most wonderful personalities in the world, which makes up in a lot of respects, perhaps, for the lack of sharpness in uniform dress. But their appearance is something I wish you would give some special attention to.

Senator BYRD. I have not seen any of our policemen dressed in blouses.

SUMMER UNIFORMS

Senator MONRONEY. They are in shirts now, because it is summertime.

Do they have a uniform date?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Yes, sir. The Chief issues regular orders, including all men, according to the weather. Of course, if we should have a real cold snap, maybe he would have to put them temporarily back in blouses or jackets. But in the summer, they are in shirt sleeves, and in the winter, in blouses.

DOORMEN AND ELEVATOR OPERATORS

Would you like now for me to answer the second part of that comment, sir, as to putting doormen and the elevator men in uniform?

Senator MONRONEY. Yes, sir. We would have to buy the uniforms, then?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Yes, sir. Mr. Duke would have no objection, and it might be very helpful, as Senator Humphrey says, to have the elevator men and the doorkeepers distinguishable from tourists and other clerks.

I might give you, if you would like, a cost estimate.

RECOGNITION OF MEMBER

Senator BYRD. I would like for the elevator boys to be able to distinguish some of the Senators from visitors and clerks.

Mr. CHEATHAM. We try to have them properly informed.

Senator BYRD. I think you have done an exceedingly poor job in the new building. Of course, my office is in the old building, and I do not, I suppose, get over here in the new building often enough for them to know that I am a Member. But I find it difficult to get to my committee meetings lots of times.

I, of course, do not want to say anything to the elevator boys or people on the elevators, but it seems to me they ought to use their pictorial directories, and I think most of us have pictures of recent vintage, and we can be identified with proper alertness on the part of the elevator operators.

But I certainly would hope that some effort would be made additionally to see that our boys do recognize Senators and do not stop at every level and just delay, while they are at each level.

Mr. CHEATHAM. We will be glad to. But there is this problem that I would hope the Senator would appreciate. Due to our patronage system, with a very rare exception here and there on the elevators, every position of this type turns over within the year, and many Senators do not keep them over 2 or 3 months. By the time an elevator boy learns the faces of all the 100 Senators, many of whom seldom ride his car, he has been replaced by his Senator with another man.

Senator BYRD. Well, I think this is true. But it seems to me with a little effort on the part of the elevator boy and a little greater use of the pictorial directory, this should not constitute a problem beyond the first week.

COST OF DOORKEEPER AND ELEVATOR OPERATORS UNIFORMS

Mr. CHEATHAM. The elevator and doorkeeper uniforms would be cheaper than the police uniforms, and I have a rough breakdown.

For about \$22,000, the first year—it would level off after we have the first stock—we could acquire enough uniforms for the elevator men and the doorkeepers, plus the cleaning and laundering and so forth. And then, of course, we would need some space provided for lockers, so the men could change as they come and go.

Senator MONRONEY. What is that figure again?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Roughly \$22,000, Senator, for the first year. After we acquire the original stock, the per annum figure would become less, because all of those uniforms should not wear out in 1 year.

Senator MONRONEY. No, but if they turn over every 2 months, you are going to have to have an assortment.

Mr. CHEATHAM. The police turn over a lot, too, and the chief puts those uniforms right back in stock after cleaning and renovating and reissues them to other men.

DIALING TELEPHONE TO ASCERTAIN PURPOSE OF BELLS

Senator MONRONEY. Mr. Cheatham, has any consideration been given to a system where you would dial a telephone number when the legislative bells sound and a recording would advise you of the purpose for which the bells are being sounded?

In other words, we were asked for a \$230,000 appropriation to equip the two Senate Office Buildings with clocks and with lights showing the different purposes of the call bells. It seemed to me that perhaps with secretaries on the telephone and with a certain number, like when you dial Weather you get a recording, each office could be advised, after the bells sound, of exactly what the rollecall is or whether it is a quorum call or not. Has there been any inquiry made in that direction?

Mr. CHEATHAM. From time to time, since I started here 42 years ago, there have been many informal comments ranging from "A to Z" about means to enlighten Senators about floor activities but no change was ever requested. I think it may be assumed, under your suggestion that a Republican Senator would probably want to hear the voice of his man, and the Democrat his. As you know interpretations may differ.

I discussed this with Mr. Duke since you asked Mr. George Stewart that question on Wednesday. I was here and heard it. Mr. Duke said he will be glad, if the committee requests him, to have the telephone company make a survey in conjunction with our staff. Being uninformed as to the expense involved, I cannot advise whether we would need extra funds for such a project.

COST OF LIGHT SYSTEM

Senator MONRONEY. It seems to me there is a way of doing it cheaper than the \$230,000 installation proposed by the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. CHEATHAM. They are two different things, as I understand it.

Senator MONRONEY. I understand that. But the \$230,000 is the main thing that is standing in the way of the Senate and this committee ever approving it. So if we need the service, let us find a way of getting it at a much smaller figure.

Mr. CHEATHAM. And would you have any advice to offer about who is best to rely on for making the record?

INFORMATION BY TELEPHONE

Senator MONRONEY. It does not necessarily have to be a record. You could have an open line into both cloakrooms, and it could be done the same as with a record recording, where the page could say that a vote is occurring on Senate Resolution 15, such and such a bill, or that this is a live quorum and all Members are due at the floor, so that a Senator's secretary by just dialing that one number would be able to find what the legislative call is for.

It seems to me foolish that we have to go to this great, elaborate lighting system, when the Senators have had a hard time remembering which light is which, when you look up to the wall to find out. I doubt if Republicans or Democrats would care which voice was on the phone. It may take two telephone attendants to operate all the calls that do come in. I think just one voice speaking, and all tuning in, over and over again, would take care of it.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Of course, you do have coming into play carelessness or misinterpretation of the information, if one person delivers it on such as a recording to everybody, you know.

VISITORS' PARKING

Senator MONRONEY. Quite frequently citizens from Oklahoma drive 1,400 or 1,500 miles to Washington and then are disappointed to find they cannot park within miles of the Capitol. Could not a better provision be made for visitors' parking within a block or so of the Senate and House Office Buildings?

I notice that very little of the space is available on an hour or an hour and a half usage; that it is all tied up, practically, on all-day parking.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Well, the reason for that is that with approximately 3,000 employees on the Senate side, even though we have enlarged the parking facilities, Senators and chairmen of committees keep insisting that we give more and more of their clerks specific places, or places that are not specific, on parking lots. Requests of Senators and chairmen must be honored first. There just is not anything left over.

We also give the press a large block. They live up here and come to work at the beginning of the day, to the press galleries, and stay until the day is over.

There are a few other employees that have them, besides those in Senators' offices and those on committee staffs. The Sergeant at Arms does not permit employees under him, such as doorkeepers, police, elevator operators, postal clerks to have parking space. But unless the committee would want to order the Sergeant at Arms by legislation to take a certain amount of spaces away from each Senator's office, each committee, and the press, I do not know how we could do it. If

you ordered that, offices of Senators, committees, and the press would lose at least half of what they have. Otherwise you could do it by building new lots on new ground.

Senator MONRONEY. This land is very expensive.

INVESTIGATION ON LAND PRICES

Senator HAYDEN. In that connection, I might say we have carefully investigated and acquired all of the cheap property that we could economically in the vicinity of the Capitol, and took the old houses off and improved the land with parking lots. There is much more parking space than there was, but there are more employees owning cars.

Mr. CHEATHAM. And Chairman Hayden had me working with him for about 3 years helping to get that land by settlement rather than condemnation trials.

Senator MONRONEY. It is a difficult thing, but I do not think we give enough attention to our visitors who come who want a place to park for maybe an hour to run in to see their Senator, Congressman, or maybe take a quick look at the Capitol or transact some business here. Yet they have to park so far away it requires almost a taxi ride.

Mr. CHEATHAM. You are exactly right, Senator, and we regret it just as every Senator regrets it. But we don't know how to solve it. As you know the architect of the Capitol would like funds to construct underground garages for parking.

Senator MONRONEY. It is one of the perennial problems, parking space.

I believe that is all of the questions.

POSTMASTER SALARY

Mr. CHEATHAM. Did you have something on the Postmaster?

Mr. Duke opposes that. So if you would, give me a chance to present it, please, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. He would be opposed to raising that salary?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Yes, sir. There are a number of reasons.

Senator MONRONEY. I know all these have been carefully adjusted, and once we start moving up these jobs, we have a chain reaction, where everybody has to be increased because one has been increased.

BASIS OF REQUEST FOR SALARY RAISE

Mr. CHEATHAM. As I understand it, the request of the Post Office Committee is based on the fact that the Postmaster of the House of Representatives receives a higher salary than our Postmaster. The Legislative Subcommittee of Appropriations has many times reiterated to us and others appearing before it that it was not interested in making a comparison between Senate and House positions of the same title.

REASON FOR OPPOSITION TO RAISE

Another and very serious reason why Mr. Duke opposes any promotion for the Postmaster is that the five positions to which I referred earlier would then be thrown out of kilter. Please recall that this committee carefully considered and fixed the salaries of the Postmaster

and the Superintendent of the Service Department, both under the Sergeant at Arms, and the Librarian, the Stationer and the Superintendent of Documents, the latter three under the Secretary of the Senate, at a base pay of \$6,060 because their duties were found to be of equal quality and responsibility.

This has worked well for several years and Mr. Duke does not know of any fact to justify moving the Postmaster ahead of these other four gentlemen. Further, Mr. Chairman, as you said a few minutes ago, without referring to these specific five positions, if one of a group is increased the others urge adjustments. Accordingly, if the committee increases the Postmaster then other Senators interested in the other four men of this identical salary category will probably offer amendments from the floor this year or appear before your committee next year.

A third reason for opposing this increase is based on surveys made by competent expert Post Office Department personnel of the Senate post office. These studies have been kept up to date. The Department experts pointed out that the duties and responsibilities of the Senate Postmaster are not anywhere near comparable to those of postmasters in large cities who receive virtually no more salary than is received now by the Senate Postmaster.

EXAMPLE OF CITY POSTMASTER SALARIES

The following are a few examples in tabulated form:

	Postal field service grade	Annual gross transactions
Phoenix, Ariz.-----	16	\$7, 178, 000
Boston, Mass. ¹ -----	18	44, 733, 000
Oklahoma City, Okla.-----	16	8, 143, 000
Providence, R.I.-----	16	7, 073, 000
U.S. Senate post office-----		² 1, 000, 000

¹ The next highest grade in Massachusetts is 15.

² Less than.

The salary of PFS grade 16 currently starts at \$12,955 and is increased by seven in-grade raises of \$430 each over a period of 11 years to the top of \$15,965. The Senate Postmaster is now receiving \$13,920 which is slightly more than step 3 in grade 16. In 14½ years the Senate Postmaster will receive three more longevity step raises amounting to at least \$1,100. At the end of this period the Senate Postmaster would receive roughly \$15,000 even at his current base rate.

The Department experts also point out that postmasters in large cities have many official activities beyond the confines of their offices such as dealing with improvements for large industries, local government officials, and in civic matters affecting the Post Office. Contrasted with that they found that the Senate Postmaster has none of those responsibilities but functions in the post office under the policies set by his superior, the Sergeant at Arms.

As of the end of last October the Senate Postmaster received two increases, one by the Cost of Living Act and the longevity step, aggregating \$1,227. He is now receiving a total gross of \$13,920 but the written request received by this committee states he is receiving what he got a year ago.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Cheatham, for your help on this. We may call you back for some other information at a later time.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Fine. Thank you, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you very much.

We have now the men who have the responsibility for operating the restaurants in the Senate side of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings.

Would you state your name?

SENATE RESTAURANTS

STATEMENTS OF PHILIP L. ROOF, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, AND DANIEL J. GEARY, ACCOUNTING OFFICER

STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. ROOF. Philip L. Roof, Executive Assistant to the Architect of the Capitol, and with me, Daniel J. Geary, Accounting Officer.

Senator MONRONEY. We are honored to have a member of this Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Restaurants of the Rules Committee, the distinguished Senator Byrd of West Virginia, who is quite interested in this subject as well. And since it does involve the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee as well as this committee, I think having him here will help us to expedite some means of ameliorating the deficits that have been occurring in this operation.

Would you care to make an opening statement?

STATEMENT OF MR. ROOF

Mr. ROOF. I have submitted a statement, Senator, that shows you on the first page the breakdown of the different operating units, and on the second page that you have provided us \$106,500 for this year, and we are asking \$116,000 for next year.

Senator BYRD. You mean \$106,500 was allowed this year?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir; and \$116,000 for next year.

COST OF PAY INCREASES

The only difference in these two figures, Mr. Chairman, is the cost of the pay increases, which were mandatory so far as we were concerned. It does not represent additional cost occasioned by operation of the restaurants by the Architect.

Senator MONRONEY. It is an additional loss, is it not? Because your restaurant is supposed to pay for the cost of the help and cost of the food, and whenever it does not do that, that is a loss. I do not see how you could figure it any other way.

RISE IN RESTAURANT COSTS

Mr. ROOF. It is a loss, but to compare this with a loss of \$85,000 by the concessionaires wouldn't be fair, because they did not have this 7-percent mandatory pay increase.

Senator MONRONEY. The prospect of increased wage costs was, I think, one of the reasons for terminating the contract of the concessionaire. So this must be a part of the cost of the operation of the restaurant. It may be excessive, and I think it is in some cases, but I think the purpose of this meeting would be very much obscured if we do not take into this cost whatever we have to pay. If our wage cost is high, that is one of the problems.

PRICE INCREASE PROPOSED

Senator YOUNG. That is my feeling. And I think if costs go up, prices should be increased.

Mr. ROOF. That is a matter that we have before Senator Byrd's subcommittee. And we also have the matter of closing the Capitol restaurants during the adjournment, which have been kept open ever since there has been a Senate restaurant, because we don't feel there is really any urgent need now to keep those restaurants open. We have never kept them open on the House side during adjournment.

You have a very large cafeteria over here in your new building, which you didn't have years ago when we kept the Capitol restaurant open and the Capitol is where we are losing a tremendous amount of money.

STATUS OF EMPLOYEES

Senator YOUNG. If you close it, could you keep these employees on part time?

Mr. ROOF. That is one of the problems. It does work a hardship on the employees.

Senator YOUNG. It would be better to keep them on only part time than lose all this money.

Mr. ROOF. We could do whatever Senator Byrd's committee directed. But if you keep them on part time, you are only saving perhaps half the salary. Normally, on the House side, Senator, what we do is to give the employees their leave, which normally is about 2 weeks. We give them their compensatory overtime, which would normally be about 2 weeks. So that gives them a month's pay after they quit work, after the House adjourns. It is true, however, that this might be a hardship on these people that have been working for years here in the Senate not to be on pay status just before Christmas holidays. But we have to do something, if these costs continue to rise. That is one thing we can do.

COMBINATION SOLUTION

Another possibility is the across-the-board increase in prices.

Senator MONRONEY. Can you not have a little of each?

Can you figure out some economies in operation and then some increases in prices?

Your volume, as I understand it, is around \$700,000 a year.

Mr. ROOF. That is correct; yes.

Senator MONRONEY. A 5-percent increase in prices, if it extended across the board, which it could, would be about \$35,000, and if you could pick up another \$35,000 in reduction of losses from operating during the time that the Senate is in adjournment, then we would have about \$70,000 to take off of this \$116,000 estimated deficit, which would reduce the losses to less than actually I believe they were under the Nationwide operation; is that correct?

Mr. ROOF. That is correct, sir.

Senator MONRONEY. Senator Byrd, you have been very much concerned with this, as chairman of the Restaurant Committee.

RECENT RESTAURANT LOSSES

Senator BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I have only had the Restaurant Committee assignment this year, and I do not know a great deal about this whole matter, but I think we are going to have to do something about this problem.

Your total loss in 1960 was \$77,000. In 1961, it was \$82,000. You were operating with a concessionaire at that time, were you not?

Mr. ROOF. That is correct, sir.

Senator BYRD. And then the Architect of the Capitol took over the operation of the restaurant?

Mr. ROOF. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. And in fiscal year 1962, the loss was \$85,000?

Mr. ROOF. Our operating loss was \$73,734, and the rest of our loss was capital outlay. Nationwide let the stocks run way down, especially in the cafeteria. Our operating loss was \$73,734 last year for 11 months and Nationwide lost about \$4,000 during July 1961, a total of about \$79,000. But you have an entirely different situation now.

Senator BYRD. Let me continue. Your appropriation for 1963, was \$106,500; is that correct?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. And this year it is estimated that the loss will be \$116,000; is that correct?

Mr. ROOF. Next year; yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Now, of this loss, in fiscal year 1963, according to your chart, the carryout operation showed a profit.

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir, to date.

Senator BYRD. Of 25.5 percent. The Senator's dining room—I suppose that is the dining room here in the new building—showed a profit of 13.5 percent. The coffeeshop showed a profit of 3.5 percent. The snackbar showed a profit of 6.5 percent.

The cafeteria showed a loss of 10.9 percent. Is that the cafeteria in the new building?

Mr. ROOF. That is for both cafeterias in the new building.

Senator BYRD. What about the cafeteria in the old building?

Mr. ROOF. We called that the coffee shop.

Senator BYRD. And the Capitol dining rooms showed a loss of 80.9 percent, a total loss of \$111,000 in the Capitol dining room on food operations.

Mr. ROOF. That is right, sir.

CAPITOL DINING ROOMS

Senator BYRD. So that is where our losses are coming from, mainly in the Capitol dining rooms.

Now, I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that I can presume to speak for my subcommittee today, but I shall recommend to my subcommittee, when it holds another meeting—and we have this under consideration—that during adjournment we close the main dining rooms in the Capitol.

We did keep last year, did we not, the Senate dining room in this building open during adjournment?

Mr. ROOF. No, sir.

That was the year before last, when we had the Capitol facilities closed for the renovation. But I think we should, if we are going to close the Capitol restaurant during adjournment, retain the Senate dining room here, so that the Senators would have at least one place where they could go and take guests during this period.

Senator MONRONEY. The Capitol dining room was used primarily by staff. It was a rare day, when you come back after adjournment. It was mostly staff members that were given the advantage of using it, which is fine, if it is done on a profit or break-even basis.

Mr. ROOF. And the public, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. I think they kept it open thinking the public would support it.

Mr. ROOF. That was once true when Congress adjourned earlier, but now after the children go back to school, your tourist trade drops way down.

CAFETERIAS

Senator MONRONEY. In connection with keeping this small dining room open here, is your kitchen facility linked with your cafeteria, so that you do not duplicate a whole set of kitchen people, as you would have to do if you were operating out of the Capitol?

Mr. ROOF. That is correct.

Mr. GEARY. It takes only eight persons to run this dining room in the new building. In addition to those who are already employed in the kitchen for the cafeteria, there are only 8 persons in this dining room, as opposed to about 56 in the main dining room in the Capitol restaurant facilities.

Senator BYRD. So you would not suggest that the visitors' cafeteria in the new building, or the employees' cafeteria in the new building be kept open during adjournment?

Mr. ROOF. We always close the visitors' cafeteria in the new building.

Senator BYRD. But the cafeteria in the old building could remain open to serve the employees, the press, and so on?

Mr. ROOF. Yes.

Senator BYRD. And we could close the dining rooms in the Capitol?

Mr. ROOF. That is right.

SAVINGS BY CLOSING CAPITOL DINING ROOMS

Senator BYRD. What kind of a saving would be realized from, say, a 3 months' closing of the Capitol dining room?

Mr. ROOF. It all depends on what you decide as to paying salaries during that period. At least \$20,000, I would say.

HOUSE CAFETERIA

Senator BYRD. What about the provision in the Capitol, and particularly in the visitors' cafeteria in the New Office Building, of a cafeteria on a regular basis?

Mr. ROOF. Of course, that is service, Senator, that the Senate furnishes to the public, that the House does not furnish on a regular

basis. In the House, we have never been open to the public as such. Since we constructed the new cafeteria over there, a Congressman, in advance, may make arrangements for a group of schoolchildren, a group from his own State, to have a luncheon in there during a certain period of the day, but the public cannot go in indiscriminately at any time during the day, like they do in your Senate areas.

Senator BYRD. Do you think the fact that this service is furnished on a regular basis contributes significantly to the losses?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir; because we have a larger cafeteria here, a larger establishment, than you would have to have if you didn't provide that service. And as you indicated, the cafeteria is one place you are losing money.

Senator BYRD. Well, \$20,000, then, could be saved by closing the Capitol dining room?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir. That is a rough estimate.

Senator BYRD. Together with the New Senate Building cafeteria?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, that is the visitor's portion.

Senator BYRD. During adjournment?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Does \$20,000 encompass the savings in both areas?

Mr. ROOF. I have not considered closing the cafeteria in this building, because we normally do that anyway. So the net effect is only gained from whatever you do in the Capitol.

SENATE CAFETERIA

Senator MONRONEY. This cafeteria is kept open all year?

Mr. ROOF. Only half of it, Senator. After adjournment we only keep the Senator's and Senate employees' cafeteria open.

Mr. GEARY. The south cafeteria is closed immediately upon adjournment and reopened approximately a week before the convening, just to get it settled down. But the north cafeteria for Senators and their staffs, is kept open all year. We close one-half down. The kitchen, as you know, is located between the two restaurants. One unit is closed. The other is kept open.

Senator YOUNG. Could I ask a question at that point?

Would it not be well to keep one of these cafeterias open, here, and charge more for the meals to make up for it. It seems to me that you would have to have something to take care of all of these employees.

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir. We would plan in any event to keep one of the cafeterias open, here.

Senator BYRD. Has the one cafeteria been sufficient in the past to serve both the employees and the visitors during the fall?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir. We tried last year, because we expected an influx of Library of Congress people, and they petitioned the Senate to let them use this facility. We tried for awhile keeping both the cafeterias open, both the north and the south, and we found that after awhile we didn't need them, so we closed one cafeteria.

Senator BYRD. One cafeteria is enough, then?

Mr. ROOF. Yes.

SENATORS' DINING ROOM

Senator BYRD. Well, do you think it is necessary to keep the Senators' dining room in this building open during adjournment?

Mr. ROOF. Not unless you want a place for the Senators to—

Senator BYRD. The Senators can eat in the cafeteria, can they not? Are there not tables there with signs on them "For Senators Only"?

Mr. ROOF. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. How much additional money would be saved?

Mr. ROOF. The point is, Senator, that your Senators' dining room does operate at a profit. So actually I do not think you would save anything.

Senator BYRD. You would possibly lose?

Mr. ROOF. You might lose something.

ROOM SERVICE FOR SENATORS

Senator BYRD. I have one further question, Mr. Chairman.

Do you have very many Senators who desire room service?

Mr. ROOF. We have about 15 or 16 that regularly request room service. And that is one of the things that is expensive. We don't have that on the other side.

Senator BYRD. This is not true on the other side? Could you estimate what portion of the loss is involved in this type of service?

Mr. ROOF. I don't have a figure on that, Senator. It is one of those intangible sort of things. It is more a disrupting type of thing than it is anything else.

Mr. Sonntag, the manager, for instance, has assigned six waiters to the Senator's main dining room in the Capitol. He gets notice of only 15 or 20 minutes that a Senator wants service for one, three or five, brought up to room so and so. He has to take a waiter out of the dining room and assign him to that room service. Well, that takes, although it seems simple, perhaps the waiter's whole time during the rush period, when you normally expect service in your main restaurant.

So that is the reason you often go into the main restaurant, and you will only find four waiters there, because we have been trying to cut down expenses, and because some of them are assigned elsewhere for room service.

Senator BYRD. So you might have 10 or 15 Senators in the dining room wanting service and waiting on service, and you could have the service preempted by someone who is having one of your clerks bring over a hamburger?

Mr. ROOF. That is correct, sir; one of our waiters.

Senator BYRD. So this does not contribute to the loss so much as it does to inconvenience?

Mr. ROOF. It contributes indirectly to the loss, because if you did not have to keep that maximum of employees, you would not have that heavy a payroll. You have to anticipate the service required. The trouble in the Senate restaurant is this: as you know, you have your late sessions, which the House does not have regularly. So you have to anticipate a peakload. You do not know what to anticipate. You might have four Senators come in. You might have a hundred Senators come in. So we have to provide for that contingency.

Senator BYRD. You could not have a hundred, or the Senate would not be in session.

Mr. GEARY. Sometimes we have one full-time waiter, one full-time bus girl, and sometimes six part-time waiters, and three part-time bus girls, that are assigned to the Senators' dining room in the Capitol.

Senator MONRONEY. That is Senators only?

Mr. GEARY. Not the two private small rooms. That is the main dining room. This means that we have a staff of 10 persons for service purposes in the dining room. Very frequently one or more of the waiters has to be pulled out of the dining room for this room service. It is conceivable that we could even reduce the staff by, I should say, two part-time waiters.

Now, the part-time waiter's salary is approximately a hundred dollars a month. This sounds rather small. But that is a 4 hours a day, 6 days a week job. And of course his income is augmented by his tips. This you could project on an annual basis, say, to \$2,500 or \$3,000 a year.

This is just an approximation of what might be saved. Possibly we could further reduce the force.

SENATE DINING ROOM SERVICE

Senator MONRONEY. I would hate to see you cut the service down, although I rarely eat there, in the main Senate dining room, because it is so slow now.

Mr. GEARY. The reason it is slow, Mr. Chairman, is that, because of the six or seven waiters who should be there, there may be only four or five, because three of them are absent rendering room service, often in the Old Senate Office Building, the Capitol Building, and the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. ROOF. You might recall that the service was much better when we first opened the new facility in the Capitol. We had a lot more waiters then than we do now. We have cut it down because of the expense.

Senator BYRD. I do not want to belabor this point, and this is something the Rules Subcommittee will have to consider, but I would like to ask another question along this line.

Senator MONRONEY. I hope you will, because we are anxious to have your advice on this, and we certainly do want to cut down on this amount of money appropriated for the losses.

CONTINUOUS ROOM SERVICE

Senator BYRD. Without mentioning any names, do you have Senators who ask for one of your waiters to bring over perhaps a hamburger and a bag of potato chips?

Mr. ROOF. Yes, sir, small orders.

Senator BYRD. And is this done on a regular basis? Is it done often?

Mr. ROOF. Fairly regularly.

Senator BYRD. By the same Senator or Senators?

Mr. ROOF. Generally the same, yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. I assume that this also affects the operation of the other rooms in the Capitol dining area, does it not? Or does it only affect the Senators' dining room?

Mr. ROOF. It affects the whole operation to some extent. It even affects the operation in this building because some of the service is provided from this building.

But it is a little different over here. Very often, here, it is just a question of delivering the food to the Senator's offices and coming back. And very often it might be done by a bus girl. And in that way she doesn't lose a whole lot of time. Normally it is done in the Capitol and certain other areas, where they require a waiter to take it up, and he is out for quite a long time.

Senator BYRD. Well, personally, while I do not see a great saving of money that would accrue, I feel that other than the leadership—I would expect the leadership to be shown some additional consideration along this line, and possibly Senator Hayden or a few of the other Senators who are chairmen of committees—I certainly ought not to take advantage of the other Senators and members of the press and people who use the various dining rooms in the Capitol, by having a bag of potato chips and a hamburger brought over regularly by waiters. I send someone on my own staff down to the cafeteria and get my hamburgers. If I have someone who wishes to eat in my office with me, I send my staff member down and let her get food for two.

Senator YOUNG. I do the same thing.

NOTICE FROM LEADERS

Mr. ROOF. You mentioned the leaders. As far as the leaders and assistant leaders in the Capitol are concerned, they are no problem, because they give us notice. They give the manager notice maybe a day ahead or something like that, if they want some special service. So we can have a waiter there if they give the manager notice.

Senator YOUNG. The Members who really need it most are not the problem?

Mr. ROOF. They are not the problem.

Senator MONRONEY. Is it not possible that sometimes when food is being delivered it goes to an employee rather than to a Senator, anyway?

Mr. ROOF. I do not think so, Senator.

MINIMUM ORDER ROOM SERVICE

Senator YOUNG. Could you not have a minimum service charge to a room, just to eliminate the small orders?

Senator BYRD. Well, this is something the Rules Subcommittee certainly should consider, Senator Young, and I personally feel it ought to be limited to those situations in which the Senator may have three or four persons eating with him, and this would not be too often, perhaps.

Senator MONRONEY. You could make an extra charge, I think, for food served outside of the regular dining places.

Mr. ROOF. We do make an extra charge for that service.

Senator YOUNG. Could you not have a minimum charge for even a bag of potato chips?

Senator MONRONEY. What is the charge you make?

Mr. GEARY. Twenty percent.

Senator MONRONEY. I know the 1937 statute provided for it.

OTHER SOURCES OF SAVING

Senator BYRD. Mr. Roof, other than the possible increase in prices and the shutting down of the Senate dining room and the one cafeteria in the new building, what other areas do you think we might possibly make some savings in?

Are there days during the session that we should or could close?

Mr. ROOF. During recess?

Senator BYRD. During the period that we are here.

Mr. ROOF. We do close in the holiday periods. If it is a day before a holiday, we will keep maybe one facility open, and that usually will be the coffee shop in the old building, and we have found that that over a period of years is the best solution.

I don't think, Senator Byrd, you could save a whole lot there.

Senator BYRD. What about Saturdays, when we are not in session? You do keep the Senate dining room open, do you not?

Mr. ROOF. We do, and we keep the House dining room open.

Senator BYRD. If we are not in session, what do you think about closing the Senate dining room? Could we realize any savings in this way?

Mr. ROOF. You could if it is agreeable to the Senate, but whether or not it would be agreeable to the Senators would be another matter.

PROBLEM OF EMPLOYEES

Senator BYRD. Well, if the Senate Rules Committee authorized you or directed you to close the Senate dining room on Saturdays during the session, do you think we would realize a saving that would be worth while?

Mr. GEARY. Senator, there is only one comment I would like to make on that. The employees of the Senate restaurant are paid on the basis of a 48-hour week. We have a rather awkward pay situation, because we must pay all of the employees under the legislative pay acts, which provide for monthly or semimonthly payment. When we converted the hourly rates that were formerly being paid by Nation Wide, we converted on a 48-hour week, converted on a monthly basis, for approximately 26 working days a month.

All of the employees, if we were closed on Saturday, would lose 6 hours' pay. This would constitute a saving. We would also save the value of the food that they would consume while they were on duty, the meals that they are normally furnished. But it would reduce the pay of the employees in such a way that it might create quite a difficulty as far as retaining employees is concerned.

It is true that there would be a saving, but the saving would simply be a reduction of the hours of labor paid to these people, who are already being paid on a 48-hour week, or are required to work 48 hours to get a full week's pay.

Senator YOUNG. Senator Byrd, if I might offer a suggestion, it would seem to me that there would be less opposition if we went in the direction of charging more for the service than eliminating too much of the service.

EFFECTS OF INCREASING PRICES

Mr. GEARY. Increasing prices would decrease the loss only to the extent that it increased your revenue, which does not necessarily follow. An increase in the price of food might not increase your revenue at all. It might have the opposite effect.

Senator MONRONEY. You do not need to run two cafeterias, then. We are not here to try to build up the revenue load. What we would like to do is to have a balance of revenues and costs.

Senator YOUNG. All we want is necessary service, for which we would be willing to pay.

MEMORANDUM ON SOURCES OF SAVINGS

Senator BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this suggestion, namely, that Mr. Roof supply me with a memorandum indicating the savings that would accrue from closing of the Senate dining rooms during the adjournment of the Congress, taking into consideration a 3 months' period, as a normal adjournment period, the amount of savings that would accrue from putting some reasonable restrictions upon room service to Senators, and the amount of additional moneys that might accrue from 2, 3, 4, or 5 percent increase in prices across the board, and the amount of savings that would accrue from closing the Senate dining room on Saturdays while Congress is in session.

Senator MONRONEY. Would the Senator yield?

QUESTION OF SERVING BREAKFAST

I was going to ask about cutting out breakfast. I know lots of us enjoy eating breakfast in the main Senate dining room, but we could have it in this one over here if it were open, just as well, or in the cafeteria.

Senator YOUNG. I would rather eat over here in this building, myself.

Senator MONRONEY. I mean just by cutting out the breakfast, could you actually assign one waiter to a reserved section for the Senators for breakfast, and you would find you would get your food faster, and you would cut out the cost of opening that whole dining room section and the kitchen section in the Capitol for an extra number of hours?

Is not breakfast a great loss meal?

Mr. ROOF. Are you speaking of the whole operation, or just the Senator's dining room?

Senator MONRONEY. I would say the whole operation.

Mr. ROOF. A lot of the employees and members of the press eat there.

Senator MONRONEY. But you have a cafeteria over here, and the cars are running.

Senator BYRD. You have two cafeterias over here, including the old snack bar.

Senator MONRONEY. But they run a full breakfast over here and ought to be able to show a profit on that operation.

Senator BYRD. If Mr. Roof might give the Subcommittee on Restaurants a memorandum with these items, plus any others he might have in mind we could possibly have a meeting and give you some guidelines before you mark up the bill, Mr. Chairman, which would be helpful to you.

Senator MONRONEY. It certainly would be, because one of the main things we would like to do is cut way down on this amount asked to make up losses.

Senator YOUNG. I always have breakfast over in the dining room in the Capitol.

Mr. GEARY. On June 5 we served 24 persons, and on June 6 we served 3 persons breakfast in the main Senators dining room. This is pretty typical. The average breakfast in the main dining room—this is the Senate's dining room only now, not speaking about the staff and press section.

PRESS AND SPECIAL GROUPS

I do not have with me figures on the number of breakfasts served in the staff and press section, but we do have several regular breakfasts that are served in the Capitol Building, in the Vandenberg room and in S-120. I think there are several served every week, various groups, prayer groups and others. This I believe would necessitate at least having a partial staff in the kitchen.

Senator MONRONEY. But you have rooms here in this building above your kitchens in the cafeteria, and you have space in the cafeteria.

Mr. ROOF. Mr. Chairman, they have been accustomed for years to having these breakfasts in the Vandenberg room. These groups prefer it to the new room we have across the hall there.

Senator BYRD. Well, could you itemize these various suggestions and give us some estimates of what savings might be realized? Then the subcommittee can consider them. It might throw them all out. It might adopt one or several or all of them. And then we could come back to the chairman of this subcommittee, before he marks up the bill, and possibly be able to assist him in arriving at his conclusions.

As soon as you can give that to me, I will try to get Senator Clark and Senator Scott and have a meeting.

Mr. ROOF. I will be glad to, Senator.

Senator MONRONEY. Senator Byrd, thank you very much. You have asked practically every question that I had made a note of, and it seems to me that you are going at it in the right way.

Senator BYRD. I have one further question.

PROFIT FOR APRIL

How did you happen to show a profit in the month of April?

Mr. ROOF. That was a surprise to us, too, but you see, actually we did lose a small amount overall—about \$400.

Senator BYRD. That is right, \$433.

Mr. ROOF. The secret of that is the volume of sales. When we can bring the volume up to \$80,000 or \$90,000 we can break even.

In May we are not going to have that good a picture, because the volume is down around 70,000.

When the volume is above 80,000, we usually hit fairly close to the saving line.

Senator BYRD. Actually, you only showed a loss in the Capitol dining room. You showed a profit everywhere else.

Mr. ROOF. That is right, Sir.

Senator BYRD. And you came very near to wiping out your Capitol dining room losses of \$7,500.

Senator MONRONEY. That is cherryblossom time, when everybody comes to Washington.

Mr. ROOF. We had \$83,000 in sales and your cigar stand sales were \$8,200. So there is almost \$90,000. When you can hit that peak, we don't have any loss.

Senator MONRONEY. We would certainly appreciate any other ideas you may have for reducing or eliminating this deficit.

MAIL COLLECTION, NEW SENATE OFFICE

We had a matter that Senator Saltonstall was quite interested in and wanted me to ask about. That is the letter and answer for the record regarding the letter mail belt conveyor in the New Senate Office Building and the long continuing practice of collecting mail from boxes at the bottom of each chute.

Senator Saltonstall writes that he is inquiring about why this belt has never been workable and why this machinery has not been adjusted or readjusted to perform as intended, and if it would not be less costly to use the conveyor, if it could be operated satisfactorily, instead of collecting the mail by manpower.

I will give you this letter, which has an answer of the Sergeant at Arms to Senator Saltonstall, but it seems to me it has some bearing on the Architect of the Capitol as well.

GUIDE FORCE ON FEDERAL PAYROLL

Further now, the Architect of the Capitol, we know, is in charge of maintaining the Capitol Building, with its thousands of tourists who come here every year. What is the position of your office with respect to placing the guide force on the Federal payroll and establishing an orderly system in the corridors of the Capitol Building?

I receive dozens of complaints each year from visitors to the Capitol objecting to feeling they are being required to pay 25 cents to see their own Capitol. And the handling of the crowds we are told requires this service, but they feel they get it in all other Government departments, and certainly the Congress should not require each visitor to pay to see his own Capitol.

Mr. ROOF. Mr. Chairman, of course that is not a matter that comes under Mr. Stewart's jurisdiction, but he has expressed before the House Appropriations Committee recently that he is very much in favor of putting the guide force on the Federal payroll. So that is the position of the Office.

Senator MONRONEY. I think it would give the guide force a certain amount of security if they are eligible for our retirement system and would help to upgrade the quality of the guide service if it were of more permanent tenure. It would take legislation beyond this appropriation bill, would it not?

ATTITUDE OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Mr. CHEATHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt, please, sir? Since one-half of the members of the guide force are under the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and the others under the Sergeant at Arms of the House, Mr. Duke would be prejudiced if we were to have some comments on the record from Mr. Stewart and not any from the Sergeant-at-Arms. Mr. Duke's views are opposite to those of Mr. Stewart.

Senator MONRONEY. We would be happy to have his comments on it.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Would you mind after you are through with Mr. Roof asking me the question?

Senator MONRONEY. Fine.

That was all I wanted. I notice the Architect in the House has commented on the guide services.

I personally have a bill now drawn, which I have been poised to introduce, along with my colleague in the House, Congressman Steed, who is chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Committee over there.

We certainly would be glad to hear from Mr. Cheatham on the views of Mr. Duke now.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for asking me the question as to whether the Sergeant at Arms would favor placing the Capitol guides on a Government salary or retaining them under the present and long-continued practice of allowing them to charge fees of 25 cents for individuals and 15 cents for school groups and other groups, and dividing the money among the guides.

REASONS FOR KEEPING GUIDES INDEPENDENT

Mr. Duke feels, from his long experience as Sergeant at Arms, that it is much better to leave the guides as they are.

One reason is that if they were put on the payroll there would be great pressure to have the guide positions put in patronage, such as most all of the rest of his employees are. That would take it out of his hands as to selecting the guides.

For several years, he has tried very carefully to interview many people every time he has a vacancy, and not just those who apply. He has sought all over town for people who have had experiences in other fields of guide or lecturing work.

Therefore, he feels the caliber of the guides would fall off considerably.

Senator MONRONEY. You mean if you went to a patronage system.

Mr. CHEATHAM. If we went to a patronage system. In other words, Senator X would be assigned by the patronage committee one guide. He would send over Miss Y and say, "Please put Miss Y on my guide position." Unless it could be said that she is just absolutely no good, she would be appointed.

BILL DRAFTED ON GUIDE SITUATION

Senator MONRONEY. The bill that I have drafted, and that which was drafted by Congressman Steed, would take that out of the patronage system and turn it over to a special committee or a guide committee to protect probably those who are now employed, to go on with the benefit of Federal retirement and a straight salary.

Mr. CHEATHAM. Such fringe benefits could be worked alone by special legislation without placing them on a payroll.

Now, another reason. Some Members on each side endeavor now to have certain constituents shown through free. Mr. Duke has ordered Senate-appointed guides not to show groups around for Members free, because their livelihood would be diminished.

He also believes that if they are on the payroll, the Members would want all sorts of special services. Not long ago, we had a Senator who wanted a guide to come over to his office and pick up a group of 100 people and take them over to the Capitol and show them around. Of course, the guides weren't able to because of orders. If they were actually Senate employees, it might turn out that the entire system of lecturing would fall down, or due to many extra demands we would have to have many more guides on the force.

Another reason is that we have found that there are some Federal agencies which conduct tours of people around Washington. They pay the guides out of petty cash but don't have enough petty cash funds to extend this practice of touring as far as they would like. If the guides were on a regular payroll and there was no charge to these agencies, there would just be no end to the people the Federal agencies would "dump" on the guides.

Senator MONRONEY. I do not understand why there would be more people that would come out, unless you would feel there would be more because there was no charge.

Mr. CHEATHAM. That is the right answer, sir.

DEPARTMENTAL VISITORS

Senator MONRONEY. But I do not think the Government agencies downtown would be sending more people out to the Capitol.

Mr. CHEATHAM. They take them through somewhat on their own now when their funds are low and no more is available to pay the Capitol guides. The people their own attachés now have to show around would just be given to the guides if their services were free.

Senator MONRONEY. Would it not be better to have your Capitol guides showing these visitors, foreign oversea visitors and others around, than having somebody come up from the State Department that has never undertaken to lecture on the Capitol itself?

Mr. CHEATHAM. Of course, some of those agency escorts who come regularly are reasonably good on the major features.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, maybe they are not very well liked by the other guides, because they would conflict, would they not, with the tours being run, particularly at this time of year?

Mr. CHEATHAM. There is no regulation to prevent agency personnel from showing people around, just as if any citizen has a group of friends he wants to bring up. There is a regulation that prevents

the professionally licensed city guides, those that you see out on the street corners soliciting tourists that drive by, from showing people around.

They may bring their customers up to the Capitol Grounds and then leave them until the persons have seen the building on our guided tour or until such visitors sightsee on their own.

It is also thought that the interest on the part of the guides, if on the payroll, might not have as much zeal as when they are in effect working for themselves.

I thank you for hearing me.

EFFECTS ON VISITORS

Senator MONRONEY. You have made a nice contribution, except it is all on how this affects the guides. What we are interested in, in the Senate, is how it affects the hundreds of thousands of visitors who own the Capitol. It is their possession, and they are spending a lot of money to get here. And it is a matter of whether they should have the advantage of seeing, under good auspices, this cornerstone of our democracy.

Mr. CHEATHAM. That is another means of guides having many more people to show around. Now, frequently, anywhere from 50 to 60 percent of tourists in peak loads do not take the guides. So if those extra thousands per day found out that quick service was free, then instead of 24 guides you may end up by needing around 48 or 50. One or two more galleries might then need to be set aside for the exclusive use of guided tours, leaving but little gallery space for regular visitors.

Senator MONRONEY. Sir, out of a hundred billion dollar budget, I will not worry about having to add a few extra guides if these people can come and see their Capitol and go away with the feeling that they have had an adequate and fine explanation of the business of our democracy and how it is carried on. I think these guides do a good job. I think the only abrasive part is when they are told as they finish this tour of freedom, that the place of freedom is not free; that there is a two-bit tab; which they cheerfully pay, but they go home resenting it. And if we can do some things in some directions, I think in every other tourist temple they go to see, it is not required that they pay a guide fee, and I think that the Congress could certainly consider compensation to the guides. Also I think the fact is that the security of employment and maybe the dignity of working as Federal employees is in issue. As for these guides that work over there, I am not thinking about them primarily, but in return for what they might sacrifice in some additional income from the sharing of the fees, they would be allowed to share in the civil service retirement pay and in the health program and in life insurance and many other things. Those would be fine benefits.

Mr. CHEATHAM. There has been legislation offered from time to time to give them fringe benefits even under the present system, but some way it did not pass.

Senator MONRONEY. This is pretty hard to do.

Mr. CHEATHAM. They would contribute, of course. Their records are all scrutinized by the General Accounting Office. That office, at

the request of the Sergeant-at-Arms, several years ago set up an auditing system for the guides to follow. Based on this, contribution for fringe benefits could easily be deducted if provided for by statute.

Senator MONRONEY. And I think you could make it almost on the basis of merit to those who have tenure of employment. And they would be allowed to continue on a nonpatronage basis. I see nothing wrong with that. But the main thing, I think, to be concerned with is the effect on the people who visit here, who want to see their Capitol.

Mr. CHEATHAM. I appreciate your letting me act on my instructions and tell you of the Sergeant-at-Arms' opinions based on experience.

Senator MONRONEY. We are happy to have your advice. It is not something to put into this bill, but it is something we are considering very seriously.

The committee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. (Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m., Friday, June 7, 1963, the committee recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1963

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m., pursuant to recess, in room 1223, New Senate Office Building, Hon. A. S. Mike Monroney (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Monroney and Saltonstall.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Senator MONRONEY. The Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations will be in session.

We resume our hearings this afternoon on bill H.R. 6868, the legislative appropriation bill for 1964.

We are pleased to have with us this afternoon a distinguished member of the President's Cabinet, the Postmaster General, and we also have the Senator from Delaware, Mr. Williams.

Senator Williams has introduced an amendment on the subject of use of a simplified address for the sending of mail under the franking privilege which has been referred to this committee.

I believe it would be in order for the committee to hear Senator Williams on his amendment, and then we will be in a better position to discuss it with the Postmaster General.

So you may proceed, Senator Williams.

I understand the Republican Party has a conference at 2:30, so we would like to expedite the hearings.

I also would like to announce that the committee is in receipt of a statement from Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, urging the committee to continue the ban on the use of the simplified mailing address under the franking privilege.

The statement of Senator Moss will be included in the record following Senator Williams' statement. He supports Senator Williams' position on this.

You may proceed, Senator.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM
THE STATE OF DELAWARE****AMENDMENT ON UNADDRESSED MAIL**

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing here in behalf of this amendment.

Last year, as you know, the Senate, in approving the Legislative Appropriation Act for 1963, accepted a similar amendment, the purpose of which was to repeal the junk mailing privilege of Members of Congress, as to unaddressed mail.

Prior thereto, the Members of Congress could send under the franking privilege unaddressed mail to constituents, including those in rural areas, a privilege denied businessmen.

This meant that candidates for reelection could use their franking privilege and circulate to the voters of their States, with the taxpayers paying the postage, by simple process of first inserting a speech in the Congressional Record and then having reprints made. This placed the Postmaster General in the embarrassing position of having to classify whether this was official business or not.

IMPORTANCE OF AMENDMENT

As evidence of how important this amendment is, I cite certain statistics, which I understand were furnished by the Post Office Department, which show that the volume of mail for Congress for the fiscal year 1961 was 88,881,000 pieces, and the cost was approximately \$3,986,000.

Then there was added to the supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 a provision liberalizing the franking privilege to extend this franking privilege to all so-called unaddressed mail.

COST OF LIBERALIZED FRANKING

The volume of mail for that year significantly jumped, from 88 million pieces to 110,944,000 pieces, with an estimated cost of \$4,867,374. According to that, there was an increase in the cost of about \$881,000.

Now, Congress approved this amendment last year. The Senate approved it first, and it was accepted in the House by the conferees. And I notice that this year in the House report, not only have they eliminated the amendment but they also specifically spell out their intent that the Postmaster General shall be instructed to go back to the provisions of the law as it was administered prior to the adoption of this proposal.

I strongly recommend that the committee accept this amendment.

Senator MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his statement.

As he well knows, this has been a matter of great controversy between the two Houses.

NEGOTIATIONS ON AMENDMENT

I think your amendment, or amendments which you joined in, were presented several times in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. And oftentimes they led to very difficult and prolonged negotiations in the conference, in which the Senate was never able to fully resolve the matter, as well as it did last year.

DIFFICULTY OF PASSING AMENDMENT

Now, I am informed of, and of course the record of the House report indicates, a strong feeling on this matter again. And the fact that it was not challenged on the floor of the House this year again makes it appear that the difficulties between the two Houses would be very great if it were to include the Senator's amendment in the bill and make the provision apply to both the House and to the Senate.

As I recall, and I would like to have your advice on this, because you have been intimately connected with it, Senator Williams: Several times in the past, when the language was in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, the proposal was made to let each House determine its own rules on the franking privilege, and in the comity between the two Houses, each House is judge of its own rules.

While the franking privilege is not a rule of procedure, it has been traditional that each House on matters involving their personal or housekeeping prerogatives has been the judge of their respective situations.

We are anxious, of course, to get a bill through. I am sure the sentiment of the Senate is one that does not wish this mailing privilege for ourselves. The change in the Senator's amendment last year was graciously accepted by the Senate, even though we had used and enjoyed the privilege of mailing unaddressed mail to boxholders on rural routes and in fourth-class post offices.

The amendment of the Senator last year took that privilege away, but I have never heard one Senator complain.

The use of the frank to reach city occupants or residents, was the point at issue generally when we met with the House on this.

EACH HOUSE FIX RULES

I would like to have the Senator's feeling on this matter, whether it would be possible, in continuing the necessary comity between the two Houses, to fix the rules as we feel is proper and just for ourselves, and leave it to the House to either adopt the same rules or to go ahead with their liberal use of the unaddressed mail under the franking privilege.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is more a matter of principle, and one which we should act upon as both Houses combined.

As I understand it, while the House has objected to the action of the Senate, they have not objected to the action on the basis of the separation of the Houses.

The first time we proposed this amendment, it was included, as you state, in the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, and, on the last evening of the session, we were confronted with the alternative of

letting the Post Office Department go without any money, because the amendment was stricken out in the House, and then they adjourned, or to accept its elimination. We would have handicaped the operations of the entire Post Office Department and Treasury Department, had we insisted.

REASON FOR TRANSFER TO LEGISLATIVE BILL

That is the reason why I transferred the amendment last year over to the legislative appropriation bill. I did not think it was fair to the Postmaster General to jeopardize his appropriation.

Now, I do not think we will get a similar deadlock this time, because if we did, it would not be any great catastrophe. It would merely mean that both the House and the Senate would wait for our own pay until such time as we adjusted our differences.

So I have the feeling that there would be an incentive to adjust the differences, and it would not result in one House going home.

I do feel that this amendment should be adopted. I notice, too, that in repealing it, the House did not repeal it just for the House; they repealed it for both bodies.

Senator MONRONEY. There is no repeal. There is merely the failure to include the language which the Senator had, and to make it effective. And, there is language in the House report, which states that in the absence of the language of last year it reverts to the so-called old law, which is, in fact, no old law at all.

Senator WILLIAMS. It was a ruling or policy.

POSITION OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

Senator MONRONEY. Well, I do not think the Postmaster General has ever ruled that this was acceptable. I mean this was always a theory, that the House could have these rights unless we specifically prohibited them.

The Postmaster General never got the opportunity to rule on this and it has been my feeling all along that he still did not feel that this was properly addressed. But he is here to testify later, and we can have his viewpoint on this.

Senator WILLIAMS. Of course, the reference in the House report was not to Members of the House of Representatives alone, but to Members of Congress, and so in effect their interpretation would be for both.

But I would hope that the amendment could be included as a part of the bill, and I hope also that there will be very strong language in the Senate report, reaffirming the position of the Senate.

POSSIBLE LACK OF FULL KNOWLEDGE

I am wondering if one reason that more was not said about it in the House is if it happened in the House, as it so often happens in the Senate, that the bill came out and was acted on so quickly that maybe the matter just did not catch somebody's eye.

Senator MONRONEY. No, I am sure that the people who were interested last year and who moved to recede and concur with the Senate amendment had knowledge of the proposal.

Senator WILLIAMS. The committee members would, yet, but I thought maybe some of the House Members would not.

Senator MONRONEY. These were the ones who led to the acceptance of the amendment last year by moving to recede and concur. Therefore, we will be faced with a very difficult, if not impossible, bargaining effort, if the past is a criterion of the future in this matter.

I would personally feel, if we are interested in the principle, which I am definitely interested in, we should not get ourselves into a position where the Senate at least cannot live by the rules that we think are proper for use of the franking privilege.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

If the House then wishes to have its own set of rules, it comes within the comity, I think, between the two Houses, to the degree that this is one of the privileges of the legislative body to determine what is frankable and what is not frankable.

It is not a rule, I must admit. It does not come within the prohibition of the Constitution. But growing out of the Constitution, and the principle that each House shall be the judge of its own rules, comes a feeling that makes it very difficult for the Senate to tell the House what to do and for the House to tell the Senate what to do.

Senator WILLIAMS. This may be one of many such controversial proposals we have before the Senate this year, and perhaps the experience we have in fighting this out may stand us in good stead with some of the others.

I would like to see at least an effort made.

QUESTION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

Senator SALTONSTALL. Would it be in order to ask the Postmaster General a question at this time?

Mr. Day, is it not true that with the expiration of the proviso in the 1963 act, the Post Office Department, under substantive law, can authorize Members of Congress to use a simplified address, or can prohibit its use?

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

**STATEMENT OF HON. J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL;
ACCOMPANIED BY FREDERICK C. BELEN, ASSISTANT POST-
MASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS; RALPH W. NICHOL-
SON, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF FINANCE;
AND LOUIS J. DOYLE, GENERAL COUNSEL**

MAIL PROHIBITION IN 1963 ACT

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, suppose there is no prohibition written into the act this year. The House bill as of today does not contain one. Would you not go back to the last action of Congress on this subject, which was the prohibition contained in the 1963 act?

Mr. DAY. We would feel that unless the Senate and the House agreed in indicating they wanted this type of privilege available for Members of Congress, we would not, as an administrative matter, make it available. We would stay with the present situation.

Of course, that is subject to the point that was touched upon by the chairman, and that is that if there was an indication that the Houses were agreeable to having the matter handled differently for the two respective Houses, we could do that, too.

QUESTION OF ACTING UNDER LATEST ACT OF CONGRESS

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, now, I realize that the House report indicates that you would go back to the provision enacted in 1961, under which there was authorized simplified mailings, but that act was 1 year before the prohibition enacted in the 1963 act.

Now, if the Senate report indicated the opposite view, would you not seek the last action of the Congress, and not language in the committee reports? And that last action is the prohibition contained in the 1963 act.

Mr. DAY. We would consider not so much the last action of the Congress, Senator, as we would the fact that this is a matter where the Department seeks to reflect what they feel is the will of Congress.

And if, because of the conflict in the reports of the two Houses at this time, there was not agreement as to how it should be done, we would decline to grant the privilege to either House, and we would in effect end up with the same result you described. We would stay exactly with the situation that was brought about as a result of the October 1962 legislation.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Then I think you have answered this question in the affirmative, but I would like to ask it: Accordingly, if the Senate report takes the position that local patron mail for Congress should not be reinstituted, because the Congress has spoken in the 1963 Appropriation Act, can you assure this committee you will not authorize the local patron simplified address for mailings in the future until the Congress takes affirmative action to the contrary, and that the policy during the fiscal year 1963 will prevail in the future until such time as the Congress sees fit to write additional legislation on the subject?

MEANING OF "SIMPLIFIED ADDRESSING"

Mr. DAY. In general, yes, Senator. But there is an important point that I must bring up that bears on Senator Williams' proposed amendment, and that is that there is no clear meaning of what "simplified addressing" means.

Now, our interpretation of Senator Williams' proposed amendment would liberalize the proposed situation, because it refers to permitting mail that either has the name of an addressee or is addressed to a specific street number.

Mail addressed to a specific street number is what we loosely refer to as "occupant mail," for city delivery. It is addressed: "Occupant, 5804 Brookside Drive, Boston." And that is not permitted under the present practice for congressional mail, but it is permitted for the general public to send, through city delivery, mail that has a street address, but does not have the name of the resident.

DIFFICULTY OF WRITING PROVISION INTO LAW

Senator SALTONSTALL. What I was trying to bring out was what the chairman was putting in questions to Mr. Williams.

I think there will be great difficulty, perhaps, in getting a provision written into the law, as Senator Williams suggests. Now, as far as I am concerned, I would like to see it in, but I do not know whether we could get it through conference.

But I think it is important that if the Senate does decide to put language in the bill, and that language is stricken, the Senate report indicate clearly the Senate position. And that would be of assistance to you, would it not, in carrying out affirmatively the statement that you have just made?

CLARIFICATION OF INTENT NECESSARY

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir. It is important, I think, that somewhere along the line we clarify what is the intention as to this specific type of mail, which involves not having the name of the addressee, but having the street on it, because that is a situation where Congress is denying to itself something that is available to the general public.

And the way we use the expression "simplified addressing," just for internal convenience in the Department, is that it has neither a name nor an address, simply to take a certain number of pieces, enough for each stop on a carrier's route, or for each box in the rural office, or for each box in the city office, and the carrier is instructed to leave one of those at each house.

That was tried a couple of times in years past, even for the general public, and it was highly unsatisfactory. The Department would never want to go back to that kind of a situation, where there is neither a name nor an address.

"OCCUPANT MAIL" PROVISION

But at the present time, and for a substantial period of time, it has been permissible for the general public to send mail which does not have the name of the resident on it and does not require the person sending out the mail to know the name of that resident. He simply says "occupant."

Senator MONRONEY. But puts the address on?

Mr. DAY. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. And as I understand it, that is a little different from the case that originated this dispute, where it was merely occupant mail, without any address whatever, or name. Is that not correct?

Mr. DAY. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Because the issue was originally that you were giving to the Congress privileges for mailing in a more simplified way that were not available to the general public.

METHODS OF HANDLING MAIL SHOWN

Mr. DAY. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I have a brief chart here that outlines the way that this has been handled in each of three periods, and I would like to submit this for the convenience of the committee.

It shows to whom various types of addresses were available prior to September 30, 1961, and then it shows what the situation was between September 30, 1961, and the action of Congress effective October 1962, then it shows the present situation, which started with October 1962.

And it shows over in the right-hand column our interpretation of Senator Williams' proposed amendment, which you will see is different from the present rule, in that it would permit the occupant mail, which is down there in the third box, under the heading, "To be available to Members of Congress," as it is now available to members of the general public.

The situation before September of 1961 was somewhat different than it was after that date, as shown down in the fourth box under the heading, because up until September of 1961 it had not been permissible to send mail either for Members of Congress or for the general public which had neither a name nor an address on it.

After September of 1961, as shown in the fourth box under the column, there, in the middle of the page, that privilege did become available only to Members of Congress. That was stricken out, along with other privileges, in October of 1962.

AMENDMENT NOT INTENDED TO LIBERALIZE RULING

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

I did not intend by this amendment to liberalize last year's ruling, and I think there is a misunderstanding here.

I merely reintroduced a copy of the same amendment that I introduced last year to get it before the committee. At that time the committee approved this language as section 105.

Do you have a copy of that here?

It reads:

No part of any amount appropriated in this act shall be available to finance under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails with a simplified form of address, under the franking privilege, by any Member or Member-elect of Congress, to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes.

Now, as I understand it, that was more restrictive than this amendment which was originally introduced.

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that at the time I introduced this amendment, so I would make this suggestion: That if we are going to act on this item, we incorporate—and I would like to modify my amendment to so read—the same language we approved last year.

If we are going to take this action, I think it would be much simpler to explain to the Senate that we were doing the same thing. At the same time it would be much simpler from the administrative standpoint of the Postmaster General to leave the rule as it was last year, if we are going to accept it.

Would that not be your recommendation, too?

QUESTION OF SAME PRIVILEGE AS PRIVATE MAIL

Mr. DAY. Well, we would leave the rule the same, Senator, if there is this disagreement.

I must say, in frankness, that I do not understand why Members of Congress should not have the same privileges as private individuals do in the use of occupant mail, which is different from what we called simplified address mail. But if the Senate indicates that they do not want any change from the existing situation, as I stated before, we will interpret that as a lack of agreement from the two Houses, and will leave the situation as it is at the present time.

Senator WILLIAMS. Then do I understand that this amendment, as it is now printed, merely gives to Members of Congress the same privileges that are extended to private industries, and no greater ones?

Mr. DAY. That is correct. That is shown in our analysis of the amendment in this last column.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would leave it to the discretion of the committee as to which procedure you adopted. I prefer last year's language.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMENDMENTS

Senator MONRONEY. I am not clear now on exactly the difference between these two amendments.

Senator WILLIAMS. As I understand it, the amendment would extend to Members of Congress only those privileges which are now extended to every other citizen.

The amendment which was finally approved last year by your committee was a new section 105, which further restricted privileges in that it insisted upon all mail being addressed.

Now, I would like for the Postmaster General to comment as to whether I am correct in that explanation of the difference between the two amendments.

Mr. DAY. Yes. The difference is that the general public is permitted, in city delivery offices, to send mail that does not have the name, or any name, for an addressee, that merely uses the term "Occupant," or "Postal patron."

And the Congress, by its action of October 2, 1962, in section 105, which has been referred to, prohibited even that type of occupant mail, although that type of mail is available to any member of the general public.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, the occupant mail with the address, the street address, is available to third-class users?

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE ESSENTIAL

Senator WILLIAMS. I think that it is important that we act. Personally, I have always defended the franking privilege as being essential for the administration of our offices, just the same as it is essential for the Postmaster General in carrying out his duties.

But I do think that it should be used and confined to answering our bona fide mail. Personally, I do not see where the occasion arises that I should have to write to a man when I do not know his name.

I think that in carrying out the functions of our office we, as Members of Congress, would have the name of the man to whom we are writing, and I would be more than willing to limit mailing as it was limited last year. I will leave both proposals here for the committee to study.

SAME PRIVILEGE AS GENERAL PUBLIC

Senator MONRONEY. As far as I am concerned, I would be happy for the Senate to observe that rule.

I have always believed that we should never use the frank for a privilege that the general public does not have. This is why I have supported the Senator's amendment consistently. We did not want to establish a precedent under the franking policy of just saying, "Occupant," without any address whatever, and flood the States or cities with 10,000 letters, if we desired, merely having "Occupant."

Senator WILLIAMS. Both proposals, of course, would stop that.

DIFFERENCE ONLY IN CITY DELIVERY

Mr. DAY. I do not want to get this any more complicated than it is, but I should point out, in order to be sure that it is all on the record, that the differences I am describing between the Senator's amendment and the present situation relate only to city delivery offices.

But there are two other situations, even under Senator Williams' amendment, and under the existing law, where Congress does not have the right to use a form of address that can be used by the general public.

This relates to rural routes where the general public can have less of an address than a Member of Congress can, and it also relates to boxholders at offices that do not have city delivery.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be the third- or fourth-class office, would it not?

Mr. DAY. For the most part; yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we understood, or I did, that we were eliminating that right. Congress does not need it.

The reason that this other point slipped by me is, I suppose, the same reason that it slipped by your notice. Neither of us had used it, and I had not heard of any other Member of the Senate missing it, so in the absence of any of us trying to use it, none of us missed it.

MEMBERS LOSE PRIVILEGES PUBLIC HAS

Senator MONRONEY. Would the Senator tell me whether, under his interpretation of his amendment that is before us today, as written, the user of the frank would have the right to do all of the things that the general public can do?

Senator WILLIAMS. No.

Senator MONRONEY. Or that we would be under the same prohibition that we are under as the law stands, as the appropriation act limitations stand, as of today, but which expire with the closing of this fiscal year?

Senator WILLIAMS. Under either of the proposals, the amendment, as it is printed or the amendment as it was approved last year, provides that Members of Congress would lose, as I understand it, some

of the privileges which are accorded to private business in that we would not be permitted to send a thousand unaddressed letters just marked "Occupant" to a certain post office in Delaware or somewhere, with the instructions that they be delivered to every boxholder in rural routes, or to put one in each box.

I do not think we should have that privilege. Both amendments did restrict that. Because if it were not restricted, you would have wholesale circulative powers which I do not think are a part of our duties. It was intentionally precluded, that phase of it.

Senator MONRONEY. Was that in your amendment?

Senator WILLIAMS. That is in the amendment as introduced, and also in the amendment approved last year.

Senator MONRONEY. But as I understand it, that portion that expanded the prohibition beyond what the general public was entitled to come in through the House.

Senator WILLIAMS. No, I do not think so. It was a part of the amendment as it was introduced originally, because I specifically was intending to stop the right of Members of Congress to send thousands of letters with no addresses by just looking in the postal directory, counting the boxholders, and sending 500 to this office, 750 to that office, to see that they are completely circulated. That was restricted in both proposals.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT MORE RESTRICTED

Now, the difference between the amendment which was finally approved by your committee last year and the amendment as it was first submitted to the committee is that you went one step further in approving the amendment last year by denying Members of Congress the right to send mail to cities, with addresses only but without the names.

Now, the amendment which was approved last year prevented that. The amendment originally submitted to the committee continued that privilege if you had the address.

As I say, I would prefer seeing that restriction continued.

Senator MONRONEY. As you understand it, then, your amendment would continue the right to send mail to an occupant, if the address was included? If the city address was included on the envelope?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. It would have to be the exact address.

Senator MONRONEY. But rural boxholders or post office boxholders of third- and fourth-class offices—that mailing would be denied to members using the frank, even though it is available to the general public?

Senator WILLIAMS. That is right.

Mr. DAY. Just one moment, Mr. Chairman.

It would not continue, as far as occupant mail is concerned. It would reinstitute it, in permitting occupant mail for Congressmen. It is not permitted at the moment.

Senator MONRONEY. Under the old law, passed last year?

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir.

CONTINUE LAW AS LAST YEAR

Senator WILLIAMS. And as I stated, I did not know that this amendment when I submitted it this year went further than the amendment which was approved last year. It was not so intended, and that is the reason that I hope the committee will consider the adoption of the amendment as we approved it last year.

I think that the action of the committee last year cleared this situation up far better even than the original amendment, and I would like to recommend that we continue the law as it was approved last year. As I understand it, the Postmaster General will continue to interpret it so in the absence of an agreement of both Houses of Congress to the contrary; is that correct?

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir, and in the absence of an indication that the Houses are willing to or wish to have it handled differently for each House.

LANGUAGE OF AMENDMENT

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, as I understand it, that could be accomplished by just striking out "or is addressed to" on page 2 of the original amendment; is that correct?

Senator MONRONEY. I have the language of the amendment here, which I would like to read. It is page 141 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act. It reads as follows:

Section 105. No part of any amount appropriated in this act shall be available to finance under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivery of mail matters sent through the mails, with a simplified form of address, under the franking privileges, by any Member or Member-elect of Congress, to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes.

This was the language?

Senator WILLIAMS. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. And this is what the Senator would like to amend his amendment to read?

PRESENT AMENDMENT WOULD BE PERMANENT LAW

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. Of course, the amendment as I offered it would be permanent law, rather than just a rider on the appropriation bill. This would be a rider, but the amendment you read, would not be a permanent change in the law.

But I would like to see this adopted, and I think it would be more appropriate because then it would not be legislation.

Senator MONRONEY. You understand, we have to either put it on the appropriation bill, in which case it will be legislation on the appropriation bill, or it will have to go to another committee.

Senator WILLIAMS. But I say I would like to see this same language, as we approved it last year, continued.

LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Senator MONRONEY. I would like to ask the staff: Will this be legislation on an appropriation bill, and require two-thirds?

Mr. SCOTT. Senator Williams' amendment this year is legislation and would be subject to a point of order. His amendment last year was a limitation.

Senator WILLIAMS. But this is a limitation and would not require that. That is the difference.

I would recommend that we adopt last year's language, which is not legislation on an appropriation bill, but which does achieve the same purpose and the same objective.

POSSIBILITY OF PRESENT RULE REMAINING

Senator MONRONEY. Let me ask the Postmaster General: If this is presented and is defeated or amended, then would that be legislative history that would be adverse to the position you have testified to, that in the absence of action by either House to amend, you would consider the last action of the Congress to be controlling?

Mr. DAY. It is hard to predict all the various things that might happen, Mr. Chairman, but my answer was that if we got from the reports or otherwise an indication that the Houses were in disagreement about changing the present situation, we would leave the rules as they are at the present time. And we might get that in various ways.

The House report is not legislation. It recognizes that this is a matter within the administrative discretion of the Department, and urges it upon us. But if we felt the Senate was urging us not to do it, we would let the two urges cancel each other out.

Senator MONRONEY. But if the Senate has attempted to take affirmative action to continue the provision of last year, and should we lose, then this would not give you the validation of your position that until changed by Congress you must assume that the old law applies?

Mr. DAY. Well, I think we have to rely only upon what is on the record, and if there is nothing on the record showing the Senate disapproving of any change, we would have to take into account the House's statement.

INTERPRETATION UNDER SENATE FAILURE TO ACT

Senator MONRONEY. If the Senate failed to act favorably, though, on the amendment that was identical, last year, then what would your interpretation be? That the Senate had reversed its position of support for the language that we operate under this year?

Mr. DAY. I looked to the report of the Senate and the action that was taken by the full Senate on that report, just as we have on the House side now. We have the report, and we have the discussion on the floor of the bill, including the references to that report.

One thing also that should be emphasized is that if this section 105 is reenacted, even if it is in the law, while it is not legislation and is only a limitation, it would only last for 1 year, as I am sure you realize.

QUESTION OF ANNUAL APPLICATION ONLY

Senator MONRONEY. You say it would only last for 1 year?

Mr. DAY. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Then how can you determine, since it is a limitation and not legislation—and this is what is in the law today—that this continues beyond the 1 year?

Mr. DAY. Well, we only are planning to continue an administrative policy which is consistent with what is now in the law. We do not consider that after June 30 of 1963, there is a law that would prohibit us from granting various forms of simplified address to congressional mail.

We are merely seeking from the reports or elsewhere an indication of what Congress wants us to do, because we can do it either way. And our position is that if there is an indication from the action of the two Houses of disagreement between them, we will, as an administrative matter, continue in effect the practice which is now brought about by section 105.

ACTION UNDER SENATE APPROVAL

Senator WILLIAMS. As I understand it, if the Senate approves section 105 as a part of our bill and it goes to conference, even though in that conference there should be a deadlock, and the section should be eliminated, you would recognize that as disagreement, and therefore you would continue the present interpretation of section 105?

Mr. DAY. That is correct, Senator.

It is very hard for me to predict everything that might be said and might happen as a result of that conference, but I am sure we are in agreement as to the general proposition.

IMPORTANCE OF ACCEPTANCE

Senator WILLIAMS. I appreciate that. I think it is more important that we accept it, Mr. Chairman.

And another point is that whole we hope that the present Postmaster General will be with us for a long time, the officers do change as time goes along and the next one may put another interpretation on it.

Therefore I think it would be important for the Congress to face this issue and keep this as a part of the bill. I do not think it is quite fair to put the Postmaster General in the position of having to rule between the two Houses.

EACH HOUSE MAKES OWN RULES

Senator MONRONEY. I think it would be fine if we could make our decisions and live with them. This was why I leaned toward fixing our rules and letting the other body fix theirs, feeling that there can be no argument, then, as to how each House stands on it, and that this would avoid confusion that is otherwise bound to occur.

If they wish to take the responsibility for simplified addressing, or for no address at all, and would provide for that in their amendment to our amendment for their own guidance on franking, then I think it would be perfectly simple for the Postmaster General to abide by that.

I think you are going to have confusion, though, if in the passage of this bill section 105 were introduced as an amendment, and if it should be voted down completely, to have the Postmaster General say that the position of the Senate is uncertain, because the legislative history then would certainly indicate recent Senate action in not continuing for another year this limitation.

Senator WILLIAMS. I am a natural born optimist, and I think we can pass it.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, it has passed frequently, and we have had no trouble in the Senate in the passing of it, but in getting it into being, we have had a great deal of trouble in the conferences. And the Senator well knows that.

EFFECT OF AMENDMENT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senator WILLIAMS. We should not have so much trouble in the conference since it is being hooked on the bill which involves our own pay.

Senator MONRONEY. This does not involve just the pay of the Senators, but it involves the staffs and clerks and everybody, so it is not just as simple as penalizing the Congressmen.

Senator WILLIAMS. But there is an incentive to get it done whereas before we were under the handicap we could not afford to let the Post Office Department go without its appropriation.

I hope that the committee will accept a continuation of the language of last year.

POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT

Senator MONRONEY. We will take this under advisement.

I regret deeply that the full membership of our committee is not here to have the advantage of this oral testimony, both the valuable statements from the Postmaster General and the distinguished Postmaster General and his staff.

I wonder whether, in the final analysis, if the Senate in conference should recede from the Williams amendment, if passed, it would not then be possible to say that the House and Senate are in agreement.

Having passed it in the Senate, even, and having gone to conference, assuming we would lose it in conference, would it not then appear that we were in agreement with the House position?

Senator WILLIAMS. I would say if we went to conference, and gave up the amendment, and back without putting up a fight for it, yes; but that will not happen.

Senator MONRONEY. I have long since learned that you can never tell what is going to happen in conference.

Senator WILLIAMS. No, I cannot tell what will happen, we may lose it in conference, but I do not think it would come back and be accepted so graciously.

The Senate may very well do as it did before, and insist upon its amendment. I think we can, and I think we will be successful. I think that there is considerable sentiment on the part of both houses to clear this up.

I would defend use of the franking privilege for any Member of Congress for the answering of our legitimate mail. It was never intended, as I review it, that we use this franking privilege to propagandize our constituents.

CAMPAIGN ADVANTAGES OF INCUMBENTS

We have an election year coming up. The incumbent Member of Congress running for reelection would have a decided advantage, then, over his opponent in that he can circulate all of his constituency at the taxpayers' expense. I think that would be wrong.

And if we, as we sometimes do, have a Member of Congress who gets interested in running for the Presidency in the absence of any change, and going back to the old law, he could pretty much circulate the United States at the taxpayers' expense.

I think it would be wrong to put the Postmaster General in any such position where he would have to rule on this. I think that we in Congress have a responsibility to decide it.

Senator MONRONEY. I would much prefer to have the Congress rule on it, myself. But what I am after is an effective final decision on this, and to have something in the act that we can live with and also something that will pass and get through the conference committee.

SENATE 1963 ACTION SATISFACTORY

Senator WILLIAMS. I have not heard a single Member of the Senate complain about what we did last year.

Senator MONRONEY. I have not. I think everyone was satisfied.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think everyone was perfectly satisfied, and it closed it off in a very effective manner. I do not think we could improve upon the action that we took last year.

PRESENT LANGUAGE OF SECTION 105

Senator MONRONEY. But I want to ask the Postmaster General, while he is here with his experts, about the language of section 105 under the simplified form of address under the franking privilege.

This still would prohibit, would it not, occupant mail, if addressed to a street address?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes, sir, it would.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, in connection with that particular paragraph, section 105, there is a technical point.

This has nothing to do with the policy problem we are facing, but there is a technical point that I believe should be entered in the record.

In the bill before you, the 1964 bill, the item available to us in 1963 is for payment of work done by us in 1962. During 1962, the Congress did authorize, and we did incur expense for, franked mail with the simplified address form.

EFFECT ON POST OFFICE OF LANGUAGE

The actual or specific language in section 105, if repeated, would prevent us from getting reimbursement for work properly done in the year when it was done.

I would like to suggest that you consider adding just a few words. After the sentence where it reads, "Delivering of mail matter sent through the mails," insert the words "after October 2, 1962," and then continue with the rest of the section.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, from July 1 to October 2, it was permissive, as to any of the franking privileges that might have been used?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Actually a longer term than that, Mr. Chairman. In the fiscal year 1962, when this work was done for which we are being reimbursed in the 1964 appropriation bill, simplified address

mail actually started on October 16, 1961, and ran in this fiscal year that we are discussing, until June 30, 1962.

Again, next year, there will be an increment of the fiscal year 1963, when this mail was valid.

So the general statement that the money is not to be used for reimbursement for any such mail carried after October 2 would be a blanket authority for us to use reimbursement for work done when it was proper for us to have had that form of address.

Senator MONRONEY. I see. Fine. I thank you very much for that information, and the staff will take note of that being the date at which this would be effective.

DEPARTMENT FORCED TO LOOK TO RECORD

Mr. DAY. I think, Mr. Chairman, we should emphasize again, from the Department's standpoint, that there is a vague area here that has been recognized by all concerned, as to what would happen if there were a conference on this section, and it completely disappeared from the legislation.

I think it is unpredictable what we would have to rely on in the way of legislative history. And we would have to look at the record, rather than what we might know from our conversations and communications.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think, if I might interject, I can understand the Postmaster General's position on that, and I think that merely emphasizes the importance of establishing a record upon which we could rely.

But that is our responsibility, and I think we should therefore insist on an amendment.

But I also think, that in the absence of the Senate's recognition of this problem, and just saying we do not even make an effort to put section 105 in but merely accept the House rejection of it, you would be in a position of almost having to accept that as the will of both houses.

So I think we do have a responsibility. I think we have a responsibility to submit this reinstatement of section 105 and insisting upon its retention.

SENATE ACTION COULD BE DEFINITIVE

Senator MONRONEY. I also feel that you could get definitive action, which I am sure would be finalized, without too much difficulty in conference, if the Senate was to observe section 105 and leave it to the judgment of the House whether it chose to use its interpretation for franked mail on the Senate side.

That is bearing in mind that it does not, as it is prepared, and as the Senator wishes to give it, deny to those using occupant mail the privileges of the public that Senators and others are assuming for themselves.

Senator WILLIAMS. Of course I think it is a matter of principle embracing the Members of both Houses of Congress. The House recognized that. There are plenty of precedents for this. It has been dealt with before as a problem concerning both.

And we have before the Rules Committee now the so-called Burleson bill, which deals with accountability of Members of Congress as to funds, and that affects both the House and the Senate.

When you come to a question like this, which is a matter of principle, I think it is something that we must recognize. If it is wrong, it is wrong, equally wrong whether a man be in the Senate or in the House.

HOUSE ATTITUDE

Senator MONRONEY. But the Senator's persuasive arguments in the Senate are not heard in the Halls of the House.

Senator WILLIAMS. They were last year, and I have great confidence they will be equally loud this year.

Senator MONRONEY. That would be fine. But the House has taken action not to enact this, you see, which leaves us in a quandary as to whether it would be successful or not.

Senator WILLIAMS. Maybe the House is just trying the Senate out. If we stand pat I think they will know we mean business.

STATEMENT ON FRANKED MAIL PROPOSED

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, if the committee agrees, we would like to submit for the record a statement as to the volume of this type of franked mail, because there has been a reference to an increase between fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962.

This is only for information and not argument on one side or the other. But while there was a big increase between 1961 and 1962, 1961 represented a very large drop from fiscal year 1960. Fiscal year 1960 was almost the same number of pieces as there were in fiscal 1962.

So I think that it might be helpful to the committee, for their record, to have the number of pieces since we began receiving reimbursement for congressional mailings, which began in fiscal year 1954.

Senator MONRONEY. Yes, sir; we will welcome that for the record, sir.

(The information referred to, together with Senator Moss' statement, follows:)

Congressional mailings

[Millions of pieces]

Fiscal years	Franked mail		Congressional mailings by Government Printing Office	
	Pieces	Percent of increase or decrease (—)	Pieces	Percent of increase or decrease (—)
1954.....	43.5		(1)	
1955.....	45.6	4.8	6.4	
1956.....	58.2	27.7	5.3	-17.2
1957.....	59.6	2.4	5.4	1.9
1958.....	65.4	9.8	6.2	14.8
1959.....	85.5	30.6	6.0	-3.2
1960.....	108.0	26.4	7.2	20.0
1961.....	85.1	-21.3	5.9	-18.1
1962.....	110.1	29.6	7.4	25.4

¹ Not available.

Simplified address mail (sec. 123.4, Postal Manual)

Simplified address mail		To whom available, prior to Sept. 30, 1961	To whom available, Sept. 30, 1961 to Oct. 2, 1962	To whom available, Oct. 2, 1962 to date	Effect of proposed Williams' amendment
Sent to—	Address required				
(a) Rural route, any office.	(a) Postal patron, local or rural route boxholder, local.	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.	(1) General public only.	(1) General public only.
(b) Boxholders at offices that do not have city or village delivery service.	(b) Postal patron, local or post. office boxholder, local.	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.	(1) General public only.	(1) General public only.
(c) Residents or box holders at offices having city or village delivery service.	(c) Occupant: street address (or box number), name of city and State (or local).	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.	(1) General public only.	(1) General public. (2) Members of Congress.
(d) Residents or box holders at offices having city or village delivery service.	(d) Postal patron, local.	Not available to anyone (previously available to anyone during period Oct. 12, 1934 to July 1, 1935 and from Aug. 21, 1953 to Mar. 31, 1955).	(2) Members of Congress only.	Not available to anyone.	Not available to anyone.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH

Senator Monroney and members of the subcommittee, I think it is always discouraging when a job has been done, and done well and with justification, to find that it has to be done all over again.

In the second session of the 87th Congress I appeared before this subcommittee to urge that the "occupant" mail privilege for Members of Congress be rescinded—and I gave what I felt were very persuasive arguments for doing so. I was most gratified when the subcommittee recommended rescinding the so-called junk mail privilege of franked mail, and even more so when the recommendation was accepted on the Senate floor, and finally, after prolonged argument, by the House conferees.

Now I learn that the House Appropriations Committee has removed the restriction in section 105 of the 1963 law from the legislative appropriation bill (H.R. 6868) in an effort to repeal the work done last session, and that the House has passed the bill in this form.

I have read carefully the section in the House report on the bill (H. Rept. 369) which gives committee reasoning behind rescinding the ban on franked mail carrying a simplified address—that is, an address for "Postal Patron" or "Rural Route Patron" or "Boxholder," rather than the full name and address of the person to whom the mail is directed. The report quotes statistics intended to prove that the use of the simplified mailing address for city delivery for 8 months in fiscal 1962 did not greatly increase the volume of mail over a similar period in 1960 when the city bulk mailing privilege was not in effect. I do not think the argument is valid, on two counts:

First, the periods are not wholly comparable. One was a presidential campaign year, and one was not. We all know that there is more informative material sent out on records of the Congress and the administration in a presidential campaign year than in an off-presidential year—if for no other reason than that there is usually greater discussion of the issues. Mass mailings are likely to use the simplified address.

Second, any real reduction in volume cannot be ascertained until there has been time to assess the effect of the withdrawal of the privilege of sending rural route bulk mail under the frank. The rural route bulk mail privilege has been available to Members of Congress, without interruption, since June 1932. It has been widely used to send to farmers along every route and in every small town the famous farm bulletin order list from the Department of Agriculture. So until we can get a full assessment on the volume of congressional mail since the withdrawal of the use of the frank for simplified address mailings to rural areas, I don't think we can decide whether or not the action taken by the Senate has or has not cut franked mailing costs. However, I see no purpose in prolonging the argument on this aspect of the case. This subcommittee and the U.S. Senate decided last session that the privilege of franked "occupant" mail to both cities and rural areas should be rescinded for a number of solid reasons, and those reasons are just as solid today as they were a year ago.

The bulk mail privilege is used by users of a third-class mail permit—by the small businessman who is trying to get word to his neighborhood customers about the special in his cleaning shop, or in his grocery store. Last session we considerably increased the amount the advertiser or the commercial user of this type of service must pay.

Why should we give to ourselves the privilege of spending as much mail as we wish, as often as we wish, simply to "Occupant" in the cities, and to "Postal Patron" on "Boxholder" or "Rural Route Patron" in the small towns and out along the rural routes, when we have limited the man who uses mail to make a living. If the House bill is allowed to stand, we are placing a "no limit" sign on the use of the frank, a "no limit" sign on the number of times we can mass mail our opinions into every home in our congressional district or our State.

Some of the people are already resentful of "junk mail" from commercial and business firms. We know that from our own mail. Why add to that resentment by sending them "junk mail" under the frank?

Out of respect to both our constituents and to ourselves, I feel we should continue the ban on use of the simplified mailing address under the frank, and limit our mail to that which is properly and individually addressed to each person or family whom we wish to reach. To do otherwise is of questionable morality. I sincerely hope that this subcommittee will amend the bill before it to prevent the expenditure of any funds appropriated for the sending of either

"occupant" mail to the cities, or "boxholder" or "rural route patron" mail outside of the cities.

STATEMENT ON COMITY

Senator MONRONEY. Our next witness is our distinguished colleague in the Senator, Senator Douglas, who has asked to appear before the committee with reference to a matter that was put into the legislative appropriation bill on the House side.

This is a matter the nature of which I am sure the Senator is familiar with. Like Gaul, all legislative appropriation bills are divided into three parts. There is the House side of the appropriation bill, and the Senate side, with the Senate taking primary jurisdiction in its field, in the Senate side, without reference to the House action. The House, on its part, passes its appropriation for the House without language in the bill referring to the items in the Senate.

Then there are the joint items, in which we consistently join together in the consideration of legislation, which applies to the central part of the Capitol.

So this is the matter that we discussed informally the other day, regarding the comity between the two Houses and the jurisdictions that traditionally have been recognized in the area of appropriating authority of the two Houses.

Senator, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM
THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGROUND GARAGES

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you very much, Senator.

I am accompanied by my legislative assistant, Mr. Kenneth E. Gray, and also by Mr. James B. Hodgson, Jr., who represents the Capitol Hill Restoration Society and the Capitol Hill Community Council, and with whom I have taken advice and counsel on this matter.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify.

Senator MONRONEY. The Senator will testify in his own behalf; will he not?

Senator DOUGLAS. That is right.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the fiscal year 1964 appropriations bill for the legislative branch.

I am here specifically to recommend that this subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee reject the pending request of the Architect of the Capitol for \$8 million to construct two 3-level underground garages on lots identified as squares 637 and 691, south of the Longworth and Rayburn Buildings, or the second and third House Office Buildings.

H.R. 6868 includes an appropriation of \$4,625,000 for expenditures in fiscal year 1964 for construction of the proposed garages, with the remainder of the \$8 million to be requested later.

DETAILED PLAN DEMANDED

I believe that this money should not be appropriated, and that no funds should be appropriated for planning or construction affecting these two lots, 637 and 691, nor any of the other vacant lots surround-

ing the Capitol and Library buildings, until both Houses of Congress approve a detailed plan based on a thorough study encompassing the proposal for the Madison Memorial, the additional facilities for the Library of Congress, additional parking lots or garages above or below ground, and all other proposals to extend the facilities of the Capitol.

Such a study and plan should include consideration of President Kennedy's request that Congress authorize the construction of a mass transit system along the lines suggested by the National Capital Transportation Agency, a competent projection of the actual needs of the Library of Congress, and a decision on the proposals for a Capitol Hill Visitors Center, with peripheral parking and bus transportation to the Capitol, probably located in Southeast Washington, along the lines of the Visitors Center already established in Williamsburg.

To proceed with blind and segmented decisions such as the proposed parking garages before a comprehensive plan is decided upon will result in extreme and unnecessary waste of public funds.

CONSTRUCTION UNWARRANTED AND UNJUSTIFIED

Moreover, I am thoroughly convinced, even aside from the close relationship this proposal for two additional underground garages bears to the overall development of Capitol Hill, that these proposed underground garages are unwarranted and unjustified, as I think I will show later, as well as excessively expensive.

I know it is claimed by some that whatever developments take place on the House side are no business of the Senate, and I fancied that I detected some reflection of this sentiment in the initial statements of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee.

SENATE SHOULD EXERCISE RESPONSIBILITY

But I think it is high time, in view of the record of the fantastic bungling of the Architect of the Capitol, that the Senate should exercise its full responsibility in these matters, which involve such wasteful and ridiculous expenditures of public funds.

The present proposal for additional underground garages is one more in the long series of the Architect's pig-in-a-poke proposals to Congress. We are only given a glimpse into the bag each time, so that each irreversible step forces us to grant more and more funds to support the illogical, wasteful, and grotesque development of Capitol Hill.

The history of the development of the Capitol Hill buildings and facilities during recent years is resplendent in examples of architectural mismanagement on the part of our "Architect without diplomas," as the Washington Post recently described him.

SENATE OFFICE MISTAKES

We can all recall the bungling of the Senate Office Building project in which we now meet; the lavish waste of this building, floors which lead nowhere, the misplacement of elevators, the decorative monstrosities placed on the walls of the hearing rooms so as to inflict bumps on the heads of Senators, the covering over of the expensive floor tiling

with an even more expensive carpeting, the clocks with hands too massive for the mechanism to turn, and so on.

We can all recall the circumstances surrounding the construction of the two new tunnels and the subway car systems to the Senate wing of the Capitol, which cost far more than planned, and the extraordinary case of the expensive new subway cars which wore out their wheels every week or so, with the result that both new tracks and a rubber tire system became necessary to install, at high cost.

EARLIER PARKING PLANS

I am sure that the case of the parking palace which the Architect of the Capitol proposed to build underneath the Capitol plaza is still fresh in the minds of this subcommittee, for from my reading of this year's hearings, the Architect has not yet given up on this venture which is to cost seven times more per parking space than comparable underground garages built in Chicago and Boston.

And I may say the record of the Boston underground garage is not very handsome.

When I raised questions about the plaza garage proposal last year, I was first told that I was imagining things, but I later presented evidence that it was part of the plans of the Architect.

PLANNING WITHOUT AUTHORITY

In fact, the record may show that the Architect, without any approval from Congress, placed the footings for such a plaza garage under the east front extension of the Capitol.

This extension of the east front has been carried through at a cost of \$24 million, the most expensive real estate venture, I suppose, in the history of the world, in terms of cubic feet of space obtained—over the objection of the American Institute of Architects. But our Architect insisted that this was necessary to keep the dome from falling.

EXTENSION OF CAPITOL

Now, this brings us to his present proposal to extend the west front of the Capitol—the west front—at a cost of \$20 million. And what is the reason? It is the same alleged reason; namely, to keep the Capitol dome from falling.

We did it once at \$24 million. Now we have got to do it again at a cost of \$20 million more.

RAYBURN OFFICE BUILDING

It was only 2 weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, that it was revealed that the Architect neglected, in planning the third House Office Building, to provide direct access between each Representative's personal office and his main staff office, negligence which it is estimated will require at least \$169,000 for correction.

In view of all that has gone before, I quake even to think about the joyful days the newspapers will have in the future, reporting the errors which will become apparent when the Rayburn Building is opened. But the record is there, and I am sure that the mistakes in the new House Office Building will be directly proportional to the

fantastic cost of that structure, which probably will be in excess of \$80 million.

As each of these and the other blunders and extravagances come to the attention of the public, congressional responsibility is denied, on the grounds that it was solely the responsibility of the other body.

The Senate lays the blame on the House, and says, "We can't interfere with the House."

The House lays the blame on the Senate, and says, "We can't interfere with the Senate."

And then, as the chairman implies, there is this "no man's land" in front of the rotunda of the Capitol.

Or it is said that the authorizing legislation, passed in 1955, leaves us no choice.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

I think it is time that these shibboleths be exposed for what they are, and the Congress, as a whole, assume its responsibility for practicing the economy it appears to espouse.

One way, it appears, to become responsible is to appoint a qualified architect, which this gentleman is not.

MEASURES TO BE INTRODUCED

I will reintroduce, shortly, the bill which I first introduced in 1959, to require that the Architect of the Capitol be a qualified architect, and that he be appointed by the Congress, rather than by the President, as is now the case. I may propose this bill on the floor as an amendment to the legislative branch appropriation bill, which you are now studying, although I suppose it is susceptible to a point of order, which I hope will not be raised.

Also, I shall introduce amendments to this appropriation bill which would forbid the use of any funds therein appropriated for planning, construction, or any other work related to the proposal to extend the west front of the Capitol.

But today I wish to call to your attention a method by which your subcommittee and the Senate can at least hold the line against buying further "pigs in a poke."

BLANK CHECK GIVEN

I understand, although I do not agree with, the reluctance of some to risk irritating certain powerful Members of the House, and I know all too well the text of the authorizing legislation. Indeed, the legislation, the so-called Additional House Office Building Act, of 1955, gives a blank check to the House Office Building Commission and the Architect.

I believe it to be one of the most irresponsible acts of Congress in recent years. It was not a law considered carefully in the customary manner. It was pushed through as a last-minute floor amendment to a supplemental appropriation bill, contrary to the rule of the House. An objection was raised to legislating in an appropriation bill, but it was gavelled down by the man who was in the chair on the spurious grounds that the objector was not recognized.

ACTION OF SENATE

What is even more remarkable is that the Senate committee not only kept the blank check in the bill, but expanded the already broad authorization. In addition to authorizing an additional building, the Senate committee amended the bill to include changes in present buildings and additions to the subway system, provided unlimited authority to the Commission to acquire any property it desired south of Independence Avenue, and raised the initial appropriation from the \$2 million approved by the House to \$5 million.

A full statement of these proceedings on the Senate side is contained in the Congressional Record for April 14, 1955 (pp. 4444 and 4445). From reading this, it is apparent that it was put through with virtually no one on the floor, with no understanding by the Members of the Senate as to what was happening, and it constituted a blanket grant of authority to the House Building Commission for everything south of Independence Avenue.

Now let me point something out here to those who would say the Senate cannot properly concern itself with the parking garages, because they are a House matter.

SENATE COMMITTEE EXTENDED HOUSE POWERS

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate wrote the authorizing legislation in this matter. It was the Senate committee that proposed the extension of the powers of the House committee.

It cannot be argued both ways.

If it was proper for the Senate to provide the broader authority, and of course avoid the problem of House rules, then it is entirely proper and necessary for us to see what we are buying with the blank check.

The Senate amendment, I am sorry to say, passed without discussion, and the conferees, to no one's surprise, adopted it. No further objection was raised in the House, and the bill was signed by President Eisenhower.

The record will show, however, that I opposed this supplemental bill, although I did yield to the argument that the House Office Building amendment was a House matter, and so did not raise specific objections to that point.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we should consider closely the relationship of the parking garages now proposed to the overall development of Capitol Hill, to stop this megalomaniac and fantastically expensive program of the Capitol Architect and his cohorts.

PENDING PROPOSALS

It is my understanding that the following proposals, among others affecting the expansion and improvement of Capitol Hill, are pending.

First, additional parking facilities on the House side in the form of the two underground garages, for which an appropriation of \$4,625,000 is in H.R. 6868, to have a total cost of approximately \$8 million.

Second, the James Madison Memorial, proposed for the cleared site south of Independence, and immediately east of the Old House Office Building, in block 732, which, according to plans of influential

Members of the House, may take the form of a mausoleum or a monument with landscaping, a memorial library, a small memorial library, or a monument with subgrade vaults for storage of Presidential papers.

Third, additional facilities for the Library of Congress, the Architect's plans for which, according to some reports, certainly initially call for the two blocks east of the Library Annex initially, and as to which there have been adumbrations that it is the plan of the Capitol Architect to take the entire area from Third Street to 11th Street.

It is my further understanding that the forms which the Madison Memorial and the Library proposals will take have not been determined. This being so, it seems to me to be wholly unjustified to proceed with the construction of underground garages in squares 637 and 671.

MADISON MEMORIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY

It may well be, and I personally believe it should be, that the Madison Memorial, on block 732, can be combined with the largest segment of the Congressional Library's additional facilities.

You will note that it is right next to the main building of the Library of Congress. If this were done, you could have a library building called the Madison Memorial Library, with an interior court and fountain and a statue of Madison there, and have great storage facilities for books, and with underground storage facilities either for books or for automobiles, or for both.

And this would mean that the two blocks east of the Library Annex and of the Folger Building would not have to be taken. This would effect a great saving, both in land acquisition costs and on construction costs.

Square 732, the proposed site for the Madison Memorial, is 40 per cent larger than the blocks east of the Library Annex, and hence ought to have enough space for the library and a memorial.

Moreover, a library memorial on square 732, combined with additional library facilities on the nearby squares, certainly would be adequate.

RIGHTS OF AREA RESIDENTS

The people of this area of Capitol Hill, as well as the general taxpayers across the country, have a right to have these possibilities fully investigated before irretrievable constructions are undertaken on the vacant land south and east of the Capitol complex.

To my knowledge, the residents of this area have not had a fair hearing, and I believe they should have it, and from the Congress, not just in the form of letters to the editor columns of the Washington newspapers.

Mr. Chairman, no matter what resolution is made of the Madison Memorial and Library proposals, it would be my judgment be folly to construct the proposed garages at this time. Undoubtedly other buildings and facilities will be needed on Capitol Hill in the next few decades, in addition to these two garages.

NO LATER CONSTRUCTION POSSIBLE

If underground garages are constructed on lots 637 and 691, it may subsequently be found that one of the other projects or related structures will be better located on these blocks. But the construction of these garages at this time would forestall any possibility of including these areas in the needed overall planning for the Capitol complex.

The present plan, as I understand, is to have park and lawns on the surface and garages underneath, but unless proper foundations are laid within the underground garages, no facility could be constructed on top of the garages later. There would not be a heavy enough under-structure.

What the Architect asks us to do is to play a blind game of chess, with the squares surrounding the Capitol, a game in which the taxpayers are certain to be the losers.

But important as is the need for comprehensive planning before acting, Mr. Chairman, and comprehensive planing by both Houses, instead of one House presenting the Congress and the country with an ultimatum, I also believe that the Senate should reject this parking garage appropriation because taken by itself it is too costly, and not needed.

PRESENT GARAGE PROPOSAL

The proposal is to build two three-level underground garages in these 2 blocks, as I have said, 637 and 691, providing 1,220 parking spaces, at an estimated cost of \$8 million, part of which will pay for a maintenance shop in one of the garages.

Knowing the history of such projects on the Hill, I think it is safe to assume that the actual cost will be 20 percent greater.

The Architect, in his justification, claims that the cost of these parking spaces will be \$5,806 each, roughly \$7 million divided by 1,220, but this fails to take account of the acquisition of the land.

The hearings reveal only that five squares in this area were acquired for about \$8 million, or an average of \$1,600,000 per square. And I ask the committee if its staff could find the actual cost.

So the cost of these two squares was at a minimum \$2 million. Since the average cost was \$1,600,000, I think it is most conservative to say that the cost of the two squares was at least \$2 million. On an average basis, it would be \$3.2 million.

The acquisition cost, the cost per parking space, will be closer to \$8,000. That is, \$10 million, divided by 1,220.

ACTUAL PARKING SPACES NEEDED

Moreover, it must be recalled—and now this is very important—that approximately 760 cars now park on the surface of these lots, although the Architect testified that only 500 cars parked there. I have had my assistants check this number twice.

This means that we are really asked to approve, assuming the Architect's estimate of construction cost is correct, an additional 460 parking spaces at a cost of \$10 million, or close to \$22,000 per space.

This rivals the proposal to build the underground garage under the plaza.

COST OF CHICAGO AND BOSTON SPACE

I again want to remind you that the cost of Grant Park in Chicago and the Boston Common—and God knows that Grant Park permeated the Boston Common situation—is only about \$3,400 per space.

Now, the question is, do we really need these additional 460 spaces so badly that we must pay \$22,000 each for them?

PRESENT PARKING SPACES

Let us look at the number of parking spaces now provided on the House side. From the hearings, and from an above-ground survey by my staff, I conclude that nearly 3,000 parking places will be reserved for House Members and their staffs on the House side, when the Rayburn Building is completed; 1,900 of these are in the Cannon and Rayburn Buildings, and 1,075 are in reserve lots or reserve street parking areas, close to the House Office Buildings, as follows: The Cannon Building, 300; the Rayburn Building, 1,600. I understand there is none under the Longworth Building.

The number representing the cars now parked on squares 637 and 691 is the result of double counts by my staff. On square 637 are 440; square 691, 270.

At C and First Streets there is room for 240; and on the street, reserved spaces in the area total 125; a total of 1,075. Adding all these together there will be 2,975 reserved spaces on the House side when the Rayburn Building is completed.

Now, there are 435 Members of the House. This provides for an average of about $6\frac{1}{2}$ cars, or close to 7 cars, per Member.

But these 3,000 spaces do not include the additional 460 which would be the net addition requested for the 2 underground garages in question. Nor do they include the 760 reserved spaces in the Capitol area, the 825 above-ground spaces in reserved lots around the Senate Office Buildings, the 195 reserved street places in the Senate Office Building area, the 187 spaces in the legislative garage underneath the park west of the Old Senate Office Building, some of which are assigned to House Members, the 154 spaces in 2 floors of garages in the New Senate Office Building, the large privately owned parking lot or lots across Canal Street from the House Office Buildings, and the unreserved street parking in the Capitol Hill area.

GRAND TOTAL OF RESERVED SPACES

Thus, not taking into account the private and unreserved parking facilities, or the Library and Supreme Court facilities, we now have on Capitol Hill a grand total of about 5,130 reserved parking spaces for legislative bodies of 535 Members, or almost 10 per person.

I submit that there is no need for us to approve the construction of new underground parking facilities at this time, which will result only in a net increase of about 460 spaces, but do so at a cost of over \$20,000 each.

ASCERTAIN BY COMPLETE STUDY

I ask the committee to seriously consider our responsibility in this matter.

We signed the blank check in 1955. I think we have the right and duty to see what we are getting, and to exercise some control.

At the very least, we ought to ascertain if there has been full and comprehensive study of the future needs of the entire Capitol area before we further commit ourselves to the schemes which continually spring from the ever-spending mind of the Architect. I think that we ultimately should repeal this 1955 amendment.

I also ask the committee to consider the statement prepared at my request by Mr. James B. Hodgson, Jr., representing the Capitol Hill Restoration Society and the Capitol Hill Community Council.

Thank you very much.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ACT

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you, Senator Douglas, for your very comprehensive statement, and for your coming before the committee and giving us the advantage of your testimony.

The 1955 act you refer to—is that the so-called East Front Act, or is that the Rayburn Office Building authorization? I believe they both came in that year, if I remember correctly.

Senator DOUGLAS. This is cited as the "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955."

Senator MONRONEY. The New House Office Building is in the second supplemental.

Senator DOUGLAS. This was the second supplemental.

Senator MONRONEY. That is the Rayburn Building, and the other, the east front, was in the legislative appropriation bill, the same year.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is right.

AUTHORITY UNDER "EAST FRONT" BILL

Senator MONRONEY. Referring to that, in your studies do you have—and I think it is quite important, in order to avoid having things get out of hand or get presumed to be authorized, if they are not—any advice for the committee on whether the authorization bill, often referred to as the "east front bill," does, by any interaction, authorize the remodeling work on the west side?

Senator DOUGLAS. I certainly hope not. I certainly hope not.

Senator MONRONEY. This is a question that should be taken up and resolved before any commitments are made, because it is very hard to undo commitments once entered into.

Senator DOUGLAS. The language which I have read deals primarily with the area south of Independence Avenue.

HOUSE HEARINGS

Senator MONRONEY. In the hearings of the House this year, on page 171, Mr. Steed, the chairman, said:

Do these acts of authorization you referred to carry authority to build the west front if the Congress sees fit to do so?

I presume that means to appropriate the funds.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir. The authorization carries language broad enough to cover both the east and west fronts.

Mr. STEED. It is broad enough?

Mr. HENLOCK. In our judgment, yes. Scheme B, in addition to providing for extension of the east front, provides for reconstruction of the west front in marble. Under the statute, the Commission can accomplish that objective with such modifications and changes as the Commission may approve—in other words, through extension and reconstruction in marble.

Mr. STEED. And there is no time limit on the life of the Commission?
Mr. HENLOCK. No, sir.

1955 LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION ACT

This is a matter, I think, of concern. And for information I would like to read on from the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the year 1956, "Extension of the Capitol." This is the authorization.

The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized, under the direction of a Commission for extension of the U.S. Capitol, to be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, to provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the U.S. Capitol in substantial accordance with scheme B of the architectural plans submitted by a joint commission of Congress and reported to Congress on March 3, 1905 (H. Doc. 355, 55th Cong.) but with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities, and such other facilities in the Capitol grounds, together with utilities, equipment, approaches, and other appurtenant or necessary items, as may be approved by said Commission, and for such purposes there is hereby appropriated \$5 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of said Commission without regard for the provisions of section 3709 of the revised statutes, as amended, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

So it does indicate that the language refers to the reconstruction and replacement of the central portion of the U.S. Capitol.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE LANGUAGE

Senator DOUGLAS. I am sure no one thought that that was true at the time it was passed. I certainly was thinking only of the east front. And I think it was a great mistake, as to the east front.

I may say I hope the committee will include the following language: namely, "That no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for designing or constructing an extension of the Capitol on the west front."

I hope the committee will include that language. If they do not, I am going to move it from the floor.

Senator MONRONEY. This would not prohibit funds necessarily to go into an engineering inspection of how to repair the west front.

Senator DOUGLAS. It says for designing or constructing an extension of the Capitol.

QUESTION OF ENGINEERING STUDIES

Senator MONRONEY. It would not prohibit engineering studies as to how to correct the deteriorating influences as the Capitol now stands?

Senator DOUGLAS. You mean the possibility that the dome may fall in unless the west front is extended?

Senator MONRONEY. Or the foundations, which are resting apparently on very insecure ground.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I would not object to a good engineering study, provided you get a neutral architect; but I certainly would object to it if the existing Architect is to carry this work out.

Senator MONRONEY. An architect-engineer of great national prominence.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think we should get an outside architect to handle this money.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, I feel it will require one of the foremost engineers we could find.

Senator DOUGLAS. This is rough language, Mr. Chairman, but I use it advisedly.

RESOLUTION FOR TWO-HOUSE COMMISSION

Senator MONRONEY. I have heard you use it on the floor.

Is there any legislation that you have in mind? You mentioned that you were thinking in terms of introducing a resolution to require the appointment of an overall two-House commission of some kind to carry out the long-range planning for the Capitol Hill area.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. You do not plan to introduce that, or you are not asking for that to be in here as a part of the legislative program?

Senator DOUGLAS. We can do that. I would be delighted if the subcommittee took this task on.

Senator MONRONEY. This is the Appropriations Committee, however.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, is it not true that upon occasion the Appropriations Committee has attached legislative provisions to appropriation bills, particularly if the House has done likewise?

Senator MONRONEY. We sometimes do it. We do not consider it the best legislative technique.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think the cause is so important that the Senate Appropriations Committee would not only be pardoned, but commended, for doing it.

Senator MONRONEY. I regret that the other members of the committee, particularly the ranking Republican member, had to go to the Republican conference, and therefore was not available to hear your testimony, which will be made available to him.

I want to thank you and your aid for being here and giving us this testimony.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you. I want to say I have received a great deal of help from Mr. Hodgson.

Senator MONRONEY. Is the Senator giving us this for the committee reference, or for the record?

Senator DOUGLAS. For the committee reference.

Senator MONRONEY. Not necessarily for the record?

Senator DOUGLAS. That is for the committee to decide this.

Senator MONRONEY. This is the way I would take it.

Thank you very much, Senator Douglas, for your appearance.

LETTER FROM SENATOR STENNIS

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
June 17, 1963.

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been interested for the past several years in the efforts to restore the Old Senate Chamber on the principal floor of the Capitol, room S-228, to the condition in which it existed when last occupied by the Senate

in 1859 and to also restore the Old Supreme Court Chamber, room S-141, on the ground floor of the Capitol to the condition in which it existed when last occupied by the Court in 1860.

These rooms are in the first section of the Capitol to be completed and occupied when this Nation was in its infancy. I believe these historical shrines will become one of the most outstanding and worthy ever accomplished in this country. They will be appreciated by all who visit the Capitol, as well as those who labor here. These shrines will bring to life the Halls where Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and other notable figures in our history delivered their famous addresses and engaged in decisive debate; where Thomas Jefferson twice was inaugurated as President of the United States, and where the Supreme Court of the United States reached decisions that shaped the future of the Nation.

I believe it important that an initial appropriation of \$37,500 be included in the bill this year. This is a small sum, but it will provide for drawings, specifications, and other primary work which is necessary if this restoration is ever to be made. With this small sum, the preliminary work can be accomplished. It will never be wasted, because in my judgment, this installation will be voted by the Congress someday and this preliminary work will have been performed.

I would appreciate it if your subcommittee could see fit to include \$37,500 in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for 1964. Attached is a statement for inclusion in the record which I have prepared in detailed justification of this worthy restoration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS, *U.S. Senator.*

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS

Three years ago, the Legislative Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee included funds in the bill for the restoration of historic places at which time the point was made concerning the restoration of the Old Senate and Supreme Court Chambers. Unfortunately, the funds were lost in conference.

In last year's hearings on the legislative appropriations, 1963, I made a brief presentation when there was incorporated in the hearings a very excellent letter of March 13, 1962, from the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. J. George Stewart, to the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman of the full committee, together with a picture presentation, as well as drawings, which magnificently presented the history of the chambers. I would like to make a brief résumé of this letter dealing with the historical background of these two rooms. Located in the old Senate wing of the Capitol, they are of great historical and architectural interest.

The Old Supreme Court Chamber, the first-floor chamber, located east of the central north-south corridor which formed the lower portion of a former two-story room, was used between 1800-08 as the Senate Chamber, as Supreme Court Chamber during 1810-14, and after the fire of 1814, 1819-60, and as the Law Library, 1860-1950.

The principal floor chamber is located directly over the first-floor chamber. A part of it formed the upper portion of the lower room from 1800 to 1808 and was used as the Senate Chamber, 1810-14 and 1819-59, and as the Supreme Court Chamber, 1860-1935.

These two rooms, then, have housed the Senate and Supreme Court Chambers at definite times during our history.

No provision had been made for the Supreme Court, so in 1801, when the Court moved to Washington, it sat in the committee room on the first floor, west side of the Capitol.

By 1806, the need to provide for a permanent chamber for the Supreme Court was urgent, and upon presentation and approval of a plan to President Thomas Jefferson to alter the north wing, adapting it to the use of both the Senate and the judiciary of the United States, the former Senate Chamber was divided into two rooms, one above the other, the Senate to sit in the upper room and the Supreme Court to sit in the lower room formerly occupied by the Senate.

The construction was completed and the Senate occupied its new chamber on the principal floor February 10, 1810. The Supreme Court occupied its new chamber on the first floor February 5, 1810.

When the British burned the Capitol on August 14, 1814, great efforts were made to destroy the courtroom. Therefore the Senate and the Supreme Court could not use these chambers after the fire of 1814 until repairs were completed in 1819, at which time they reoccupied the chambers.

In 1859, the Senate moved to its new chamber in the new Senate wing which it occupies today. The Supreme Court then moved up to the principal floor in 1860, into the chamber vacated by the Senate after some alterations had been made and the lower chamber then became the law library.

I recommend substantial restoration of these chambers to the period when last occupied by the Senate and the Court in 1859 and 1860, respectively. Now is the practical and ideal time to preserve space in the Capitol Building. For the first time, this space is not needed because the uses to which both places have been put have been taken care of in the addition to the Capitol.

I am hopeful favorable consideration may be given to this item and urge approval not only in behalf of those of us who now will receive inspiration from our Nation's heritage, but for generations to come. We seek inspiration as we seek strength. Preservation is essential to our national interest.

The sum of money which I want to support in this statement is small, but if made available will provide for drawings, specifications, and other primary work to be accomplished in the restoration of the Old Senate and Supreme Court Chambers. I respectfully request, therefore, that the sum of \$37,500 be appropriated in the bill this year.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

NOTE.—Subject to the close of the hearings, the following communication was received:

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1963.

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, Senate Committee on Appropriations, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: Enclosed is a statement by the American Library Association in support of the restoration of funds requested by the Government Printing Office for initiation of the program of distribution of non-GPO publications through the depository library system as authorized under Public Law 87-579.

We should be pleased to have this statement included in the record of the hearings on H.R. 6868, the legislative appropriation bill. We urge that your committee give this matter favorable attention.

Sincerely yours,

GERMAINE KRETTEK,
*Associate Executive Director of American Library Association and
Director, ALA Washington Office.*

STATEMENT OF MISS GERMAINE KRETTEK, ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

The American Library Association is a voluntary membership organization which represents more than 25,000 librarians, members of library governing bodies, and lay citizens who are concerned for the development, improvement, and extension of library services as essential factors in the educational, scientific, industrial, and cultural needs of the Nation. Through its public documents interdivisional committee, the association takes cognizance of matters relating to public documents issued in the United States.

The American Library Association was highly gratified by the passage of Public Law 87-579 which revised the library depository laws. It felt that this much-needed revision would do much to assure that the published results of costly research and other work would be made more generally available, promptly and economically, to the public.

H.R. 6868 as passed by the House of Representatives on June 11, 1963, would provide \$206,000 for fiscal 1964 for implementation of the new Depository Library Act. However, the association is greatly concerned that the House report on appropriations for the implementation of this legislation (88th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. 369) does not provide adequately for the distribution of non-GPO publications, many of which cover valuable and essential information. The association urges, therefore, that consideration be given to restoration of the funds requested for this purpose.

In this connection, several points should be made. In the first place, the fear has been expressed that the distribution of non-GPO publications would lead to the sending to depository libraries of vast quantities of unneeded and

inappropriate materials. This apprehension is entirely unjustified because the new depository law expressly states at the outset:

"Each component of the Government shall furnish the Superintendent of Documents a list of publications, except those required for official use only or those required for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, * * *"

With these exclusions specifically provided, it is clear that only significant documents and reports dealing with research and other activities, a part of the total departmental or agency publishing output, would be placed on a list of non-GPO publications for selection by depository libraries.

Another point to be kept in mind is that the Federal Government is undertaking its vast program of research and studies at great cost not as academic exercises but for the benefit of the public, including scientists, businessmen, housewives, students, and many other groups. It is imperative that this information be disseminated as widely as possible and that research and other Government activities not end with the production of a document, report, or bulletin. The publication should be made easily available to all who need it.

Of great pertinence to this matter is the statement in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 2d sess., page 6:

"2. Reasons for interest in science information:

"The subcommittee has concentrated on science and engineering information because of the latter's significance to—

"(a) national defense;

"(b) civilian standards of living;

"(c) competition in the world market; and

"(d) health of the American people.

"Underlying this significance is the considerable amount of taxpayers' funds invested in federally supported science and engineering programs. In the 1963 fiscal year, one out of every eight U.S. budget dollars is assigned to programs of scientific research, development, testing, and evaluation, involving some \$12 billion.

"This sum represents two-thirds of the national total of science and engineering research and development expenditures. For the years ahead, all projections indicate that the absolute and relative Federal outlays in the national total are likely to grow appreciably."

Similarly the National Science Foundation in Federal Funds for Science, volume 11, 1963, estimates \$14.4 billion for research and development in science. If such large sums are expended in carrying out the projects, surely the relatively infinitesimal amount could be spent for the distribution of the resulting publications.

So desperately do libraries need the non-GPO publications as an aid in the research, industrial, and cultural life of the Nation that some 60 libraries maintain a document expeditor in Washington to seek out these materials and forward them to the institutions desiring the publications. The association is of the opinion that in the interest of research and scientific development, the service should be available to all depository libraries through the Federal depository system rather than to a limited number of libraries by private arrangement.

Examples in just one area of the type of substantial non-GPO publication in which libraries are interested and to which they do not now have access are studies resulting from contracts under the cooperative research program of the National Defense Education Act. A report on the effectiveness of special day class training programs for severely mentally retarded children, prepared by George Peabody College for Teachers is one such item. "Identification of Gifted Elementary School Children With Exceptional Scientific Talent," the result of a study by Hunter College, is another report which falls in this category. The University of North Dakota has completed a study, "Evaluation of Counseling Treatments With Underachieving High School Students," which also is not distributed at present under the depository system. Such publications should be easily accessible through libraries to the Nation's teachers. Federal Government-supported research aimed at improving education cannot be productive if the results are not available to educators.

The Federal departments and agencies with their bureaus and divisions numbering in all about 250 likewise have an urgent need for non-GPO publications.

These Federal libraries require in their daily operation many Government documents that are printed outside the Government Printing Office. Under current procedures, by the time that many of the Federal libraries learn of the existence of an essential Federal document or report, the edition is exhausted and the material unobtainable. The remedying of the situation is thus of practical concern to Federal libraries.

There is a question about the capacity of agency processing facilities outside the GPO to run sufficient copies to supply the needs of the depository libraries selecting certain materials. Our position on this problem is that if a large expenditure of Federal money has produced a significant publication, ways should be found to make it available to all needing it.

In considering this non-GPO problem, and in fact the whole depository problem, there has been a tendency to think of the library's role as that of trying to get something for nothing or at best of trying to build up library collections. This is absolutely not the case. Libraries are acting not for themselves, but rather as agents of the Government in rendering service to the educated public including scientists, businessmen, students, and others.

The association appreciates what the Superintendent of Documents is doing to implement the new library depository law, but it believes strongly that funds should be restored in the 1964 appropriation, so that the question of non-GPO publications could not only be explored but that a start be made on the sending of such materials to the depository libraries in fiscal year 1964.

The subcommittee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 3:37 p.m., Wednesday, June 19, 1963, the hearings were concluded.)

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Addison, William H.....	1
Basler, Roy P.....	119
Belen, Frederick C.....	255
Brenkwerth, Robert A.....	207
Buckley, Carper W.....	1
Campoli, Mario E.....	35
Caraway, J. Lewey.....	35
Cheatham, William S.....	224
Clancy, Thomas F.....	35
Coffin, Lewis C.....	119
Cristafane, Felix E.....	1
Davidson, Julius.....	119
Day, Hon. Edward.....	255
Douglas, Hon. Paul H.....	271
Doyle, Louis J.....	255
Durkin, Charles A.....	35
Elsbee, Hugh L.....	119
Geary, Daniel J.....	235
Gleason, Merrill C.....	1
Harrison, James L.....	1
Henlock, Charles A.....	35
Humphrey, Harry J.....	1
Kamenstein, Abraham L.....	119
Merold, Harry D.....	1
Mumford, L. Quincy.....	119
Nicholson, Ralph W.....	255
Rogers, Rutherford D.....	119
Roof, Philip L.....	35, 235
Stevens, Robert D.....	119
Stewart, J. George.....	35
Welsh, William J.....	119
Williams, Hon. John J.....	252

INDEX

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

	Page
Architect of the Capitol.....	35
Amount requested.....	35
Architect, Office of, salaries.....	35
Change in financing requested.....	39
Contingent expenses.....	45, 47
Justifications.....	36
Pay Act costs.....	41, 42
Personnel request.....	39
Assistant coordinating engineer.....	44
Construction payrolls, personnel on.....	43
Distribution of increase.....	41
Duties of transferred staff.....	40, 43
Messenger-driver.....	45
Staff status, present.....	40
Botanic Gardens.....	109
Amount requested.....	109
Conservatory walls.....	113
Justification.....	109
Lawn sprinkler system.....	114
Nonrecurring items.....	112
Personnel increase.....	112
Road servicing, nursery.....	113
Supplies and materials.....	113
Toilet facilities.....	113
Capitol Building.....	48
Amount requested.....	48
Bronze handrails, House side.....	54
Cleaning and repairs, various.....	55, 56
Contractors' apprentices.....	60
Colored applicants.....	61
Elevator maintenance personnel.....	53
Elevator units, new.....	53
Exhibit cases, crypt.....	56, 57
Extension of Capitol.....	62
Amount requested.....	62
East front, situation on.....	117
Illumination, East front.....	64
Justification.....	62
Justification.....	48
New positions.....	53
Painting, annual.....	54
Policy for Capitol employees.....	59
Contracts, difficulty with.....	61
Promotions, overtime, and holiday pay.....	52
Retirement fund.....	54
Roof repairs.....	56
Skilled Negro labor, employment of.....	57, 58
Stennis, Hon. John, letter and statement of.....	281
Wage board increases.....	52
West Wing, no funds for.....	114, 115
Outside experts, advice of.....	115, 116

Architect of the Capitol—Continued	Page
Contingent expenses	45, 46
Items under contingent expenses	47
Justification	47
Capital grounds	65
Additional laborer-gardeners	65, 68
Condition of grounds	71
Enlargement of grounds	67
Justification	65
Maintenance force	67
Work performed, report on	69
Justification summary	35
Library buildings and grounds	95
Amount requested	95
Cleaning walls	108
Drinking fountains	107
Fire equipment	107
Fire protection system	104
Floor tile, installation	103
Furniture and furnishings	108
Justification	108
Amount requested	108
Justification	96
Lighting improvement, main building	105
Machines and devices, maintenance	109
Repairs and replacements	104
Sidewalk repairs	107
Underground sprinkler system	107
Wage increases	103
Increased pay cost	103
Water, sewage and drainage systems, replacement	105, 106
Amount requested	105, 106
Time required	106
Parking, vacated land	118
Powerplant, changes in	44, 91
Amount for	89
Capitol dome, lighting of	93
Cost of, letter on	93
Electricity, purchase of	93
Heating and refrigeration	95
Justification	89
Personnel benefits	92
Positions, additional	91, 92
Reimbursements, other building	94
Wage increases	91
Senate Office Buildings	72
Air-conditioning and refrigeration maintenance	81
Amount requested	72
Clock system, funds for	84
Electrical personnel, increase in	78
Elevators, discussion on	79, 80, 81
Fireproof doors, Old Senate Office	83
Fire protection, Old Senate Office attic	82
Justification	72
Legislative call system	85
Complaints on	85
Modernization, elevators	78
Rat control	88
Supplies and materials, amount for	87
Tunnel, conversion of	86
Justification	87
Wiring, replacement of	82
Disbursing Office of the Senate	207
Additional pay costs	216
New positions	217
Payrolls affected	216
Regular accounts, placing in	218
List of positions	217

Disbursing Office of the Senate—Continued	Page
Administrative and clerical employees	210
Agency contributions, retirement and insurance	213
Amount requested	207
Automobiles and maintenance	211
Committee employees and conferences, compensation	210
Communications	220
Compensation, Vice President and Senators	208
Contingent expenses	211
Expenses, Vice President and leaders	209
Folding documents	213
Furniture	211
Gratuity expenses, funerals	219
Inquiries and investigations	212
Pay act costs	212
Joint items	222
Atomic Energy, Joint Committee on	223
Joint Economic Committee	223
Douglas, Hon. Paul, letter from	223
Nonessential Government Expenditures, Committee on	222
Legislative counsel	221
Life insurance	209
Mail transportation	213
Mileage costs	209
Miscellaneous items	213
Postage	219
Reasons for increase	207-210
Pay act costs (<i>see also</i> each item)	207
Absorption of pay costs	221
Reporters of Debates	210
Retirement and health programs	208
Salaries, officers and employees	209
Senate restaurants	214
Capitol dining room	215
Autumn months' losses	215
Prior management	214
Solution for loss problems, possible	216
Total subsidy	214
Sergeant at Arms, secretaries, and whips	210
Statement of appropriations	223
Stationery account	220
Construction projects	271
Douglas, Hon. Paul H., statement of	271
Committee language, request for	280
Congressional responsibility	272, 274
Engineering studies	280
"East front" bill, authority under	279
1955 legislative appropriation act	280
House hearings, 1964	279
Madison Memorial and Congressional Library	276
Parking spaces	276, 277
Cost of Chicago and Boston space	278
Pending proposals	275, 277
No later construction possible	277
Present parking space	278
Reserved space, grand total	278
Rayburn Office Building	273
Senate Office Building	272
Two-House Commission, request for	281
Underground garages	272
Detailed plan demanded	272
Earlier parking plans	273

	Page
Government Printing Office.....	1
Documents, Superintendent of.....	23
Buckley, Carter, statement of.....	23
Clerical force, need for.....	33
Depository libraries, new.....	29
Distribution to libraries.....	32
Waste, letter on.....	32
GAO report.....	33
Justification.....	24
New personnel.....	31
Sale, cataloging and public distribution.....	30
Sales force.....	34
Sales, total.....	34
Employees, decrease in, 1954-63.....	13
Justification.....	4
Modernization of plant.....	2
Personnel situation.....	13
Printing and binding.....	1
Agency printing plants.....	22
Amount requested.....	1
Apprentice school.....	2
Deficit in operations.....	11
Cost method of ascertaining.....	15
Funds to abolish deficit.....	12
List by years.....	14
Origin.....	14
Profits in operations.....	15
Revolving fund.....	3
Denial of amount for revolving fund, effects of.....	16
Present status.....	18
Surpluses since establishment of fund.....	16
Use of requested funds.....	18
Site acquisition and construction.....	19
Building authorization.....	21
Deletion of funds asked.....	19
Total business, 1963.....	11
Wage determination.....	17
Workload, total.....	4
Library of Congress.....	119
American Library Association, statement of.....	283
Funds available to Library, sources of.....	148
House bill, comments on letter.....	205
Justification.....	119
Salaries and expenses.....	119
American motion pictures, preservation of.....	199
Amount requested.....	119, 124
Books for general collections.....	135
Amount requested.....	136, 190
Foreign acquisitions.....	136
House action.....	136
Justification.....	190
Price increases.....	136
Blind, books for.....	137, 193
Braille music program.....	195
Amount requested and justification.....	193
Contents of category.....	195
Telephone Pioneers, donations by.....	196
Card distribution service, catalog.....	132, 135, 189
Amount requested.....	189
Cost covered by income.....	190
Justification.....	189
Returns on service.....	132

Library of Congress—Continued

Salaries and expenses—Continued

	Page
Cataloging Division, needs of	124
Arrearages in work	125
Backlog	127
Catalogers, grades of	159
Descriptive and subject cataloging divisions	125
House action on personnel request	127
Job descriptions	159, 160
New positions	124
Staff in divisions	126
Unprocessed material	127
Computer, request for	133
Copyright Office	133, 180
Amount of cost recovered	185
Amount requested	180
Copyright fees	185
Justification	180
Personnel requests, reasons for	184
Rewriting copyright law	184
Fair employment practices	156, 201
Counseling services	202
Training program	203
Foreign currency program	131, 136, 137, 186
Additional currency request	138
Amount requested	186
Benefits of program	187
Contributions, other countries	187
Justification	186
Net increases	131
Staff under program	131
Justification	140
Krettek, Germaine, statement of	283
Law library	192
Request and justification	192
Legislative Reference Service	133, 188
Amount requested	188
History of service	189
Inquiries, breakdown of	134
Justification	188
Personnel requested	133
Naval Weapons Plant, quarters in	124, 133
Maintenance	156
Renovation	156
Pay increases	196
Personnel, total Library	132
Loss of personnel	155
Presidential papers, microfilming	197, 200
Amount requested and justification	197
Other library collections, microfilming	200
Ramp for handicapped	200
Reference Department, fund for	131
Slavic and Central European Division, special studies	138, 139
Russian accessions, index of, direct financing	128, 147
Circulation of Russian material	158
Foreign subscribers	148
House action	130
Number listed	158
Other agencies, financing discontinued by	128, 129
Personnel in work	130
Sales, returns from	147
Use of index	129
Transfer of Library, question of	142
Cost of use by executive agencies	154
Funds transferred from departments	154
Medical and agricultural libraries, cost of	146
Users of Library, table	143

	Page
Senate restaurants.....	235
Amount requested.....	235
Cafeterias.....	238, 239
Capitol dining rooms.....	237
Memorandum on sources of savings, requested.....	244
Press and special groups.....	245
Profit in April.....	245
Restaurant losses, comparison.....	235, 237
Combination of solutions.....	236, 243
Employee status under closure.....	236, 243
Pay increases.....	235
Price increase proposed.....	236, 244
Room service.....	240, 241, 242
Senators' dining room.....	24, 240
Sergeant at Arms.....	224
Administrative officer, recording studio.....	226
Capitol Police.....	228
Comment on appearance of police.....	228
Disciplining policemen.....	229
Uniforms furnished.....	229, 231
Dial system to ascertain purpose of bells.....	231, 232
Doorkeeper position.....	225
Doormen and elevator operators.....	230
Cost of uniforms.....	231
Equalizing salaries various positions.....	227
Guide force, placing on Federal payroll.....	246
Land prices, investigation of.....	233
Mail collection, new Senate Office.....	246
Postmaster salary.....	233
City postmaster salaries.....	234
Post office revolving fund.....	225
Total cost of position.....	225
Visitor parking.....	232
Unaddressed mail, amendment on.....	252
Day, Hon. J. Edward, statement of.....	255
Amendments, difference between.....	259
Annual application only.....	263
Effect on Post Office of language.....	266
Franked mail, table on.....	268
Language of amendment.....	262, 266
Latest congressional act, acting under.....	256
Legislative situation.....	262
"Occupant mail" provision.....	257, 260
Prohibition in 1963 act.....	255
"Simplified addressing," meaning of.....	356
Williams, Hon. John J., statement of.....	252
Cost of liberalized franking.....	252
Privilege, matter of.....	255
Postmaster general, position of.....	254
Reasons for transfer to legislative bill.....	253



