

Senate Hearings

Before the Committee on Appropriations

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations

Fiscal Year 1978

95th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

H.R. 7636

Part 6 (Pages 2517-3176)

Department of Agriculture
Energy Research and Development Administration
Federal Energy Administration
Smithsonian Institution

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR
1978**

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1977

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

The subcommittee met at 8 a.m., in room 1114, Everett McKinley Dirksen Office Building, Hon. Mark Hatfield presiding.
Present: Senators Hatfield and Stevens.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

STATEMENT OF S. DILLON RIPLEY, SECRETARY

ACCOMPANIED BY:

JOHN F. JAMESON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

CHARLES BLITZER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HISTORY AND ART

DAVID CHALLINOR, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE

JULIAN T. EUELL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

PAUL N. PERROT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MUSEUM PROGRAMS

T. AMES WHEELER, TREASURER

RICHARD L. AULT, DIRECTOR OF SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

BROOKE HINDLE, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

PETER G. POWERS, GENERAL COUNSEL

THEODORE H. REED, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

JON E. YELLIN, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PROGRAMING AND BUDGET

HEARING RESUMED

Senator HATFIELD. We will now resume our hearings on the fiscal 1978 budget estimates of the Smithsonian Institution. The preliminary hearing was on April 18. We have some questions today. We hope to concentrate on the major parts of the 1978 budget submission.

FOLKLIFE PROGRAM

Last year this subcommittee expressed concern about the future of folklife programs and we were anxious that folk culture in this country have a proper attention place in the Institution. I believe that the Smithsonian, serving as a depository and promulgator of American culture, has to have a commitment to all forms of American expression of life.

Therefore, I am pleased to see from your budget, Dr. Ripley, that a Folklife Council has been created to authorize and supervise all folklife programs in the Smithsonian and that the folklife studies have been moved into the American Studies Division. I believe American Studies is an appropriate place for the folklife program where it is likely to receive the necessary attention, but I am still hopeful that a separate, permanent home for folklife can be created in the Institution.

Those of us who have worked to insure that folk culture take its appropriate place in studies that are devoted to high culture and popular culture have been gratified by these developments. And on the informal side, may I say that your presence at the inaugural square dance demonstrated your personal commitment and concern for this aspect of American life.

So I want to congratulate you on the progress that has been made and thank you for your efforts.

My questions today are not meant to criticize but to explore further where the Smithsonian is headed and perhaps find ways in which we in the Congress can be of help.

I see that your combined request for both American and folklife studies is \$233,000. Yet last year we appropriated \$167,000 for the Bicentennial folklife program alone. Therefore, the question is do you feel that this request is sufficient?

FOLKLIFE PLANNING

Dr. RIPLEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have with me today two associates who have been deeply involved both in the origins of this festival, going back now almost 11 years, and also with the plans for reorientation. I would like to ask Mr. Julian Euell and Mr. Charles Blitzer, Assistant Secretary for Public Service and Assistant Secretary for History and Art, respectively, to join me at this point.

Senator HATFIELD. We are happy to welcome each of your colleagues here this morning.

Dr. RIPLEY. Now, Mr. Blitzer, would you have any comments on this?

Mr. BLITZER. Yes. Senator Hatfield, I also am grateful to you for your words. We took very seriously what we heard from you in the past, and under Secretary Ripley's direction, we now have set up a new organization of folklife.

The council to which you referred is, among other things, a planning body within the Smithsonian. As you know, with the new interest in the Folklife Center in the Library of Congress, at the Arts Endowment, and now in the Smithsonian, some time, I think, has to be devoted to figuring out a general strategy and deciding who will do what in the area of folklife.

PROPOSED INCREASE FOR FOLKLIFE

The \$100,000 increase that we are expecting in fiscal 1978 is to allow, among other things, a tripartite project involving three organizations, the Folklife Center of the Library, the Arts Endowment, and the Smithsonian, in a kind of pilot project of outreach folklife festivals around the country. The attempt here is primarily for these three organizations to work with local and community organizations in helping them and showing them how to develop their own folklife festivals.

Another, roughly one-third of the increase we are requesting, is for the continuing of festivals of American folklife at the Smithsonian, which we will be doing on the Mall in Washington.

And the final third of the \$100,000 increase is for documentation of what we have done in the past and planning what we should do in the future. I may say, sir, that I would hope that when this planning process is done with, the Smithsonian will come back and request funds for a larger program.

Senator HATFIELD. But you feel that this is sufficient for this particular phase of the program?

Mr. BLITZER. Yes, sir. I think we really wouldn't know exactly what to do with a very large amount now.

PERSONNEL FOR FOLKLIFE ACTIVITIES

Senator HATFIELD. Let's go back for a moment into each of these divisions of the program that you have outlined. As you know, a problem that plagued us all last year was personnel. The festival last summer relied heavily on contractual and volunteer assistance. On building a permanent program stature, however, it would seem to me that permanent positions would be needed. And yet I noticed in the budget that only four permanent positions are requested for the American and folklife studies.

Do you feel that as of this moment that more slots are needed? And, if so, would these slots need congressional approval, authorization? Or can you shift within the Smithsonian budget to meet these particular needs?

Mr. BLITZER. Mr. Chairman, I would say one of the things that we have discovered, as a result I think of your interest and the interest of others, or that we have become more aware of, is that there are lots of people around the Smithsonian, and have been since the beginning, who are engaged in folklife studies and activities.

They exist in the Museum of History and Technology, in the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Department of Anthropology. So among the membership of the Folklife Council are a dozen or so people from within the Smithsonian, all of whom have very direct connections with the study of folklife.

Senator HATFIELD. So you think that it is a correlation of existing personnel to a greater degree?

Mr. BLITZER. Precisely, yes. This is not to say that in the future we may not come back to you for more people. Again, one of the responsibilities of this Folklife Council is to survey what we are doing and make recommendations to the Secretary which may then ultimately come to you for expanded programs.

If they decide, for example, that we desperately need an ethnomusicologist someplace, this would be a recommendation to the Secretary. It might well be reflected in a future budget request.

Senator HATFIELD. Do you have a general estimate as to how many within the existing Smithsonian family could be correlated into this particular area?

Mr. BLITZER. It is very difficult.

Senator HATFIELD. Could you provide that at some point for the record as far as a general assessment? I don't have to have a precise figure, but a ball park figure.

Mr. BLITZER. Yes. I might say that it is partly a matter of definition, I am afraid.

Senator HATFIELD. I think that it would be very important to be able to identify those people within that context, both skills and experience.

Mr. BLITZER. Certainly.

[The information follows:]

FOLKLIFE ACTIVITY THROUGHOUT THE INSTITUTION

As reported at last year's hearing, staff members of several of the Smithsonian's offices and bureaus—particularly the National Museum of Natural History's Anthropology Department, the National Museum of History and Technology, the Division of Performing Arts, and the Center for the Study of Man—conduct research, collect objects, publish, and prepare exhibitions in subject areas with close ties to folklife. In addition, other bureaus of the Smithsonian such as the Research Institute for Immigration and Ethnic Studies, the Office of American Studies, the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service, the National Collection of Fine Arts and its Renwick Gallery are similarly involved to greater or lesser degrees. The number of professional staff throughout the Smithsonian whose responsibilities or interests at least in part coincided with the field of folklife would most likely be in the range of 25 to 30.

PLANS FOR FOLKLIFE PUBLICATIONS

Senator HATFIELD. As you recall, last year I expressed a great interest in publications and particularly what might be published as a result of the festival of American folklife, and I notice here that you have a pamphlet called Family Folklore published by the Smithsonian as of October, from last year's festival.

What is your general projection for publications, both in the near and distant future?

Mr. BLITZER. Senator, in addition to setting up the Folklife Advisory Council, there was a kind of internal administrative reorganization that led to this new American and folklife studies program in our budget. Two people who had been associated directly with the festival and were within the Division of Performing Arts were moved from the Division of Performing Arts to this new unit, namely, Mr. Rinzler, who has been the architect of our folklife festival and his associate, Mr. Byington. One of their major responsibilities given by the Secretary when this change was made was during this year in particular to document past festivals and plans for the publication of the results of the past festivals.

So I think that we will have something quite impressive to show you when we are back next year.

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Euell, the Assistant Secretary for Public Service and under whose jurisdiction is the Division of Performing Arts, which has a segment of the folklife budget in its base, some \$70,000, to offer further explanation.

Senator HATFIELD. Fine. Happy to hear him.

1977 FESTIVAL

Mr. EUELL. Yes. In terms, Mr. Chairman, of what we planned this year, as you know, we are not doing the summer festival. We are doing the festival in October this year.

And in the Division of Performing Arts' budget, after the transfer of the two positions and some support, there is still about \$70,000 in the Division of Performing Arts' budget that will be devoted to this fall festival coming up in October.

NATIVE AMERICAN PROJECTS

Senator HATFIELD. Could you give me any specific program that relates to the folklife and anthropology of the native American?

Mr. BLITZER. Well, the largest of all projects, Senator, is our Bicentennial project, the Encyclopedia of North American Indians which, when completed, will be a definitive 20-volume work on every aspect of the Indians of North America.

In addition, I think everyone at this table, and some of my colleagues elsewhere in the room, could tell you of a particular program, including, for example, a museum training program for native Americans, to help them run their museums around the country.

We recently have added to the staff of the Museum of Natural History an absolutely first-rate linguist who specializes in languages of native Americans. Native American projects really exist very broadly throughout the Institution.

For example, I am not exactly sure how you would define this, but there was a very exciting small exhibition that opened a couple of weeks ago in the Museum of History and Technology called "Perfect Likenesses" which is a fascinating account of how popular printed portraits of American Indians came into being based on the Charles Bird King paintings. Native Americana is very pervasive in the Institution.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS

Senator HATFIELD. What is the status of the publication? Are you ready for publication? Is it going to the printer? Or where is it?

Mr. BLITZER. The Encyclopedia of North American Indians?

Senator HATFIELD. Is that the same as the handbook?

Mr. BLITZER. I cannot bring myself to call a 20-volume thing a handbook.

Senator HATFIELD. All right. An encyclopedia.

Mr. BLITZER. You are correct. It is technically a handbook.

Senator HATFIELD. Encyclopedia. What is the status?

Mr. BLITZER. The first volume is now ready for printing and will be out sometime this summer or early fall. Then there is a regular publication schedule. It stretches on considerably into the future since there are 20 volumes.

Senator HATFIELD. What is your estimated cost of that? Do you know?

Mr. BLITZER. No, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. Could you provide it for the record?

Mr. BLITZER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

COST OF ENCYCLOPEDIA OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS

We estimate that the total cost of the completed Encyclopedia will be approximately \$4.0 million.

PUBLICATION SCHEDULE

Senator HATFIELD. Is it on schedule, as you predicted it originally?

Mr. BLITZER. No, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. How late?

Mr. BLITZER. Considerably late, but I think things have recently been very much tightened up and we have much better management.

Senator HATFIELD. Is this a federally-funded project or is it a joint funding?

Mr. BLITZER. The encyclopedia is federally funded and will be published by the Government Printing Office.

Senator HATFIELD. I see, and you don't have a final date of the final volume projected?

Mr. BLITZER. Final volume? No, sir.

FINANCING OF 1977 FESTIVAL

Senator HATFIELD. One last question I have, and that has to do with the folklife festival which you are projecting for October. I notice in a Washington Post article on April 16 that you plan to raise outside funds again to finance this festival. Yet, as I recognize, we had 10 years of successful festivals or, at least, a program.

Why do you find it necessary to raise outside moneys? Is it a matter of just enriching the program or bringing in more participation for the program? Why don't you request the full funding through the budget?

Mr. EUELL. Well, Senator, if I may answer that question. For the last 10 years we have always raised additional funds. It may be a little misunderstood when we say we intend to raise additional money.

I think what we mean by that is that a lot of agencies, Departments of Labor and Commerce, have participated with us over the years, particularly the Department of Labor—we have always had a featured area in labor. We get additional funds from those departments, as well as from the AFL-CIO and other unions.

As you recall, over the last 2 years, American Airlines and General Foods were supporting cosponsors of the festival on a very large scale and they have expressed a continued interest in our festivals.

So at the time we made that statement, we were debating on whether to have the festival in the summer or in the fall. If we had had it in the summer, we would have proceeded with fundraising to enrich the program, to expand it. It is just a kind of tradition, if you will; we have always done this, and I think largely to fill out and to enrich the program.

FEDERAL AGENCY COMMITMENT

Senator HATFIELD. We did run into difficulty last year as far as other agencies' obligations in terms of the Bicentennial. They felt that they had not made such commitments—you felt they had. And

it seemed to me it raised a questionable—at least in my mind—a questionable procedure.

Mr. EUELL. Well, the procedure may have appeared questionable, sir, but I think it was necessary considering the tremendous scale of the festival last year. I don't think that we will ever have a festival of that magnitude again.

You know what we are talking about now is going back to a format that is much more manageable, small, short-term. I don't think that we will have that kind of problem.

Senator HATFIELD. You have commitments from the agencies that they will be responsible?

Mr. EUELL. I don't know whether we are going to outside agencies for the October festival. I am not sure of that at this time. I don't think that we will necessarily have to.

Senator HATFIELD. Well, then are you resting your whole program on the foundation of an unknown factor at this time as to whether the agencies will respond in contributing to the programs of the festival?

Mr. EUELL. No. Through our newly created advisory council, we have determined that we are going to give the festival in October. We have to determine the length of the festival and there is still discussion and planning in terms of the number of participants.

There is just a kind of a ball park figure now in terms of how much the festival will cost and we have a rough estimate of around \$150,000.

Senator HATFIELD. But how do those other agencies know how to provide within their own budgets sufficient moneys to make their contributions? When will they know this expectation figure?

Mr. EUELL. I am not sure, Senator, whether the other agencies will be involved with this fall's festival. I don't think we are going to produce a festival on that scale. You asked me the question why we are raising the money.

Senator HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. EUELL. If we were continuing the large scale summer festivals, other agencies would probably wish to participate, and insofar as I know—the festival is under Mr. Blitzer's office this year—the agencies haven't asked to participate in the fall festival which only will be 2, 3, or 4 days, at the outside.

Senator HATFIELD. Well, I am going back to the original question again, so I will make sure that I understand it. The article at least indicated that you had planned or you were expecting to raise moneys for these programs outside. And I am just wondering what that plan is and what the general figure is and if it does involve agencies, how soon are you going to contact them and make known to them what you are expecting from them or what they will expect to give to you?

Mr. BLITZER. Might I add just a word, Senator?

I am relatively new to this, but I have had an impression similar to what you have been inferring: that there have been problems in the past on the financing of these festivals.

Senator HATFIELD. We had a lot of problems. I was on the phone personally with a number of agencies trying to overcome some of these problems.

DIMENSION OF 1977 FESTIVAL

Mr. BLITZER. Another way of putting what Mr. Euell said is this: What we have decided to do is to plan a kind of basic festival with money that we know we have so that we will not get in the position of go and no-go and scurrying around in a crisis.

That is what we have now done. Then what I hope will develop is what I think the architects call "add alternates." If we can raise money from various sources, we will then enrich the festival. We would not, I think, lengthen it. I think it will be 5 days in October. But I think that we could have more activities going on if more money is forthcoming.

Senator HATFIELD. May I urge you to get your plan quickly because agencies just don't have money lying around, at least I hope not, that they can come up with new programs without some kind of notification, and if you are planning for October, having had that experience last year relating to the Bicentennial, I wouldn't want to see the festival ride on that point and be gambled with because I think it is a gamble unless you know how much you need and who is going to make the contributions.

Here is the time to make that known to the Government if it is to be financed by the Government. If you are depending on outside moneys, then you ought to have that plan pretty well in mind shortly and know who is going to make those contributions from such outside sources.

Mr. BLITZER. Right. I agree. I would just add I think we have removed a lot of the element of gamble, though, by planning the basic one that we know right now that we can afford.

Senator HATFIELD. Well, I want to thank all of you for your responses and I want to thank particularly our hearing chairman, Senator Stevens, for permitting me to venture off here in the folklife area.

FISCAL YEAR 1978 BUDGET REQUEST

Senator STEVENS [presiding]. Let's go now to the budget request which features an operating increase of some \$7 million over the fiscal year 1977 appropriation to date and an \$11 million request in the construction program.

Your construction request involves some priority changes. So let's try to discuss those first. Your construction account totals slightly over \$11 million, an increase of \$1.5 million over appropriations in fiscal year 1977.

On the zoo construction, you ask for \$1 million for continued construction at the zoo and the Front Royal Center. Will any of that amount be used to consolidate the work of the master plan?

ZOO CONSTRUCTION REQUEST

Dr. RIPLEY. I have asked Dr. Reed to be here this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I know that he will be happy to answer these questions. Dr. Reed.

Dr. REED. Thank you, sir.

The question, sir?

Dr. RIPLEY. The question has to do with whether we would be able to use the requested \$1 million increase to consolidate the work of the master plan.

Dr. REED. We are doing that already, sir. With funds in hand. Mainly, this depends upon the effect of Front Royal, Va., the 3,000 acres that we have for a breeding farm. We are studying what effect it will have on the aspect of what is done at the National Zoological Park in Rock Creek.

Senator STEVENS. It looks like you have a pause in construction of the zoo; is that right?

Dr. REED. We do have a pause in construction of the zoo during which time we hope to strengthen and enlarge our support capacity for that which we already have constructed. We need these new positions to maintain and properly service the facilities that have already been built.

Senator STEVENS. Last year you told us that under the master plan for this year you would be working on the central area, the parking facility and graphics.

Dr. REED. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. That is not in this year's budget.

Dr. REED. We are building the service building, which is a basic floor of the parking facility. It is under construction now, and it will probably be completed late this fall. We are working on graphics continuously and we are designing the central area for the great apes, remodeling of the small mammal house, remodeling of the reptile house and the monkey island.

We are presently constructing exhibits for the seals, sea lions, otters, beavers—and we are finishing up on the bear exhibits at the present time.

Senator STEVENS. The budget for future years shows that you will request \$7.2 million next year, \$7.5 million the next and then you jump to \$14.2 million. Is there any reason for this up and down on construction? Couldn't there have been a more even schedule for requests?

Dr. REED. Well, unfortunately, the large jump that we project in fiscal year 1982 is the completion of the parking facility which cannot be done in smaller stages. There are three floors of parking for the public which have to be built at one time, although we probably would not be using all of the money in that year. It could be spread out by contract authority.

We are also expecting to have in fiscal year 1981 the aquatic habitats building which will be the last major building in the construction program. It will be quite a large, rather elaborate building with a good deal of mechanical support. That is, an air filtration and chilling system for the penguins and some other of the Arctic animals that need cold and a water filtration system for the platypus and other animals that need a good deal of life support systems which are rather expensive.

PAUSE IN ZOO CONSTRUCTION

Senator STEVENS. Dr. Ripley, is there any relationship between the so-called penthouse construction and putting off the zoo construction for a year?

Dr. RIPLEY. No.

Senator STEVENS. It is about the same amount of money.

Dr. RIPLEY. The sixth floor addition?

Senator STEVENS. Yes.

Dr. RIPLEY. There is no relationship.

Senator STEVENS. Were there any OMB restrictions put on the zoo construction?

Dr. RIPLEY. No, not that I am aware of.

Senator STEVENS. Was this your request to defer the zoo construction for a year?

Dr. RIPLEY. I conferred with Dr. Reed and Dr. Challinor about this, of course, Mr. Chairman. We noticed that on the completion of the lion and tiger facility, there was quite an upsurge in maintenance requirements, as well as special personnel needs, for the undertaking of the day-to-day care of this facility.

It seemed to us that we would be well advised to consolidate our plans so that we would be able to assess more definitively the impact of this new sophisticated construction.

Now it has become quite obvious to me that when you take on a specialized new facility for animals, with the new sources of technologies involved in climate control and various kinds of devices for shifting animals back and forth, very sophisticated systems are required.

Therefore, this requires an addition to the normal maintenance budget which was, to me, very surprising, and I asked Dr. Reed to assess the impact of this addition. How are we going to come back to the Congress for appropriated funds when we don't really have the advance knowledge of how many people and what kind of sophisticated machinery we are involved in maintaining? So I said that I thought that it would be very useful to have a consolidation year before proceeding with the master plan.

MHT LIBRARY AND STUDY CENTER

Now, the planning for the Museum of History and Technology Library and Study Center for which some \$275,000 have been provided by the Congress is now largely complete. And, as you know, Mr. Chairman, we have been studying this sixth floor addition for approximately 10 years, as I recall, with planning, and architectural details and so on.

So that what we are doing now is simply coming to a point of fruition where we are asking you for the funds. This, then, is a coincidence in that sense in regard to your question about the relationship between zoo construction and the sixth floor addition.

Senator STEVENS. Under restoration and renovation you are asking for \$9.7 million, of which \$7.1 is for that addition to the History and Technology building.

Dr. RIPLEY. That is true.

Senator STEVENS. How large is that addition? How many square feet?

Dr. RIPLEY. I would like to ask Mr. Hindle, the Director of the Museum of History and Technology, if he would be kind enough to join us at this point. We have a model showing the proposed construction which, as I say, we have been working on for many years, and if you would allow Dr. Hindle to speak to this, he has the details, including the assignable square footage, the total square footage required. Dr. Hindle.

Dr. HINDLE. The answer to the chairman's specific question is some 62,000 square feet.

Now, Mr. Chairman, might I show on the model what the plan is in general.

COST PER SQUARE FOOT

Senator STEVENS. How does that compare with the Air and Space Museum in terms of square footage?

Dr. HINDLE. I can respond to the cost of this museum. Perhaps someone else here can give the cost of the Air and Space Museum.

The cost per gross square foot here is \$115. This is an expensive cost. There are causes for this, I might add, but I think the more important point is that the actual building standing here cost, when it was built, \$46.50 per square foot; and using two different inflation scales, we came to the average of \$109 per square foot for the present building as it stands now in terms of today's dollar.

So that the cost per square foot of \$109 for the present building compares with \$115 for this addition. The addition is expensive because it is an unusual space. If I might show it to you. It is on the sixth floor. It is an angular space. This is the addition to the present building. You will see that it changes the building hardly at all.

One of the requirements was to have the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts of the Capital approve any addition which would be made. Other thoughts and other approaches for other additions had been rejected.

This addition does harmonize well with the existing building. But it is six floors up. It has to be tailor fitted into the present building. It has to be faced with the same kind of stone and I think because of the peculiar requirements, the cost is probably understandable.

Dr. RIPLEY. Referring to your original question, Mr. Chairman, in this regard, I can say that there is little comparison between adding a sixth floor to the Museum of History and Technology and constructing at one blow, as it were, a National Air and Space Museum. We are dealing here with a rather sophisticated, dense add-on to an existing building which even in its initial construction during the late fifties and early sixties was more expensive per square foot to build because of its construction requirements.

The Air and Space Museum with its fairly large underground parking area is largely an enclosed space. So that even in today's dollars the cost per square foot for building it amounts to about \$60 per square foot.

PURPOSE OF SIXTH FLOOR ADDITION

Senator STEVENS. This addition is for a library?

Dr. HINDLE. Yes. May I explain that, Mr. Chairman?

This is intended as a working library for the museum. It will provide space for practically all of our collection, the working area of the library, the study area to house the Eisenhower Institute for Historical Research which was assigned to this museum under congressional legislation; and it will house in a small part of the area the rare book library of the Smithsonian Institution, the core of which is the

recently acquired Dibner Library of the History of Science and Technology.

Senator STEVENS. This will house the whole Dibner collection?

Dr. HINDLE. This will have the whole Dibner collection.

Senator STEVENS. How much space will that require?

Dr. HINDLE. The Dibner collection currently amounts to something less than 10,000 volumes. The shelving space projected on the sixth floor is 215,000 volumes, and you may note on this chart our total holdings at this point are 146,000 volumes.

The reason this addition has been projected over a long period of time is that when the building was constructed it was 30 percent smaller than the originally projected space. There was a deficiency in the library space, as well as in other spaces, from the very beginning resulting in a distribution of our library in the 63 different locations, 2 of which are sites off the Mall.

The intention here is to concenter all of them at one point. The Dibner collection of rare books constitutes but a very small part of this library, although it contains the most valuable books and the ones which give this collection a special value.

Senator STEVENS. How much space on the sixth floor is given to library use?

Mr. HINDLE. Of the assignable space on the sixth floor, some 77 percent, or approximately 33,000 square feet is assigned to the library, including two stacks, librarians' working space and offices, and reading and reference areas. Eight percent, or 3,400 square feet is assigned to the study center; that is, the Eisenhower Institute, offices for visiting scholars, and the dual purpose conference room. The remaining 15 percent, or 6,000 square feet, is given over to restrooms, utility rooms, and the like.

SERVICE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Senator STEVENS. The purpose of the new addition appears to be restricted to certain scholarly studies. To what extent would this facility serve the general public?

Mr. HINDLE. The library is fundamentally a working library for the National Museum of History and Technology. It is a specialized reference and research library related to the collections and to the subject expertise of staff members and of visiting scholars. The library is essential to the museum in developing its collections, its exhibits, and its responses to public inquiries and other forms of public service.

The new addition will be open to any members of the public who demonstrate genuine interest in consulting the books and journals in the library. Collectors, the casually interested, and historians make use of the present library which holds less than a third of our present collections. The balance of our library collections now are not easily available to the public because they are stored in such a variety of places and under the care of staff members who often are not free to serve the visiting public in this way. A new library will concenter nearly all of our books in the same area and under the care of professional librarians. Our whole collection will, therefore, be much more accessible for public use.

Of course, the rare book component of the library will be subject to greater restrictions in its use; however, our rare book library constitutes less than 10,000 out of our 146,000 volume collection.

In addition, the move to the sixth floor will free space that will be applied to public use. The exhibit space on the first floor in which journals and books are now stored will be freed for its intended use; and the temporary Dibner housing space will be freed for public presentation of historical experiments in science and for related movies. Moreover, the freeing of the present fifth floor library space will permit the location there of a central facility for the museum's documentary holdings, thereby increasing their accessibility to the interested public. Most are now held in reference and vault areas where access is necessarily limited.

Senator STEVENS. Well, will there be a conference area in this addition?

Dr. HINDLE. I didn't understand you.

Senator STEVENS. Conference facilities in this new addition?

Dr. HINDLE. Yes, there will be. There will be a conference room at the east end of the building and associated offices adjoining the Eisenhower Institute. The intention is to provide facilities for meetings that would be appropriate in this space.

We had from the beginning projected study and conference opportunities extending those existing already in the building and particularly tailored to the library focus.

PHASED FUNDING ALTERNATIVE

Dr. RIPLEY. I can point out, Mr. Chairman, that the \$7.1 million we are requesting is not all required in 1 year. It could be phased over 3 fiscal years.

Senator STEVENS. Would that increase the cost?

Dr. RIPLEY. No, sir. We have a firm figure for the construction.

Dr. HINDLE. The cost is \$7.1 million and the first year would be \$1.5 million. The next year would be \$4.1 million and the final year, \$1.5 million.

USE OF FREED-UP SPACE

Senator STEVENS. What are you going to do with all of the space that is currently being used for the library if it is to be moved to this addition?

Dr. HINDLE. If I may respond to that, Mr. Chairman. Space is very short in every category in the museum. The present Dibner library has been located in exhibit space. Many of our journals are located on the first floor in undeveloped exhibit spaces. Those areas would be freed to be applied to their proper function.

The present largest part of our documentary collection, that is, printed materials that function in part as objects and in part as research material, is located in the basement in a vault room intended as a staging area for exhibits and a receiving area for valuable objects. That would be freed for its proper uses.

The present library, which is exceedingly small, and holds only some 45,000 of our books, would be available then to be properly developed as a documentary center where we could bring the scattered documentary holdings we have.

We could service them for staff and scholars and the public. These materials should be available to all people who are qualified to use them and interested in them. But currently because they are scattered in many curatorial offices and elsewhere, it is impossible really to make them accessible to the people who have every reason to use them.

So that the building of the sixth floor library would have a linkage effect freeing up space and permitting the museum to function in a way that it has not been able to before.

If I might add, Mr. Chairman, our museum is a museum of objects. It is the national museum of American history. It is unique because of the staff experts present here in conjunction with what are the greatest collections in the world in many of our areas of responsibility.

The staff experts, the objects, and the books and documentary holdings are what give us our great strength. The exhibits we show, our collecting policy and leadership throughout the country in the areas that we are concerned with depend on, almost as much as anything else, a well functioning library.

Our fine professional staff cannot function as well in the present circumstances as they would be able to with a properly functioning library.

REMAINING MALL SITE AS AN ALTERNATIVE

Senator STEVENS. Did you consider using the remaining construction site on the Mall in lieu of adding another level to the existing building?

Dr. HINDLE. Mr. Chairman, I think that there are two points that might be raised in response to that question.

The library has to be adjacent to and easily accessible to the people in our building. We have the great resource of the Library of Congress which we make good use of. But that is not equivalent to a working library in which our staff and associated visiting scholars and the public can work in conjunction with the objects. So a building located that far away would not serve us in the way that we need.

I think the second answer from the viewpoint of the Congress, the public, and the Smithsonian is that the last site on the Mall almost necessarily has to serve a larger public on a more continuing basis, whatever its function is, than a working library of one museum of the Smithsonian.

And that, I think, Mr. Ripley and the Executive Committee would not feel is the best use for the public of that final space, and I doubt that the Congress would feel that it was.

Senator STEVENS. Has the Fine Arts Commission given its approval of this addition?

Dr. HINDLE. Yes, it has. It has been enthusiastic about our design.

NEED FOR CONFERENCE FACILITY

Senator STEVENS. Why don't you give us a statement for the record of the need for a conference facility in the new addition with particular reference to the Elk Ridge, Md., conference center. The committee would like to know in that statement why the existing facilities in other Smithsonian buildings could not serve the purpose of the conference facility.

Dr. RIPLEY. We will do that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Would you also include for the record in that other request the cost of housing the Dibner collection to date and the details of the Dibner collection?

Dr. RIPLEY. Yes, we will, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

SIXTH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

It is somewhat of a misnomer to describe the facilities projected for the Sixth Floor as a Conference Center. One conference room (20 feet by 30 feet), basically a seminar room with a single table in it, is projected for the east end of the floor. This conference room is located immediately adjacent to the study area intended to be occupied by the Eisenhower Institute for Historical Research and by offices of visiting scholars. As an integral part of the Eisenhower Institute program, this room will be used for seminars and meetings involving resident and visiting scholars and outside historians. At the same time, it will be available for small meetings directly related to the library or to other programs carried out in this Museum.

Existing facilities within the Museum of History and Technology for accommodating meetings and conferences include one auditorium, holding 271; a dual use space available for separate exhibits or for classroom use, holding 80; and two conference rooms, one holding 35 and the other, 18. Virtually in constant use, this very limited space must accommodate events such as Smithsonian Associate activities, docent and tour group activities, and meetings of groups from Living Historical Farms, to stamp enthusiasts, to military history groups. Moreover, alternative use of conference facilities, such as the Belmont Conference Center in Elk Ridge, Maryland, or those in other Smithsonian buildings, to house on a regular basis meetings and seminars integral to the work of the Museum of History and Technology would be inefficient and impractical.

HOUSING OF THE DIBNER LIBRARY

Temporary housing for the Dibner library specifically has cost \$131,153.

Design.....	\$27,000
Construction.....	95,818
Lighting, ADT, Smoke Detection	8,335
.....	
Total	131,153

The space constructed out of exhibit areas for the temporary housing of the Dibner library is designed to be used after the library's removal for the demonstration of historical experiments in the history of science, for movies related to the history of science, and for related public service functions. Minor construction will be needed to adapt the space to this use.

The relocation of exhibits in the area of the Dibner library cost \$28,181. This is a permanent change and represents an improvement in our exhibit presentation. The furnishings for the library and reference books required for maintaining it cost \$79,228. All of the furnishings were purchased with the intention of moving them to the Sixth Floor. The stacks, the tables, and other items will be permanently useful. Similarly the books are a permanent need. In addition to this, Smithsonian Libraries paid for packing and moving the donated books from Norwalk, Connecticut to Washington and for acquiring certain key book needs, \$30,500. The total of these sums is \$269,062.

MOUNT HOPKINS DORMITORY

Senator STEVENS. On the Mount Hopkins dormitory, you have the cost listed at \$240,000. Is that the total cost of that construction?

Dr. RIPLEY. I would like to ask Dr. Challinor to answer this, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. CHALLINOR. Mr. Chairman, the \$240,000 we are requesting for this dormitory is the total estimated cost. That figure is for a dormitory that will sleep 16 individuals.

Senator STEVENS. How far is this observatory from the proposed dormitory?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The dormitory that we are proposing would be a 10 minute walk from the new telescope. It is at the 8,000 foot level on the top of a mountain, 40 miles south of Tucson.

Senator STEVENS. You don't have to drive? It is in walking distance?

Dr. CHALLINOR. It is within walking distance. There is a road that goes up to the telescope itself on the summit of the mountain. It would be a 10 minute walk roughly from the dormitory site to the summit of the mountain where the telescope is being built.

Senator STEVENS. How long do you think that it will take to finish it?

Dr. CHALLINOR. Roughly a year and a half or possibly less. A great deal depends on the weather at the top of the mountain.

MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER AUTHORIZATION

Senator STEVENS. For the museum support center at Silver Hill, you are requesting \$325,000. Your total overall projected cost is \$21.5 million. Is there authorization for that construction?

Dr. RIPLEY. I would like to ask Mr. Perrot to join us at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERROT. Yes, we have authorization. This was signed into law in September 1975.

Senator STEVENS. For the facility itself?

Dr. RIPLEY. For the planning.

Senator STEVENS. But is the construction authorized yet?

Dr. RIPLEY. No, sir. Not at this time.

Mr. PERROT. Mr. Chairman, if I might add, construction authority is being requested by two bills that have been introduced and which I expect will be presented to the Congress by midsummer. At least this is information that we have received from staff members of the committees.

FUNCTIONS OF MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER

Senator STEVENS. Will it have conference facilities?

Mr. PERROT. No, sir. It will not.

Senator STEVENS. What is its real function going to be?

Mr. PERROT. It is a multiple function, Mr. Chairman. One to house the national collections which are now no longer adequately taken care of in the existing storage facilities of our museums and particularly, at the Museum of Natural History where over the last decades, halls that were originally intended for public display have been taken over by storage and research laboratories.

The facility is meant to consolidate a large number of the collections which are now occupying public spaces and, as well, it is intended to be a major research center where the scientific departments of the Museum of Natural History, and Federal agencies which use the museum, can have prompt and easy access to the collection for study, and the necessary laboratories so that this study can be of lasting value.

REVISION OF FISCAL YEAR 1977 REQUEST

Senator STEVENS. Is this the same facility that was requested last year for which the Congress did not provide the money?

Mr. PERROT. Mr. Chairman, it is essentially the same facility scaled-down, reviewed, pruned. What we had originally suggested was a facility that would be comfortable for the next decade. What we are proposing now is a facility which will meet the essential needs of the next decades.

Senator STEVENS. So it is scaled-down from some \$40 million to \$21.5 million?

Mr. PERROT. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The major result of this reduction is the elimination of a sizable growth factor space which had been included in the original proposal. We expect, however, that the facility that we propose will meet the needs of the Museum of Natural History over the next decades, as well as relieve pressure for storage and exhibit facilities in other parts of the institution.

CONSERVATION COST

Senator STEVENS. In addition to housing materials, you indicate the facility will contain areas for research on conservation. Do you have any details on how much those programs will add to your operating budget?

Mr. PERROT. Mr. Chairman, one of the major purposes of the support center is to adequately take care of the collections. We expect to have a conservation laboratory with training facilities for members of our staff, as well as for others who are interested in conservation and who, by learning with our staff, can also contribute valuable work to the institution's collections.

Senator STEVENS. By how much will the availability of this facility increase your program in dollars? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. PERROT. The ultimate figure for conservation will be in the order of approximately \$374,000 a year as we foresee it now. We have factored this beyond 1982. The cost of operating the building in its totality, with salaries and maintenance, is estimated at \$1,700,000 a year as of 1982.

Senator STEVENS. Well, specifically, how much will it cost to run this conservation school? Can you give us the details for the record on the increased cost of your program and the cost of running the school?

Mr. PERROT. I will be glad to provide that, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH CONSERVATION LABORATORY IN MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER

The development of a major conservation laboratory and training facility is a multiyear project. It is anticipated, if the Museum Support Center is completed by 1982, that workshops and training laboratory will be in operation, shortly thereafter. However, in view of the national paucity of highly trained staff, it is unlikely that this laboratory will be able to be in full gear before the mid-80's. A similar experience has been encountered in the development of virtually all museum conservation and training programs in this country or abroad: they have had to start on a small scale primarily because adequately trained faculty were not available in sufficient number to man a full program.

It is expected that the Conservation-Analytical Laboratory and the workshops and training programs at Silver Hill will eventually employ approximately 20 persons of which one-third may be highly trained scientists and the balance, technicians and support staff.

The cost of this personnel has been estimated at approximately \$374,000 a year. It should be noted, however, that in the first years of occupancy it is unlikely that

more than half of this could be easily expended. The conservation profession, and particularly its teaching components, is, at the present time, barely maintaining its numbers, and those new conservators that come into the profession are insufficient to meet the growing demands of museums and other fields of historic preservation which include monuments and archaeological sites. This is not only a national problem but one which affects all parts of the world. Hence, by developing laboratories and providing training the Institution would be not only developing means to better preserve the National Collections but also would be providing a national and international service.

AVAILABILITY TO SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY AND GENERAL PUBLIC

Senator STEVENS. Is that going to be open to the general public or only employees of the Smithsonian?

Mr. PERROT. It will be open to scholars from this country and abroad and there will be very small reception areas, with small exhibits which will be available for the community. Since the land on which we plan to build is, in part, not developable, but constitutes, in a sense, a nature preserve, we expect to have some trails and interpretive programs for the community of Prince Georges County.

But it is not meant to be a public museum. It is meant to be a research/conservation/storage facility. And, if I might say, Mr. Chairman, it is extremely important that this facility be developed if the Museum of Natural History, particularly, is going to be able to continue the important programs that it has in research and public display in a way that is worthy of its history.

LAND ACQUISITION

Senator STEVENS. I understand that you have already acquired 61 acres and you are negotiating for an additional 21 acres.

Mr. PERROT. The 21 acres have been excessed by the Department of the Army, and we expect that they will be transferred to us by the GSA within the coming months.

Senator STEVENS. Where did you get the 61 acres?

Mr. PERROT. If I might show the plan, Mr. Chairman.

This area marked A, shows the current facility which the Smithsonian has occupied since 1951 and was transferred to us in 1959. These areas marked C and B have been excessed by the General Services Administration and have already been transferred to us.

Area G has been excessed by the Department of Army as of last year. And area F is in the process of being excessed and transferred.

This entire section here, leading to Suitland Parkway, is not developable. It consists of ravines and wooded areas and we would like to maintain it as a buffer separating the support center from the highway, but also as an area for public teaching. This can be done inexpensively with our existing staff.

The area where we plan to construct is located here, partly on track C, partly on track F with a very small part on track G. This acreage, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, will be ready to be constructed upon within the year.

Senator STEVENS. Did you have to buy any part of the site?

Mr. PERROT. No, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Where are you going to get D and E?

Mr. PERROT. D is an Army communications tower which is going to be retained by the Department of Defense. Section E is under the control of the National Park Service.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

FORT PIERCE BUREAU

Senator STEVENS. Your request under salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1978 is just over \$89 million, which is an increase of \$7 million over appropriations to date. Under your program for the Assistant Secretary for Science you list the Fort Pierce Bureau—what is that?

Dr. RIPLEY. Dr. Challinor.

Dr. CHALLINOR. The Fort Pierce Bureau, Mr. Chairman, is a small operation consisting of a marine laboratory that was built by the Harbor Branch Foundation. The foundation allows us to use their marine facility to conduct research. No Federal dollars are being used in this bureau for salaries and expenses. It is financed completely from the income of a gift from Mr. Seward Johnson. The gift now produces an income of around \$700,000 a year.

Senator STEVENS. Would you give us a brief history of the Fort Pierce Bureau—whether there has been any Federal funding for the construction or salaries?

Dr. RIPLEY. Yes, we would be happy to. There has been virtually no Federal funding of any sort for the bureau.

Senator STEVENS. What is the annual private funding?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The \$700,000, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Again, we would like to have a brief history for the record.

Dr. RIPLEY. We will do so, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

FORT PIERCE BUREAU ACTIVITIES

The Fort Pierce Bureau, located on the Inland Waterway between Vero Beach and Fort Pierce, Florida, was established in October, 1971. Initially the Bureau assisted in the development and operation of the research submersible, Johnson-Sealink, for scientific investigations of shallow marine waters. Life histories of marine animals were among the first studies begun by the Bureau to stress reproductive biology and larval developmental patterns. In September, 1973, the Bureau initiated the Indian River Study, a long-term environmental program to obtain baseline information on the diversity of organisms in the Indian River lagoon and quality of their environment, and the sources of pollution and its effects on the organisms. These two latter programs are currently in progress.

A Federal employee was detailed to direct the Bureau's operations through March, 1977. Other than the salary of this employee, there has been no other Federal funding for construction or salaries at the Fort Pierce Bureau.

PROPOSED INCREASE FOR MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

Senator STEVENS. In the Museum of Natural History, you are seeking \$55,000 to fund six additional positions, but you only list three additional permanent positions in the request.

Now, what is the reason for that? Are there three existing unfunded positions?

Dr. RIPLEY. Dr. Challinor.

Dr. CHALLINOR. Although six positions are listed here, Mr. Chairman, only three of these positions are new positions. The other three are already in our total allotment, but there are not funds to pay the salaries. The three new positions that we are asking for are three new technicians and \$30,000 to pay them.

Senator STEVENS. Were they funded in the past? Any one of the six funded in the past?

Dr. CHALLINOR. No; not with funds available to the Natural History Museum. They were paid for out of the contingency fund.

Senator STEVENS. What are you going to use the three additional positions for?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The three technicians mentioned in the justification are to support the existing staff and to move toward our immediate goal of achieving a ratio of two technicians to each practicing scientist. With the addition of these three technicians, we will then have a 1.79-to-1 ratio.

The other three positions which are already in our base, but which are not funded, are one scientist and two technicians for the study of rare and endangered island bird populations. There is a fourth unfunded position as well, a linguist that we need very badly to continue our study of Indian languages. This scientist will work both in the Department of Anthropology and with the Handbook of North American Indians.

POSITIONS FINANCED BY CONTINGENCY FUND

Senator STEVENS. You have not funded those in the past with any other funds, private or otherwise?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The linguist is there now, but he is there only on a temporary appointment.

Senator STEVENS. But I mean those three slots that you anticipate using, they have not been funded in the past?

Dr. CHALLINOR. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are now asking for permanent salary for them.

Senator STEVENS. Where did you get the money to pay for them in the past?

Dr. CHALLINOR. I will have to refer to the Treasurer there, Mr. Chairman, to answer that question, or the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Jameson.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Chairman, the \$55,000 justified under the heading of research on island birds are for three jobs which were funded for a couple of years out of the Secretary's contingency fund. These are jobs that we had tried on at least two occasions, I believe, to get funded through the OMB process and were not successful. When we halted the contingency fund, we tried again and we were successful and these are, in effect, funds to sustain the employment of these people.

NEW COMPUTER FOR SMITHSONIAN ASTROPHYSICAL OBSERVATORY

Senator STEVENS. You have \$325,000 for the computer. Where is that located? The actual physical location.

Dr. RIPLEY. This is at the Astrophysical Observatory. Dr. Challinor.

Dr. CHALLINOR. This computer is located in Cambridge, Mass., which is the headquarters of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory.

Senator STEVENS. What is the problem with the existing computer?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The existing computer is now starting its 10th year of operation and its main problem is that it is obsolete and thus increases the danger of having a breakdown during its operation.

In other words, after 10 years of around-the-clock use, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, parts are literally beginning to wear out.

Senator STEVENS. You indicate that you are going to supplement the \$325,000 with \$175,000 of available funds.

Dr. CHALLINOR. These are funds within the Astrophysical Observatory S. & E. research funds that will be assigned to supplement the \$325,000 to carry out research problems using the computer.

Senator STEVENS. Is the cost going to be half a million dollars, or are you going to expend \$325,000 and add on \$175,000 for use?

Dr. CHALLINOR. What we plan to do here, Mr. Chairman, is either to lease or lease/purchase, whichever is the more economical, a new computer which will be operated through our computer cost center. The cost center principle implies that all costs incurred by the cost center have to be recovered from the users by means of an hourly rate. It is estimated that the requested \$325,000 which we sought to purchase the needed additional computer time will be sufficient together with funds available in the SAO base and income produced from all other users to pay for the incremental costs associated with the lease or lease purchase of the new computer.

LANGLEY-ABBOT PROGRAM

Senator STEVENS. On the Langley-Abbot program, you have a \$50,000 increase for solar research. What would be the total funding for that program if we add the \$50,000?

Dr. CHALLINOR. We have received from a foundation about \$30,000 in private funds for this program. We are now asking for an additional \$50,000. If the foundation awards a continuation of the present grant, the total funding on the Langley-Abbot program would then be \$80,000.

Senator STEVENS. Is that an ongoing program at that level?

Dr. CHALLINOR. We would anticipate it being ongoing at that level. As long as we are successful in raising private funds from foundations.

MULTIPLE MIRROR TELESCOPE

Senator STEVENS. At Mount Hopkins, how much have you spent so far on the multimirror telescope?

Dr. CHALLINOR. I can give you the exact figure here, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Are you using Federal funds out there?

Dr. CHALLINOR. Those are all Federal funds which we have been reporting each year since 1972 when we started this program. Let me get the exact amount here. The total cost is \$8.4 million. That is our latest estimate. This is a joint project with the University of Arizona which is also furnishing money for this particular project.

I will have to dig here a minute to see exactly what we have spent to date. I would estimate that we have spent somewhere in the vicinity of between $\$4\frac{1}{2}$ and $\$5\frac{1}{2}$ million. I can get that figure for you precisely.

Senator STEVENS. Has there been any cost overrun there?

Dr. CHALLINOR. It has been more expensive than we had originally planned mainly due to the delays in starting construction, to a relatively conservative initial estimate of what it was going to cost, and to the stretch-out or the extra time that has been spent to complete

this facility. Inflation has been an enormous factor in increasing the cost.

I might point out, however, in its defense that this telescope, which will be the third largest in the world, will cost, when fully operational, perhaps around \$8.4 million. It is probably less than half as expensive as the smaller telescope, the 156-inch one which is now the third largest. The latter was built at Kitt Peak, and probably ran somewhere between \$15 and \$18 million.

Senator STEVENS. I seem to recall a discussion several years ago of whether this telescope was really necessary. It was not only one of my questions, but one of my colleague's questions. Would you give us a listing of the requests that you have made and the actual cost that has been involved in the construction of the telescope and include any contributions that have been received from other sources, specifically the university, to see whether they have been contributing proportionately to the Federal funds?

Dr. CHALLINOR. I will be happy to furnish that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

Funding of Multiple Mirror Telescope

When first estimated in 1970, the Multiple Mirror Telescope (MMT) Program was expected to cost \$3,000,000 and take 45 months to complete (from early FY 1971 through FY 1974).

Initially the program cost was to be shared equally by the Smithsonian and the University of Arizona (U of A); the Smithsonian share was to come from annual appropriations, and the U of A share was expected to come in the form of Research and Development contract(s) from the Department of Defense (DOD). In response to budget requests in FY 1972 and FY 1973, a total of \$750,000 was added to the base of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for this project. However, probably as a result of the Mansfield Amendment, U of A was unable to qualify for the DOD support because the program was not DOD-mission oriented. Also, the initial U of A request for NSF support was unsuccessful (more recently, NSF is funding part of U of A's program effort). These developments notwithstanding, U of A remained committed to the program and contributed to it eight 72-inch mirror blanks, six of which will be used as the MMT primary mirrors, as well as university funds and expertise.

These funding related developments are, by and large, responsible for the significant program schedule delays and the inherent cost growth. It is now estimated that the following major milestones will be accomplished as follows:

March 1978: First light received by MMT
 Summer 1979: Facility to be routinely operational
 March 1981: Interior of housing structure complete

It is currently estimated that the program cost at March 1978 and at March 1981, respectively, will be as follows:

Item	At March 1978			At March 1981		
	SAO	U of A	Total	SAO	U of A	Total
	Cost	Cost		Cost	Cost	
Optics	\$203	\$1,241	\$1,444	\$203	\$1,241	\$1,444
Optical Support						
Structure	714	-	714	714	-	714
Mount & Controls	1,336	-	1,336	1,336	-	1,336
Housing Structure	2,600	-	2,600	3,370	-	3,370
System Engineering,						
Integration, Test	797	423	1,220	1,030	533	1,563
	\$5,650	\$1,664	\$7,314	\$6,653	\$1,774	\$8,427

The difference between the original and current estimates is a result of the following major factors: schedule delays, inflation, and increased design sophistication.

PROPOSED INCREASE FOR SMITHSONIAN TROPICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Senator STEVENS. On the Tropical Research Institute, why do you need an extra person there? You have 19 scientists onboard. Is there any other assistance used in that research project—any other funding used?

Dr. CHALLINOR. At the Tropical Research Institute, Mr. Chairman, our total grant and contract amount, at least for fiscal 1977, came to \$53,000. Of this amount \$18,000 was from the National Science Foundation and \$35,000 was from private foundations and corporations.

Senator STEVENS. Why do you need another person there?

Dr. CHALLINOR. This particular person, Mr. Chairman, is a mammologist and we feel it is very important to have him there to continue research that we have initiated over the years on the mammals of Central America, in particular, on those mammals that are vectors of yellow fever and encephalitis.

It turns out that many of the animals that live in the tropical forest are carriers of tropical diseases that infect human beings. We have, over the last few years, been working with the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama. It is primarily concerned with tropical diseases and their vectors and we hope to learn more about the role of the animals in the spread of these diseases.

In this particular case, a mammologist is being sought to help us study the sloth, an animal that lives in the trees and which we believe is also a vector of yellow fever.

TRAVEL REQUEST FOR RADIATION BIOLOGY LABORATORY

Senator STEVENS. All right.

On the Radiation Biology Laboratory, you have a \$9,000 increase in travel which would almost double the amount that is currently available. Your justification states that you want to send four staff members to the International Congress on Solar Energy Research in India. Is that the total amount of the request? Is that what the \$9,000 is for?

Dr. CHALLINOR. It is in addition to the modest travel budget they now have, Mr. Chairman. I might point out that the president of the International Solar Energy Group is on the staff of the Smithsonian Radiation Biology Laboratory and we feel it very important for him to be at this international conference.

Three other people on the staff of the Solar Radiation Biology Laboratory have been invited to deliver papers at this conference and we feel that it is very important that they be there to represent the Institution and pick up whatever knowledge they can at a meeting, such as this.

Senator STEVENS. Is Federal funding the only source of money for this conference?

Dr. CHALLINOR. This Federal money being sought would be the only source of travel funds for these people to go to it.

Senator STEVENS. Are any private moneys involved in supporting that conference?

Dr. CHALLINOR. That I could not answer, sir. I would have to furnish that for the record. I do not know.

Senator STEVENS. All right.

[The information follows:]

TRAVEL TO CONFERENCE ON SOLAR ENERGY RESEARCH

There are no private funds available for support of travel to the international congress on solar energy research.

REDUCTION IN EXHIBITS BASE OF AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

Senator STEVENS. On the Air and Space Museum, there is a decrease.

Dr. RIPLEY. I would like to ask Mr. Yellin to speak to that.

Senator STEVENS. Are you just delaying the replacement of exhibits, or is this a permanent decrease?

Mr. YELLIN. This is a permanent decrease, Mr. Chairman. When the museum first opened, we thought that certain exhibits would be temporary in nature. They have been so successful and so popular, as certain studies have shown, we have decided to maintain these exhibits, such as World War II aviation, rocketry and space flight and others, on a more permanent basis. And, therefore, our exhibit base for the museum has been reduced by \$525,000 which consists of the \$395,000 explained in this budget and \$130,000 reprogramed from NASM earlier this year, with the approval of the Congress. I might add that Mr. Collins is fully supportive of this decrease in the exhibit base.

Senator STEVENS. That has been very successful, I understand.

Mr. YELLIN. Yes, sir.

SILVER HILL EXHIBITS

Senator STEVENS. At Silver Hill, you want to open another building to the public? Is that right?

Dr. RIPLEY. Yes, we do, Mr. Chairman.

This is in connection with the aircraft facilities which are there and which are available now because of the maintenance and care they have been given by the staff at Silver Hill.

Senator STEVENS. Will you have adequate funds to maintain that and the other building, the Air and Space Museum if you have this decrease of \$395,000?

Mr. YELLIN. Yes, we would, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Where did that cut come from? Did OMB make that cut?

Mr. YELLIN. In the Air and Space Museum, this was a decision made by the Institution.

Senator STEVENS. We earlier reprogramed funds from the Air and Space Museum and now you want to have a reduction of the museum budget. Are you sure that you are going to have enough money to keep that going as you originally planned?

Mr. YELLIN. Yes, sir. We are quite sure that the total reduction which would be \$525,000—\$130,000 which we earlier reprogramed and this \$395,000—would leave an adequate base to keep the museum going just as it has been.

Senator STEVENS. This doesn't imply an intent, now, to downgrade the Air and Space Museum in the Smithsonian in any way?

Mr. YELLIN. In no way, sir.

Dr. RIPLEY. We are very proud of the Air and Space Museum.

ZOO INCREASE

Senator STEVENS. At the zoo, you are requesting an increase of 19 positions and \$798,000 which seems to be divided between the zoo itself and the Front Royal Center. There are 13 people at Rock Creek, approximately \$600,000. What is the need for additional funding and additional people at Front Royal?

Mr. REED. Sir, the additional people needed at Front Royal are keepers to care for the animals that are now being transferred to the facilities and those being born there.

We need four keepers there to take care of the animals we have and the animals projected and two additional maintenance mechanics to take care of the facilities, such as the machinery, the electrical systems, and the plumbing; work that needs to be done on the buildings that are already in place.

Senator STEVENS. One of the purposes of the Front Royal Center is breeding of species for the zoo. Do you conduct breeding work anywhere other than the Front Royal Center and the zoo proper?

Mr. REED. Yes, we have animals on loan to other zoos and breeders under breeding agreements. For example, orangutans owned by the National Zoo are on loan to such zoos as Fort Worth, Seneca Park, Kansas City, Topeka, and Omaha's Henry Doorly Zoo and Seattle's Woodland Park. Also we have loans to specialists in breeding. In all, we have 166 animals on loan to other zoos and breeding farms. Of course, we also have many animals on loan to us for breeding purposes as well.

HEALTH CONDITIONS AT FRONT ROYAL

Senator STEVENS. I read some articles about animal management and the safety of the employees. Most of these were in the Federal Times, which we will adopt for the record, by reference, and you may make any comments you wish for the record, but let me ask you a few questions about them now.

There is an allegation in one of them that prior to acquiring the Front Royal site you were warned by the Department of Agriculture that tuberculosis organisms were in the soil and that breeding animals there would be dangerous. Is that right?

Mr. REED. Before acquiring the site, we had lengthy discussions with the veterinary services of the Department of Agriculture, both the doctors at Beltsville in the Research Division and the men who had been working at the Beef Cattle Research Station. We discussed all of the diseases that had been present in the herds of cattle there over the years.

We tried to find out the problems that the Army had had when they had maintained horses and the canine corps there. We also investigated and discussed with the then occupiers of the land the grasses, the soil condition, and the toxic plants that were there. So we had as good an idea as we could have of what was there.

We were made aware of the fact that there were certain more or less standard cattle diseases that were in the area. We are more concerned with black leg, than we are with the diseases mentioned in the newspaper article. This is called Johnnes disease. It is distantly related to tuberculosis and sometimes it is referred to as paratuberculosis. However, it is not tuberculosis.

The Agriculture Department had had, a few years prior to the closing down of the station, some difficulty with this disease. However, at the time that we acquired Front Royal, the disease had been under control for several years.

They sold or moved all their animals. They moved their beef cattle off of the station a full year before we occupied it with any animals. At the time their animals left, they were tested as they had been routinely tested and were certified as being clean.

Senator STEVENS. Has any problem developed there? The article seems to indicate that you were warned of the situation before acquiring the site. Is that right?

Mr. REED. I would not say that we were warned. We were advised and we studied the total situation. We were given the full understanding of what the problems were there, which we considered no worse than any place else on the east coast. You know, the east coast has been occupied by man and animals since well before the Revolution. There have been a lot of animals and people occupying this land, so it could be contaminated.

I don't think that we were warned. We were advised of previous problems and we assessed that we would be able to handle it. We have had no problem with any of these conditions that the Agriculture Department talked about except with some toxic plants.

We have had some problems with that. We are making further studies on the wild plant life, as it affects our animals. We, of course, have a vaccination and testing program where applicable.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES ON ZOO

Senator STEVENS. These articles make many allegations. Again, if you have any comments to make about them so that we can have a record that shows any steps that you have taken to correct any of the situations in which the articles are right, or if they are wrong, we would be happy to have you respond, so we have a record on them.

[The information follows:]

Response to Newspaper Articles

Recently there has been a series of articles alleging mismanagement at the National Zoological Park. Several of the items have been covered in testimony elsewhere. Most of the allegations are based on incomplete understanding, misrepresentation, and conjecture. While I do not believe it would serve any useful purpose to include all allegations in this record, I maintain in my office a complete file on this matter with all questions minutely discussed no matter how trivial. I have submitted this documentation to the committee staff for their review.

Several of these allegations perhaps do need clarification.

First, the death rate at the National Zoological Park is alleged to be "alarmingly high." The newspaper articles claim about 30 percent a year. Apparently, they arrived at this figure by dividing the number of animals at the Zoo at the end of the year by the number that died during the year. In arriving at the crude mortality rate, all animals that were in the collection any time during the year are counted and that figure is divided by the number of animals that died during the year. The National Zoo's inventory (counts) includes every animal that is born or hatched in contrast to some zoos that wait as long as sixty days after birth, hatching, or acquisition before entering them on the inventory. By using our method of inventory every animal that is alive at any time during the year and under our care divided by the total number of animals that died during the year, our crude mortality rate for 1976 is 18 percent. Six other major zoos of comparable stature and collection size using the same method of inventorying and figuring their crude death rate fall within 3 percent plus or minus that of the National Zoological Park. The crude death rate will fluctuate from year to year depending on a variety of circumstances, but primarily it is in relation to the number of young born or hatched, particularly ducklings.

A second allegation is that there is tuberculosis of "perhaps pandemic proportions" at the Zoo. We admit that we have had problems in the past four years with tuberculosis in the birds. The highest rate of infection is 4 percent of the total collection. So far in calendar year 1977 the rate is less than 1 percent. This is certainly no pandemic or even epidemic although we are concerned. We have devoted much time and effort to developing reliable new methods of diagnosis, treatment, immunization, and prevention. We did host a conference on this subject which has resulted in much talk and effort here at the Zoo. Perhaps the newspapers are exaggerating the problem because we ourselves are devoting more time and effort in trying to understand and control this condition than is any other Zoo. Once again the National Zoological Park is taking leadership in a problem which has faced zoos for many, many years.

In the same vein, the newspapers assert that there is danger to the human visitors and that two keepers had become infected from the animals. This is totally false. Avian tuberculosis is only minimally infective to humans, and visitors are perfectly safe. Six years ago, one keeper did have tuberculosis and was absent from the Zoo for many months and did have a lung removed. However, he was not suffering from avian tuberculosis, and the doctors at the Veterans Administration Hospital where he was treated assured him his condition was not

job-related and further that they could not tell him how long he had had the condition, but it certainly appears to have been present prior to his employment at the National Zoo. This keeper has returned to duty and is working normally. The second keeper had a skin reaction to the standard tuberculosis test but does not have tuberculosis.

A third allegation that has recently appeared in the national press is that the National Zoological Park along with several other major zoos of this country acquired reptiles illegally and that indictments would be forthcoming. I emphatically deny that at any time did the National Zoological Park knowingly and willfully acquire animals that had illicitly entered the country.

Another question which has been raised concerns the propriety of the exchange of birds between the National Zoo and Mr. Ripley. Secretary Ripley has maintained an exceptional waterfowl collection for thirty years. I designated him as a Research Associate of the National Zoo several years ago. He also has interchanged birds with the Philadelphia and Bronx Zoos for many years. He is one of several collaborators of serious purpose and excellent facilities who help the National Zoo. Dr. Ripley's breeding facilities are registered with the international zoo yearbook and do admit the public.

Mr. Ripley's facilities and ornithological reputation are so highly regarded that my peers would chastise me if the National Zoo were not taking advantage of his efforts and assistance. Over the years, the National Zoo has received 50 birds for its collection from Mr. Ripley. We have loaned him about the same number for his Paddling Ponds facility to give the birds the privacy so essential to successful breeding.

This exchange is to the National Zoo's benefit. Loans to other zoos and recognized breeding specialists are of invaluable, perhaps crucial, assistance in insuring a future population of exotic animals.

OUTSIDE SERVICES OF ZOO VETERINARIANS

Senator STEVENS. One of the allegations is that the Federal employees of the zoo have been conducting private veterinary business using federal supplies and facilities. Did you look into that allegation?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Was it right?

Mr. REED. It is right in part. Our veterinarians are probably the most qualified exotic animal specialists on the east coast. Certainly you would have to go as far as Philadelphia or New York to find anybody who was as qualified as our men.

They have on their own time done services for the Largo wild animal park which is now closed. They have done work at the Kings Dominion on the exotic animals there. And I believe when the circus comes to town they have consulted and have worked for them.

Sometimes they have used our drugs. These have been replaced with a 10 percent addition for the Government. The drugs have been replaced.

However, our men have been paid for their services, which they did on their own time. I have known about this. I have been aware of the practice. I approve of it because it gives them more experience. Every time that they can handle a new or different or another exotic animal, that adds to their store of experience which benefits our animals at the zoo.

Senator STEVENS. You are satisfied that there is no danger to the zoo in the first instance or the animals there?

Mr. REED. No. Seldom has treatment been done in the zoo. There are one or two cases—I think we did have to do a caesarean section or a cataract operation on a lion that was brought in for her surgery. But there was no danger there. We are well aware of possible danger and take proper protective steps.

We do not routinely bring in out-patients or patients outside the collection to the zoo.

I think that it is an obligation on our part to the animals. A sick exotic animal needs the best care he can get and the best care that he can get is ours. I think that we owe the animals an obligation.

Senator STEVENS. I don't think that the committee would argue with that, but the allegation is that these people are using Federal facilities and supplies to maintain a private practice, you might say.

Mr. REED. No, I am satisfied that they are not maintaining a private practice based upon us. And, in fact, I don't think that they are doing much in the way of private practice. It is more of a service to the animals and of an interest to them in continuing their own professional development.

STATUS OF ZOO MASTER PLAN

Senator STEVENS. What about the zoo conditions now, Dr. Reed? There have been some reports that the facilities may be becoming inadequate for the animals. Can you tell us, what is the status of the project to upgrade the condition of the zoo?

Mr. REED. Well, with the help of Congress and many, many other people, certainly the senior staff of the Smithsonian Institution, we have been upgrading the zoo since 1961 and in particular since the

end of the Vietnam War when there has been a spurt in the construction.

We have spent almost \$26 million in improving the zoo. Now, I admit there are areas that still need work and this will be done in time in a logically phased program. Animals will be taken care of as they always have been until we have a completely modern and adequate facility for every animal in the zoo.

I am satisfied—in fact, I am very heartened with the progress that has been made realizing that it would be impossible to do everything all at once. It would be nice, but——

ANIMAL ACQUISITION FUNDS

Senator STEVENS. For animals, you have a list of \$29,000 for new acquisitions this year. Is that all the money you have or do you have private money, too?

Mr. REED. We have what is referred to as the private or the Chrysler Fund. This is an account that was started in 1926 from money left over from the Chrysler-Smithsonian expedition to East Africa. We add to that fund from the sale of animals and other gifts and bequests that we have received. We do use that primarily to purchase other animals for the zoo.

Senator STEVENS. You purchase all your animals from that fund?

Mr. REED. No, sir. We have the Federal appropriation as well as the Chrysler fund which we use. However, every animal that is purchased with either fund or acquired through a gift or capture, donations, trade, or both immediately becomes a Federal animal. There are no such things as “private” animals. They are all Federal animals.

Senator STEVENS. When you sell them, what do you do with the money?

Mr. REED. This money goes into the Chrysler fund. I think there is about \$40,000 in the fund right now. However, I have committed about \$25,000 of that for future purposes. That is, it is not in the form of a regular Government commitment. I know where the money is going to go, when the animals become available. We have tentatively committed the money knowing what we are getting in the next year.

Primarily, these will be for the new acquisitions in the new exhibit areas.

Senator STEVENS. Do you use that fund for anything else?

Mr. REED. We have, from time to time, used a small amount for other things. Most recently the gift that we gave to the ranger that brought the baby elephant from Sri Lanka that was presented to the children of America. Ms. Amy Carter received it for all the children. We gave the ranger a watch as a gift for coming over and staying with us to help care for little Shanti for 6 weeks.

There have been very minor things of that nature. But the bulk of it is for the acquisition of animals. This might include such things as the customs fees or brokerage fees, when an animal is brought in. It might include the transportation of the animal, which would be sometimes above the purchase price, depending upon how the animal arrived.

We use the term acquisition to mean all aspects of getting an animal for the zoo.

NEED FOR FEDERAL ACQUISITIONS FUND

Senator STEVENS. How do you figure out how much Federal money you need? You have animals there, you sell some, you buy some, you have money from the Chrysler fund, money from gifts, I take it, and other sources.

Mr. REED. The amount of money that we need from the federal appropriation has been based on a rather long historical evaluation of our general needs through the years.

[The following statement was later offered for the record:]

USE OF ACQUISITION FUNDS

We use the Federal funds for our essential purchases and as a continuing fund upon which we can count in good years and bad.

On the other hand, the Chrysler fund is difficult to estimate in any one year. Its amount depends on sales of animals and contributions. Sales are problematical because of the shortage of funds experienced by American zoos, so they cannot buy so many animals. And, we cannot sell animals to zoos or operations that do not have the veterinary staff or facilities to handle them. For those reasons, we can never count on a particular level of sales proceeds each year. We count on the Federal money to make necessary purchases and use the Chrysler fund to supplement those funds to the extent possible. Presently the Chrysler fund is at its highest level ever because we have not been buying animals until after the construction is finished. As I mentioned, we have a large portion of this fund tentatively committed to purchase animals for the seal and sea lion exhibit. By this time next year, I anticipate that the Chrysler fund will be greatly reduced.

SALE OF ANIMALS

Senator STEVENS. When you sell these animals, do you sell them to zoos or to individuals? What do you do with them?

Mr. REED. We generally sell them to other zoos. We have sold to some game farms. We are very careful about trying to find out where the animals go and how they will be treated when they arrive. After all, these are our children and we would like to know where they are going and what their future is.

Senator STEVENS. That fund has been in being since when?

Mr. REED. Since 1926 when the Chrysler Corp. sponsored an expedition to East Africa. Dr. Mann was then zoo director and when he returned, it has always been my suspicion that he returned after the close of the company's fiscal year, the expedition money had already been accounted for and the company told him to keep the left-over money and use it at the zoo as he wished. He put it into this fund for the purchase, acquisition and care of animals.

Senator STEVENS. How many animals are you talking about buying and selling a year? How many do you buy and how many would you sell?

Mr. REED. This would vary from year to year depending upon how many animals are born. It has in the past few years varied somewhat erratically due to the construction programs. Certainly when the birdhouse was under construction there were no birds being bought; During the year and a half, almost 2 years, that we were constructing the feline facility, there were no cats acquired. And then, when we did get our new lions in, they were on loan from the zoo at Morocco.

DOLLAR VOLUME OF TRANSACTIONS

Senator STEVENS. What would you say is the dollar volume of transactions in that fund annually? How much do you pay out and how much do you get in?

You are selling some animals and buying some animals. What is the volume of business that you are doing? You want \$29,000 in addition.

Mr. REED. This \$29,000 has been our base appropriation for years.

Senator STEVENS. You have about \$40,000 in there now?

Mr. REED. Yes, in the Chrysler fund.

Senator STEVENS. And you have some animals you are going to sell now during the year, so you will have some acquisition money and you are going to spend money.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. How much do we end up with at the end of the year if we give you \$29,000?

Mr. REED. I believe last year we spent about \$18,000, I think it was, from the Chrysler fund. May I furnish that for the record, sir, so I may be accurate?

Senator STEVENS. Yes.

[The information follows:]

USE OF THE CHRYSLER FUND

The Chrysler Fund is the means we use to facilitate the exchange of animals between zoos as envisioned by our enabling legislation—20 U.S.C. 81. The Fund has been fully explained to earlier Congresses, including in 1968 when Senator Byrd chaired the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee to which the Zoo then reported.

In fiscal year 1976, we spent a total of \$18,700 from the Chrysler Fund. About \$10,000 went for acquisitions and \$8,700 for shipping, registration on international animal listings, and other expenses involved with acquiring or shipping animals. Although we usually have a little money left over at the end of the year in the Chrysler Fund, the amount is normally not large. However, due to continuing breeding success adding to the fund and the construction program which has reduced our acquisitions, the current balance of \$40,000 is an anomaly.

USE OF FEDERAL VERSUS CHRYSLER FUND

Senator STEVENS. I just wonder if there is a real necessity to maintain a balance in the fund. That is the point. If you are going to put \$29,000 in and have \$50,000 left at the end of the year—

Mr. REED. This \$29,000 will be in the Federal appropriation which must be expended during the year where the Chrysler fund is a no-year expense. This can go over from year to year.

Senator STEVENS. I know, but you have \$29,000 to spend and you also have a bunch of Federal animals out there, some of which you are selling.

Mr. REED. They are all zoo animals. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. When you sell them, you put the money in the fund, don't you?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. And then you spend the fund without regard to the \$29,000, right?

Mr. REED. We balance between where it should come from, where we think it should come from. We normally spend practically all of the funds, Federal and Chrysler, each year.

Senator STEVENS. That is what I am trying to find out. How do you decide where it is going to come from, Federal dollars or the fund? What makes the difference?

Mr. REED. We——

Senator STEVENS. Am I confusing you?

Mr. REED. I am afraid so, sir.

Senator STEVENS. You have asked us for \$29,000 to buy animals. But you have a trade out there. You are selling animals and buying animals without regard to this \$29,000. Now, how do you decide when you are going to use the Chrysler fund, how do you decide when you are going to use the Federal dollars?

Mr. REED. That would depend upon the condition of the sale and trade. There are times when it is easier and more convenient to use the Chrysler fund than it is the Federal money because of the restrictions on how we handle the Federal money. I mean it is easier to spend the Chrysler money than it is the Federal money and since sometimes some of our deals are very involved, they must go that way. Rather, the people do not want to wait for the Federal purchase orders to come through and then the final payment.

There are some dealers throughout the world who will not deal with us federally because they do not want to have anything to do with Federal purchase orders. It just takes too much time. Their capital is tied up for too long a period of time.

So I think that each case is on a separate judgment. I would rather answer the question by saying that each case is based on a separate, individual judgment. Of course, when there are big expenses coming up in the purchase of a pair of very expensive animals, there have been times in the past when we have used the Federal appropriation to purchase one and the Chrysler fund for the other.

But, again, I say once they come to the zoo and are acquisitioned into the zoo, they are Federal animals no matter how they were acquired.

Senator STEVENS. But once you sell them, whenever you sell them, you put all the money back into the fund; is that right?

Mr. REED. That is right.

CHRYSLER FUND BALANCE

Senator STEVENS. What do you want to try to maintain in the fund? Have you some level?

Mr. REED. No, sir. We have never had a level that we wanted to maintain in there. The fact that we have so much money right now is because we do not have space to put the animals in and as soon as we have the space, when it is completed, then we will spend money as rapidly as we can. I don't believe in maintaining a big balance in that fund.

Senator STEVENS. That looks like a workable arrangement, if they are Federal animals and you sell them and put the money in the Chrysler fund and then come back and ask for more Federal dollars. It seems that you ought to have some target as to what level of money you are going to have in the Chrysler fund.

It is a strange thing if you use Federal dollars to buy Federal animals and you sell them to another zoo and put the money in this private fund.

Mr. REED. Well, this has never been the practice. We have never purchased animals for resale. You could almost say we were trying to wash Federal money if we did that. This would be evil. [Laughter.]

We buy animals for the zoo.

Senator STEVENS. I am not saying that it is evil. I am just wondering why you need more money if you have money in the fund. Now, why don't you just use it? You could wipe out the Chrysler fund and then fund it from Federal dollars in the future.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

RISING ANIMAL PRICES

Senator STEVENS. But you would want the Chrysler fund for a purpose, as I understand it, for quick purchase items.

Mr. REED. That is right, and to supplement the Federal funds. After all, the animal prices have gone up tremendously.

For instance, we are going to have the new seal and sea lion exhibit and we are going to maintain the California sea lions. The price of these animals is high. The first one I bought some 20 years ago was between \$75 and \$150 depending on what the age and sex was.

They are now up to \$1,000 apiece. The price on giraffes has gone from \$4,000 to \$15,000. The price of rhinoceros, if you can get the animals at all, is astronomical. An Indian rhinoceros would at this time be worth about \$50,000. We have bongos at the zoo which we purchased for about \$15,000 apiece. They are now, if they are available, about \$30,000 each.

The price on birds has gone sky-high since the quarantine has been put on the importing of birds and made it much more difficult to bring birds into the country. I saw a pair of cranes offered for \$4,000 apiece. This is ridiculous. Six or seven years ago I could have gotten them for maybe \$900 apiece.

ANIMAL SMUGGLING

Senator STEVENS. I saw an interesting program about the worldwide trade in birds and about how the price is going up. There is some bootlegging involved in there. You are not dealing with bootlegging now, are you, Doctor?

Mr. REED. Well, I hope not. To the best of my knowledge, I am not consorting or dealing with bootleggers.

Senator STEVENS. They had a picture of this man with a bunch of curlers, women's curlers, inside his coat. He put the little birds in each curler and got onboard the airplane. It was very interesting. It is said in the trade that how they can get them out of some of these countries into our country is a fantastic——

Mr. REED. Yes. They are bringing them in in hollowed out gasoline tanks across the Mexican border. It is a serious problem in Australia.

Senator STEVENS. Well, you really do try to deal with reputable dealers in terms of your acquisitions?

Mr. REED. We try to deal with reputable dealers. We are doing more looking into whom we are dealing with and I suspect that in the future we are going to have to send more expeditions into the field to do our own collecting. The present restrictions on importa-

tions set by the Endangered Species Act, both in this country and companion acts in other countries, are making it more difficult, so we may have to do more and more collecting personally, that is, the zoo sending expeditions out.

Senator STEVENS. Why don't you give us a listing of the acquisitions you have made for fiscal year 1976 and 1977 to date. Include the source and the price of each animal. Then for the same timeframe, give us a list of animals sold, whom they were sold to, and the prices, and whether originally acquired with Federal or private funds.

Mr. REED. Certainly. I will submit that information for the record.

[The information follows:]

Acquisition or Sale of Animals During Fiscal 1976 and 1977

In fiscal year 1976, the National Zoo purchased the following animals:

Mammals:	FEDERAL FUNDS	CHRYSLER FUND	PURCHASED FROM
Cheetah	\$5,000		Lion Country Safari
Hairy Armadillo (4)	715		Ravensden Zoo
Slow Loris	100		Charles Chase Co.
Tamandua	100		Blue Ribbon Pet Farm
Geoffrey's Marmoset	65		Gary Renfrow
Naked-Tailed Armadillo (2)	305		Blue Ribbon Pet Farm
Zorilla (2)	310		Metro Toronto Zoo
Tree Shrew	50		Oklahoma City Zoo
Black-Tailed Prairie Dog (4)	60		Otto Martin Locke
Hedgehog Tenrec	105		Frankfurt Zoo
African Crested Porcupine	300		Charles Chase Co.
Fishers (2)	400		Frank Webb
Red Brocket (2)		\$1,748	Gladys Porter Zoo
Rat Kangaroo (4)		508	National Park & Wildlife, Australia
Birds:			
Darwin's Rheas (6)	\$3,000		San Diego Zoo
White-Winged Trumpeter	300		Gladys Porter Zoo
Red-Legged Honeycreeper (6)	300		Shon Ross
Hooded Mergansers (3)	225		Winston Guest
Pukeko	200		Portland Zoo
Red-Breasted Geese (8)		\$6,400	Philadelphia Zoo
Moloccan Cockatoo		750	Zoe C. Gleysteen
Reptiles/Amphibians:			
Aldabra Tortoises (3)	\$4,700		Int'l. Animal Exchange
Boa Constrictor	250		Sheffield Edwards
Puff Adder (3)	90		Sheffield Edwards
Vine Snakes (2)	30		East Bay Vivarium
Mexican Treefrogs (4)	40		East Bay Vivarium
Asiatic Stripe-Tailed Rat Snake	60		Friendly Beasties
Cuban Anoles (3)	30		Charles Chase Co.
Leopard Tortoises (2)	325		Sheffield Edwards
Brazilian Rainbow Boa		\$215	The Shed

Thus far in fiscal year 1977, the National Zoo has purchased the following:

Mammals:			
Palm Civet	\$ 50		Val Peterson
Blesbok (2)	6,600		Jurgen Schulz
Zorilla	167		Wilhelmina Zoo
Markor (2)		\$6,295	Southwick Birds
Sable Antelope		7,500	Jurgen Schulz

Birds:	FEDERAL FUNDS	CHRYSLER FUND	PURCHASED FROM
Plumed Pigeon (4)	\$ 400		A.W. Steinbeck
Mountain Witches (6)	400		A.W. Steinbeck
Serpent Eagle	450		Jacksonville Zoo
Tinamou (4)	240		Bronx Zoo
Rufous Hornbill (4)	1,400		Los Angeles Zoo
Magellan Goose	150		Jacksonville Zoo

In fiscal years 1976 and 1977, the following animals were sold:

<u>ANIMAL</u>	<u>SOLD TO</u>	<u>PRICE</u>	<u>ACQUIRED ORIGINALLY</u>
Mammals:			
Burmese Thamin	San Diego Zoo	\$ 2,750	Born NZP
Greater Galago (2)	Cathedral Pines	50	Born NZP
Lesser Oriental Civet	Cathedral Pines	50	By Trade
Cape Buffalo	Baltimore Zoo	2,800	Born NZP
Greater Kudu (2)	Baltimore Zoo	4,000	Born NZP
Gelada Baboon (5)	F.J. Zeehandelarr, Inc.	1,150	2 Born NZP; 3 Private (1962)
Masai Giraffe	Franklin Park Zoo	13,200	Born NZP
Cape Buffalo (5)	Southwick Birds	2,850 &	3 Born NZP; 2 Private (1960)
	(Spectacled Bear)		
Raccoon Dog (2)	Rare Feline Breeding	100	Born NZP
Kinkajou (3)	Big 3 Zoo Farm	100	2 Donated; 1 Born NZP
Dorcas Gazelle (2)	Sacramento Zoo	1,700	Born NZP
Masai Giraffe	Vivo Animales, Inc.	10,000	Born NZP
Axis Deer	Cleveland Zoo	75	Born NZP
Spiny Mouse (4)	Beardsley Zoo	10	Born NZP
Greater Galago	Int'l. Animal Exchange	50	Born NZP
Pygmy Hippopotamus	Trefflich's	3,500	Born NZP
Spiny Mouse (4)	Cheniere Lake Park	10	Born NZP
Reindeer	Busch Gardens	600	Born NZP
Scimitar-Horned Oryx	Dickerson Park Zoo	500	Born NZP
Sable Antelope	Dickerson Park Zoo	500	Born NZP
Reeves' Muntjac	Pet-A-Pet Zoo	450	Born NZP
Paca	Rare Feline Breeding	50	Born NZP
Crab-Eating Fox (2)	Los Angeles Zoo	300	Born NZP
Raccoon Dog (3)	Los Angeles Zoo	150	Born NZP
Pere David's Deer (2)	Irving Game Farm	600	Born NZP

Birds:

Vulterine Guinea Fowl (4)	San Antonio Zoo	600	Born NZP
Vulterine Guinea Fowl (2)	Ft. Wayne Children's Zoo	300	Born NZP
Crested Green Wood Partridge	Shon Ross	75	Born NZP
Crested Green Wood Partridge (4)	William Perantino	300	Born NZP

<u>ANIMAL</u>	<u>SOLD TO</u>	<u>PRICE</u>	<u>ACQUIRED ORIGINALLY</u>
Birds (continued):			
Cape Shelduck	Jackson Zoo	\$ 40	Born NZP
Radjah Shelduck	Jackson Zoo	75	Born NZP
Barn Owl (4)	Cathedral Pines	160	Born NZP
Crested Green Wood Partridge (2)	Cathedral Pines	150	Born NZP
Crested Green Wood Partridge (4)	Shon Ross	300	Born NZP
Rothschild's Mynah (4)	Harold Yanik	500	Born NZP
Vulterine Guinea Fowl (2)	Busch Bird Park	300	Born NZP
Vulterine Guinea Fowl (4)	Ft. Wayne Children's Zoo	600	Born NZP
Vulterine Guinea Fowl (4)	Oklahoma City Zoo	600	Born NZP
Vulterine Guinea Fowl (2)	Brookfield Zoo	300	Born NZP
Vulterine Guinea Fowl (4)	Baltimore Zoo	400	Born NZP
Cape Shelduck	Baltimore Zoo	40	Born NZP
Lady Amherst Pheasant (2)	Lion Country Safari	20	Born NZP
Lady Amherst Pheasant (2)	Lincoln Park Zoo	20	Born NZP
Mandarin Duck (2)	Roy Arnold	35	Born NZP
Wood Duck	Roy Arnold	10	Born NZP
Wood Duck (15)	John Steen	225	Born NZP
Mandarin Duck (4)	Lincoln Children's Zoo	70	Born NZP
Mandarin Duck (4)	Gladys Porter Zoo	70	Born NZP
Wood Duck (3)	Gladys Porter Zoo	38	Born NZP
Common Rhea (19)	Wild Animals Int'l.	1,000	Born NZP
Nicobar Pigeon (2)	Walt Disney World	200	Born NZP
Common Rhea	Robinson Children's Zoo	50	Born NZP
Common Rhea (3)	Bramble Park Zoo	150	Born NZP
Common Rhea (3)	Wm. Sziget	150	Born NZP
Black Swan	Wild Animals Int'l.	125	Born NZP
Radjah Shelduck (2)	Vivo Animales, Inc.	300	Born NZP
Stanley's Crane	Warner Nartel	1,000	Trade
Chinese Necklace Doves (4)	Robert James	80	Born NZP

Reptiles/Amphibians:

Bengal Monitor Lizard	Central Florida Zoo	30	Public Donation
Bengal Monitor Lizard	Dickerson Park Zoo	20	Public Donation

PEKING ZOO

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. REED. I appreciate the opportunity to add these comments to the record.

Senator STEVENS. I went to the zoo in China, by the way, to see how the musk oxen were doing when I was in Peking and we could only find the male. We couldn't find anyone who would tell us what happened to the female. You don't happen to know that, do you?

Mr. REED. I think that that was the female you saw. I think that was Matilda.

Senator STEVENS. We were told it was the other way around.

Mr. REED. Well, I have been told that Milton died of traumatic pericarditis—you know, it is where he swallowed a piece of hardware and like on all cattle, it probably went into his heart and caused his death.

Senator STEVENS. I see. We were a little bit disturbed in Alaska because, as the translation said, these were animals from "somewhere on the North American Continent," and we thought we should have gotten a little credit for having provided the zoo animals.

Do they want a replacement? Do you know?

Mr. REED. I have not received any communication from the Peking zoo of this nature. However, I must admit that the correspondence is very, very slow.

Senator STEVENS. That is understandable. They seem to be doing a job in trying to upgrade their zoo.

Mr. REED. I think that they are and apparently it is well received by the people.

Senator STEVENS. We were there on a Sunday morning. There were a fantastic number of people there just wandering through.

Well, thank you very much. Dr. Reed, I appreciate, your comments. I think your zoo is a wonderful national center.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF MAN—CSM

Senator STEVENS. On the Center for the Study of Man, we have a request for \$95,000 and to increase five term appointments for the National Anthropological Film Center. That Center was created with funding from outside sources as the Ethnographic Film Center. In 1976 you requested \$20,000 to hire a Director. In the current year you have an additional \$20,000 and now you want \$95,000 more.

Could you tell us why such a large Federal funding is necessary in view of the original funding levels of that Center?

Dr. RIPLEY. Dr. Challinor.

Dr. CHALLINOR. Mr. Chairman, this Center was primarily funded when it came to the Smithsonian with grants from the National Endowments and the National Institutes of Health. The Center is primarily concerned with photographing the day-to-day behavior and living patterns of those communities which are disappearing culturally.

The main problem that the Smithsonian has had is developing a Federal base to maintain a core staff to service the bequests, grants and gifts that have come to the Center to photograph these people.

I might point out that during fiscal 1976 and the transition quarter, the Center received from Federal sources, both the NIH and the NEH, a total of \$243,000 and from private donations and individuals, some \$50,000.

We have requested during fiscal 1977 some \$550,000 from the NIH and the NEH and estimate perhaps another \$20,000 or more in donations from private individuals. The problem has been to attract increasing donations, especially from foundations. The permanent staff needed to maintain these facilities has not been there.

Therefore, foundations that would normally support us are unwilling to give money for administrative expenses. They feel that that is the obligation of the Institution to furnish the core administrative staff.

We are asking for \$95,000 in fiscal 1978 and five term appointments to maintain a core operating staff in the Center.

Senator STEVENS. Well, give us the details of that for the record. And a comparison on your fiscal 1976 and what your sources will be in 1977.

[The information follows:]

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1978 FEDERAL BUDGET OF THE NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL FILM CENTER COMPARED WITH FISCAL YEAR 1976 AND FISCAL YEAR 1977

The fiscal year 1978 budget request of the National Anthropological Film Center totals \$139,000. These funds are designated as follows:

	<i>[In thousands of dollars]</i>
Personnel compensation and benefits	¹ \$113
Travel	2
Other services	13
Supplies and materials	5
Equipment	3
All other	3
Total	139

¹ Funds will provide for the Director and five term employees.

In fiscal year 1976, Federal base resources for the Film Center total \$20,600. In fiscal year 1977 Federal base resources total \$43,000.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL FILM CENTER

Senator STEVENS. Dr. Margaret Mead appeared before the committee and testified on the need for documenting vanishing cultures on film before their characteristics are eroded by other cultures of our mainstream life.

Will this budget allow for that purpose?

Dr. CHALLINOR. This budget will allow it at a very minimum level. We feel the Smithsonian's obligation is to keep this particular organization fully functional from an administrative end. If we are successful in doing this, we believe that we can attract the necessary support from foundations who support this kind of research.

Senator STEVENS. Have you a commitment from the National Endowments on Arts and Humanities for this coming fiscal year?

Dr. CHALLINOR. We currently have a request in for a grant of \$183,000 to the National Endowment for the Humanities. This is

a 2-year grant. The present grant of \$118,000 expired on April 1, 1977.

We have submitted another series of grants for a 2-year period totaling \$183,000. We have not yet heard from the National Endowment whether these grants have been approved.

They have approved them in the past and if they are authorized to continue these grants, they will be an important component in supporting this facility.

COUNTRIES INVOLVED WITH FILM CENTER

Senator STEVENS. What other countries are involved in the film center?

Dr. CHALLINOR. We have secured permission from a series of countries throughout the world to photograph their remote tribal cultures. These include Indonesia, Nepal, Sudan, Afghanistan, Iran. I could furnish all the list, but those are the kinds of countries that we are now working in.

Senator STEVENS. Are you doing any work with organizations like the National Geographic to determine what film records they have of those cultures to begin with?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The films that belong to National Geographic, as I understand, remain the property of the National Geographic and sometimes it is very difficult to get them from that institution. Mr. Ripley maybe can answer that better than I.

Senator STEVENS. Well, are we duplicating the film records of the cultures involved that are in the National Geographic archives?

Dr. RIPLEY. Well, I think two things could be said here. First of all, the Geographic maintains its own records and does not release the film, and second, it is taken for other purposes. That is essentially as travel film and thus is distinct from anthropologically oriented films.

Senator STEVENS. Does the host country contribute anything to the support of the activities involved?

Mr. CHALLINOR. This depends on the country, Mr. Chairman. Often-times, they do indeed furnish support, mostly logistical support, such as travel and transportation expenses, and contacts. Guides to get into these remote areas are very often supported directly by the host country.

Senator STEVENS. The committee has received some mail that indicates that the Film Center expects to suffer losses as a result of the National Endowment's failure to meet your grant request, and that funding of \$426,000 over the budget request is needed to take advantage of these filming opportunities.

What is the validity of that mail and the assertions made? I am sure you are aware of these letters.

SUPPORTERS OF FILM CENTER

Dr. CHALLINOR. I am aware of these letters and with respect to the first part and the role of the National Endowment I would like to refer this to Mr. Jameson.

Mr. JAMESON. We believe that there is no firm policy, Mr. Chairman. Our proposal is pending before the National Endowments and

I believe we have heard nothing to indicate that there is a firm policy that they cannot support work of this kind.

Senator STEVENS. Where did the \$426,000 come from? All these letters indicate that that is the amount you need to offset the grant losses.

Now, you mentioned a \$180,000 some-odd. Where is the \$426,000 coming from? You must have a group of supporters out there that think they need more money, obviously.

Dr. CHALLINOR. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is an enthusiastic group of citizens who support this operation. I do want to say that the consideration for this budget item was made very carefully within the Smithsonian's total priorities—we have an existing base, as you pointed out, of \$43,000. Now, for the Film Center we are requesting an addition of \$95,000, as well as an amount of \$1,000 under necessary pay, which will give us a base of \$139,000 should this increase be approved.

GRANTS FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES

Senator STEVENS. This committee also funds the National Endowment for the Humanities. They have had problems. They have not been able to get the matching grants that they thought they would get. And the question was in a supplemental whether we would increase them anymore. And we did give them \$9 million more, as a matter of fact.

But, I have two questions. One, if it is a valid Federal purpose, why don't you just directly ask us for the money and not go to another group that comes in and asks for the money? And, second, have you been cut somewhere along the line?

Obviously, you have a group of supporters out there who believe you are going to suffer some loss in the program level. Now what is the basis for that fear?

Dr. CHALLINOR. I think the basis for their fear, Mr. Chairman, is that they believe—although we have no precise evidence—that the National Endowment will no longer be willing to support this particular project which they have been doing for the last 2 years and, therefore, these supporters feel that this money should be added onto our existing appropriation.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I happen to share that feeling. I don't know why we should have the National Endowment for the Humanities come in and justify to us that they need Federal dollars to make grants and then turn around and make a grant to the Smithsonian, which could come in and justify it directly.

Why don't you justify the full amount that you need?

Mr. JAMESON. Well, I guess one question that might be asked, Mr. Chairman, is how much is enough on this particular subject matter.

Senator STEVENS. Well, if you ask us for so much—

Mr. JAMESON. We have a small base, as you pointed out and we certainly have seen in the past on other budget items that it is prudent both from our standpoint and no doubt from the committee's standpoint to allow that base to grow as we could continue to justify the need in measured increments.

Senator STEVENS. You asked us for \$130,000. You are asking them for \$183,000. And the people on the outside say you absolutely need \$426,000 to meet the grant losses.

Have you got other sources of grant losses?

Mr. JAMESON. Well, there is a difference. I think that to a very large extent the directly appropriated money is for the basic core activity of the program.

Senator STEVENS. In other words, you have asked for enough? You think you can keep the program going even if the National Endowment turns you down?

Mr. JAMESON. We believe so. Much of the money from outside sources is aimed at supporting special aspects of the program, special projects, which, by and large, the people outside are inclined to support. They have very little taste over the long term to support the administrative core functioning. We need to work with you, your committee, and the Congress to develop that basic core capability.

Senator STEVENS. Will you give us a statement for the record of what you would use the \$426,000 for if you had it?

Mr. JAMESON. We would be pleased to.

[The information follows:]

EXPANDED FILM CENTER BUDGET

The Institution's fiscal year 1978 budget request for the National Anthropological Film Center (NAFC) totals \$139,000. This request is the result of a careful assessment by Smithsonian management of the immediate needs of the Film Center balanced against the overall requirements of the Institution. If additional funds of \$426,000 were available to the NAFC in fiscal year 1978, they would be applied as follows:

Research and Collections Management (\$115,000)

To provide research, administrative, and secretarial staff, five additional term appointments are requested. These five term positions fill out the core facility from which field research may be conducted and where research film material may be accessioned, catalogued, and made available for scholarly research. The following positions are requested: a Research Aide to obtain, assemble and prepare research data in relation to film studies; a secretary to provide the full range of secretarial and clerical assistance typical in an active center; a Coordinator of Research Film Projects to develop and coordinate research fieldwork and to maintain established procedures for the preparation of research film documents obtained in ongoing field projects; a Research Film Cataloguer to prepare reel-by-reel identification of the visual data contained in the research film records, and to prepare abstracts, catalogues and indexes of the film studies; and an Executive Administrator to manage expenditures and accounts, to coordinate the staff and programs, to supervise logistic support and supply for the operation of the Center's projects, and to develop sources of private support for further documentary projects.

In addition to these five positions, two Visual Anthropologists, on a temporary basis, are requested to conduct field research, and to provide the necessary annotation, assembly, and analysis of the film records. An Ethnocinematographer and an Assistant Ethnocinematographer are proposed on a temporary basis to prepare visual records of selected vanishing ways of life and cultures.

Travel and Transportation of Persons (\$70,000)

The National Anthropological Film Center organizes and undertakes collaborative and field research; it also documents and analyzes research film records. In order to conduct salvage fieldwork in Third World nations and other bastions of independently evolved ways of life, round-trip transportation is required to and from the field locations. So that project participants may assemble, annotate, and analyze the research film records, domestic and foreign travel is necessary. Domestic travel funds are requested so that Center staff may accession already existing film documents into the National Collection, and attend professional meetings for the purpose of scholarly exchange related to visual data projects, to present findings to colleagues and for obtaining information about existing films for possible accessioning.

Services, Supplies, and Equipment (\$241,000)

In order to conduct the necessary field expeditions, the required visual data recording equipment must be transported to and from field locations. Whenever necessary, additional pieces of film equipment must be purchased. Equipment must be maintained and modified for specialized research filming which frequently takes place in areas with rugged terrain and severe weather conditions. 16 mm film stock and recording tape must be purchased, and the exposed film must subsequently be shipped from the field, processed, printed and duplicated for preservation. 35 mm and 16 mm film review equipment is required to effectively analyze the research footage. Vault cans are required to house the increasing film records. Finally, in order to make these film records available to researchers as permanent scholarly resources, an indexing and visual data retrieval capability is needed. This could require consultants for the necessary research and development of video indexing and retrieval systems, development of computer programs, and use of computer time.

SMITHSONIAN REQUEST FOR FILM CENTER

Senator STEVENS. They must have gotten that figure from somewhere.

Dr. CHALLINOR. This is not our figure, as you realize, Mr. Chairman. This is a figure made up by the enthusiastic supporters of the program.

Senator STEVENS. Well, what is the total figure that you want—\$130,000 from us and \$180,000 from the National Endowment?

Dr. CHALLINOR. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. How much are you seeking from private sources?

Dr. CHALLINOR. From \$70,000 to \$100,000 through private foundations.

Senator STEVENS. That is \$426,000. Do you expect to get the money from the private foundations? Do you have any reasons to fear you won't get it?

Dr. CHALLINOR. If we are able to develop this core of support staff, we think we have a very good chance of getting most of that money from private foundations.

Senator STEVENS. If we give you the \$95,000 you will have the program level, if the National Endowment gives you the amount of your request?

Dr. CHALLINOR. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

FREER GALLERY

Senator STEVENS. Now, in the Freer Gallery, you are seeking \$10,000 and one new position to supplement the existing eight-person staff. Last year, according to our staff, you indicated there were six people in that area, maintenance people. Did you shift two people over?

And while you are looking, we submitted a question on that and it was answered in writing. We asked that you show the need for temporary maintenance help, and we asked if you anticipated requesting a new position in the near future and the answer was, no, you didn't. This was temporary maintenance help and this kind of need does not call for a new full-time staff.

Now we find that two are needed and you are adding another one. What made you change your mind in regard to maintenance staff at Freer.

Mr. BLITZER. Mr. Chairman, I think we will have to look that up and supply it to you.

Senator STEVENS. Do you know where you got the other people?

Mr. BLITZER. No, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Your answer last year was you had six people there and the justification showed you started with a base of eight this year.

Mr. BLITZER. I will have to look that up, also.

Senator STEVENS. We would be pleased to have it for the record, if you would.

Mr. BLITZER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

CUSTODIAL SUPPORT AT THE FREER GALLERY OF ART

The Freer Gallery's eight-person janitorial staff referenced on page A-43 of the Smithsonian's Budget Justifications for fiscal year 1978 includes the two part-time custodians which the \$5,000 increase appropriated to the Freer for fiscal year 1977 permitted us to hire.

Last year when we requested an additional \$5,000 for custodial services at the Freer, we had every expectation that the two part-time janitors that the increase would permit us to hire would be able to meet expected workload demands. Fiscal year 1976, however, found the Freer attended by over 10,000 more visitors than the previous year, a 5 percent increase. Furthermore, attendance figures during the Transition Quarter showed that this visitation level continued to rise at an annual rate of some 5 percent. These statistics, coupled with the increased public interest in the art and culture of the Near and Far East, as witnessed by the overwhelming response to the National Gallery of Art's two recent exhibitions on archeological treasures from China and objects from the tomb of King Tutankhamun, led us to conclude that further custodial support for the Freer Gallery of Art was both a necessary and prudent request.

AREA DIRECTOR FOR ARCHIVES OF AMERICAN ART

Senator STEVENS. You are seeking a new Washington area Director for the new Archives of American Art. That was not approved last year. It seems to be the same request. Would you provide us with any information you would have that would indicate an additional justification for that position this year, and indicate what regional offices you intend to put under that Washington office.

We assume that it would be Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, and North Carolina; is that wrong?

Mr. BLITZER. Mr. Chairman, it really would be all of the United States south of New York and east of some arbitrary point. The regional offices now exist in San Francisco, Detroit, Boston, and New York.

Senator STEVENS. Well, tell us what are the areas that you would cover and whether there is some increased necessity this year. We would also like to know what additional justification you have this year.

Mr. BLITZER. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

AREA DIRECTOR FOR THE ARCHIVES OF AMERICAN ART

The area director position requested for the Archives of American Art would serve to collect and provide for the preservation of art historical documents to be found throughout the southeastern part of the United States. It is indeed true that this request is identical to last year's, which was denied. The collection of these papers, essential to the understanding of American art history in the Southeast, was and remains the highest priority goal for further program development at the Archives of American Art. As we are now one year later, there is a greater feeling of urgency to get on with the task of seeking out these documentary resources and making provision for their preservation and microfilming before they are lost or destroyed.

ADMINISTRATION OF CUSTODIAL STAFF

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Chairman, could Mr. Jameson say something to the point of the Freer Gallery?

Senator STEVENS. Surely.

Mr. JAMESON. I think things that are said personally at the hearing are really much more useful for us and the committee than the material that goes into the record later.

I think we have been describing for you for 2 or 3 years the Smithsonian decision with regard to its custodial staff, who, for I suppose 130 years, have been serving the museums, the art galleries, and the research laboratories. For most of those years, as far as I know, for the entire period, this staff was administered centrally out of a unit that used to be called the buildings management department. Since they worked in the bureaus and, in fact, were really under the day-to-day supervision of a museum director, it made sense to us to give that museum director responsibility for their pay, administration, and other aspects of their supervision.

So we made a decision, that, except for a small group of people who are retained centrally to maintain some of the outbuildings, the Museum of Natural History, the National Collection of Fine Arts and so forth would have their own staffs. I don't remember the reason for the difference between six and eight. We will put that in the record, but I suspect that this is a reflection of the workload situation in the Freer Gallery of Art. Despite this apparent augmentation, there is still a small problem that needs to be corrected through the 1978 budget cycle.

Senator STEVENS. We are not challenging your inconsistency, but we do want to try to see that we have some continuity as far as the base we are dealing with each year. You seem to have two more people in the base than you had last year. Your answer last year was that you didn't need additional permanent people with a base of six. Now you need an additional permanent person with a permanent base of eight.

It is a little problem, not a major one. But I hope that you can straighten it out for the record, of course.

Mr. JAMESON. We would be pleased to.

REMAINING MALL SITE

Senator STEVENS. Now, you want \$50,000 to plan for the remaining Mall site. Would that include any initial building plan?

Dr. RIPLEY. No, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Is there any private funding to be used as part of this effort?

Dr. RIPLEY. We are now spending a small amount of trust funds for the development of concepts that might be applicable to site development. No additional trust funds or grants will be involved.

Senator STEVENS. Why can't that work be done by the Office of Facilities Planning and Engineering Services?

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Perrot, would you like to describe this project?

Mr. PERROT. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this amount is to do some experimentation, to do some preplanning and developing the concepts for the kind of exhibits that could be shown in this new facility when and if it is established.

We feel it inappropriate to start planning a structure without having a clear notion of what that structure is to do and how it will do it.

Senator STEVENS. Well, why not use your own internal Office of Facilities Planning and Engineering Services?

Mr. PERROT. We are not considering this, Mr. Chairman, as construction preplanning, but rather as program preplanning.

Senator STEVENS. So it would not include any building plans?

Mr. PERROT. No, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

RESEARCH AWARDS PROGRAM

You want \$60,000 for the research awards program to restore it to the funding level of 1976. Why? Isn't this budgeted for the individual units of the Smithsonian? This seems to be a special fund. Is that right?

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the initiation of this fund came in 1966 to finance new research as a substitute for the funds which were no longer available in accordance with appropriation language in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1964, recommended by the Subcommittee on Independent Offices under Congressman Thomas. These were grants that had been received by scientists on the staff throughout the Institution from the National Science Foundation.

Senator STEVENS. Are you saying that the House committee required you to maintain an institutionwide research awards program fund?

Dr. RIPLEY. No. What I am saying is that in 1963 in testimony Congressman Thomas urged that the National Science Foundation should not give an award to an individual scientist anywhere in the Government who was working in an agency which had a direct Federal appropriation. As a result during subsequent testimony we defended the concept that the Institution should therefore receive substitute funds of some sort as a direct Federal appropriation. This was approved by the then Bureau of the Budget, as well as the Congress itself.

Of course, we never seem to be able to achieve the level of substitute funds that we were able to when we were able to apply for them in the open market.

Senator STEVENS. Why aren't they budgeted from the individual units of the Smithsonian?

Dr. RIPLEY. Because the research awards program is an institutionwide competition and we still believe that the best way for our scientists to receive grants should be under the same procedures as those administered by the National Science Foundation. In other words, with peer review, with outside committees, to make sure that the small amount of funds would be competed for at a level of excellence within the Institution as a whole.

ADMINISTRATION OF RESEARCH GRANTS

Senator STEVENS. Do you pay that money to the foundation?

Dr. RIPLEY. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And it is then administered by the foundation?

Dr. RIPLEY. The grant has to be administered centrally because you have to organize the peer review process, the outside committees and the entire method of attempting to award these grants on a competitive basis throughout the Institution to any scientist who has applied. Such a procedure approximates the awarding of a grant for research in the private sector.

INCREASE FOR PROTECTION

Senator STEVENS. Under protection services, you have a \$120,000 adjustment in base resources. Does that really mean that you are asking for 12 more positions to be funded with \$120,000?

What does that mean, "an adjustment in base resources," \$120,000? Are you adding 12 new positions?

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Ault.

Mr. AULT. We have, sir, approximately 12 authorized guard positions we have been unable to fill because——

Senator STEVENS. That is our understanding. You have 527 and you filled 515. Due to budget constraints, you have 12 left. Is that right?

Mr. AULT. That is correct.

Senator STEVENS. Why did that shortfall occur? In 1977 we gave you the increase for protection services and yet you were unable to fund the same number of positions you had in 1976. Why did that happen after we gave you an increase in 1977?

Mr. AULT. We have had rising costs in other items, sir, that are enumerated here; uniforms, supplies, things of this sort that have been required items, as well. And we have had to use money for those purposes.

Senator STEVENS. Well, if we give you this \$120,000, will you be able to fund all 547 guard positions and meet those incidental costs?

Mr. AULT. Not all 547, sir. We are also asking for 20 additional new positions.

Senator STEVENS. Well, that to us means that you have 527. You ask for 20 new ones. That would be 547.

Mr. AULT. That will bring us to 547, right, with the 20 new ones, as well as the \$120,000.

Senator STEVENS. Will you be able to fund the 20 new ones, plus the 12 you didn't fund last year?

Mr. AULT. That is correct, sir.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR OFFICE OF PLANT SERVICES

Senator STEVENS. All right. Thank you.

Under Office of Plant Services, you want \$30,000 to fund a Deputy Director. Would you give us the justification for the record as to why you need a new Deputy Director in that area. Of the 327 positions in the Office of Plant Services how many are managerial positions?

Mr. AULT. I would be happy to supply that, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Would you indicate the relationship between that new Deputy Director and the existing managerial staff as to why that managerial staff cannot continue to handle the function?

Mr. AULT. I would be happy to, sir.

I will say, if I might, I am blessed with a very fine Director of Plant Services, who is responsible for the operations of this, which is my second largest directorate, with 327 people responsible for maintaining all of our buildings, the heating, ventilating and air-conditioning systems in those buildings. He has four division chiefs, and this new position that I am asking for would enable him to be able to get out more and personally observe the operations of these plant services offices and would help him in the supervision of these four division chiefs.

Senator STEVENS. All right. But again, since it is a new item, I think we had better have a statement as to why you feel this is necessary.

Mr. AULT. We would be happy to supply it.

[The information follows:]

DEPUTY DIRECTOR POSITION FOR THE OFFICE OF PLANT SERVICES

The Office of Plant Services was established in 1974 when the former Buildings Management Department was reorganized. The current organization is headed by a director and is subdivided into four distinct operating divisions, each of which is further divided into separate branches. The director, division chiefs, and branch chiefs constitute 16 managerial positions out of the total ceiling of 327.

Since inception, the responsibilities of OPLANTS have continued to grow and we have now reached the point where additional overall managerial attention is necessary if we are to insure an effective and efficient operation of the organization. A deputy director position will enable the director to spend more time providing guidance to his entire operation by removing the need to become so personally involved in the day-to-day operations and problems of the organization. A deputy director would also remove the need for division chiefs to act in the absence of the director or be assigned to special projects thereby increasing the time they have to spend in the direct supervision of their divisions.

In short, the deputy director position would improve the overall supervision of OPLANTS by providing a more direct control over the operations of the subordinate divisions and allowing time for the director to get out and personally observe the operations of the organization.

The approval of this position would also insure the orderly transition of control when the current director retires. Since the day-to-day services provided by OPLANTS are critical to the successful operation of our museums, preplanning for a successor to head this operation is imperative.

Senator STEVENS. In terms of allocation charges, the staff requested that you submit two statements detailing the changes in the 1977 program—changes since the enactment of the appropriation.

We will put those statements in the record at this point.

[The statements follow:]

FY 1977 Object Class Distribution

Obj. Class	FY 1977 Est. in FY 1977 Request	Prog. and Travel Reduction	Pay Suppl. Request	Internal Adjustments ^{/1}	FY 1977 Est. in FY 1978 Request
11	52,999	-487	+3,035	+568	56,115
12	5,061	-44	+291	+141	5,449
21	661	-66	-	+5	600
22	386	-	-	+45	431
23	9,389	-215	-	-630	8,544
24	1,066	-7	-	-140	919
25	7,475	-266	-	-1,464	5,745
26	3,362	-8	-	+393	3,747
31	3,353	-18	-	-581	2,754
32	-	-	-	-	-
41	1,346	-200	-	-21	1,125
42	2	-	-	+1	3
TOTAL	85,100	-1,311	+3,326	-1,683	85,432

^{/1} This column reflects internal adjustments as well as application of the contingency reduction of \$1,683,000 directed by Congress. The application of this reduction was left to the discretion of each bureau in order that essential programs and Institution-wide responsibilities would not be curtailed.

Object class information for FY 1977 was developed in January, 1976. This information was based on the increases requested of the Congress added to the FY 1976 base which was still an estimate. The FY 1977 column in the FY 1978 estimates was developed in January, 1977. This column was based on known needs at that time. Differences can be attributed to Congressional changes to the estimates, new prices, and changes in the way certain jobs will be carried out. Specifics by object class follow:

Object Class 11 -- Personnel Compensation +\$568,000

1. In computing the cost of personnel compensation for the FY 1978 submission, we assumed less lapse than in the previous year based on our analysis of recent employment trends. This had the effect in the FY 1978 submission of increasing funds in Object Classes 11 and 12 with a corresponding decrease in funds available in other object classes.
2. Higher salary costs are also attributable to the effects of promotions granted since preparation of the original FY 1977 budget estimates.

Object Class 12 -- Personnel Benefits +\$141,000

1. Recent rate increases by nearly all the health insurance carriers which serve Smithsonian Federal employees have resulted in higher costs to the Institution in FY 1977.
2. Based on the assumption of higher staff year delivery, the estimated costs of health benefits have increased in proportion to the increase in personnel compensation.

Object Class 22 -- Travel & Transportation of Things +\$45,000

1. Originally the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) had intended to contract for shipment of parts related to construction of the multi-mirror telescope (MMT). It has since been determined that it would be cost effective for SAO to handle the shipment through a Government Bill of Lading.

2. FY 1977 amounts reflected in the FY 1978 submission depict more accurately the increased costs associated with the transporting of specimens.

Object Class 23 -- Rent, Communications, and Utilities - \$630,000

1. The decrease in estimated expenditures in Object Class 23 reflects application of the contingency reduction and generally lower estimates of utilities costs at the time the FY 1978 budget was prepared. In view of the exceptionally cold weather experienced in January and February, however, our actual expenditures may sharply exceed the revised estimate.

Object Class 24 -- Printing and Reproduction - \$140,000

1. The decrease in estimated expenditures in Object Class 24 reflects application of the contingency reduction.

Object Class 25 -- Other Services - \$1,464,000

1. A major portion of the contingency reduction was applied to expenditures in this object class.

2. SAO originally planned to contract for the purchase of certain supplies and equipment associated with the multi-mirror telescope. It has since been determined to be cost effective for these purchases to be made directly by SAO.

Object Class 26 -- Supplies and Materials + \$393,000

1. SAO originally planned to contract for the purchase of certain supplies and equipment associated with the multi-mirror telescope. It has since been determined to be cost effective for these purchases to be made directly by SAO.

2. The increased estimate also reflects the effects of inflation on the purchase of supplies and materials integral to the day-to-day operations of the Institution.

Object Class 31 -- Equipment - \$581,000

1. SAO originally planned to contract for the purchase of certain supplies and equipment associated with the multi-mirror telescope. It has since been determined to be cost effective for these purchases to be made directly by SAO.

2. Application of the contingency reduction has also lowered estimated expenditures in this object class.

Smithsonian Institution
Salaries and Expenses

Explanation of Difference Between Committee Markup
and FY 1977 Column (without Supplemental) in FY 1978 Estimates

	<u>Committee</u>	<u>Committee Adjusted by Travel and Contingency</u>	<u>FY 1977 in FY 1978 Estimates</u>	<u>Difference</u> ^{/1}
Science	\$32,492	\$31,807	\$31,858	+\$51
History and Art	13,522	13,241	13,195	-46
Public Service	2,452	2,402	2,295	-107
Museum Programs	6,265	6,136	6,537	+401
Special Programs	1,847	1,805	1,933	+128
Other	27,272	26,715	26,288	-427
Travel	-61			
Contingency	-1,683			
Total	<u>\$82,106</u>	<u>\$82,106</u>	<u>\$82,106</u>	<u>\$0</u>

^{/1} After receipt of the appropriation, certain reorganizations took place which resulted in the movement of minor amounts of funds between units. Workmen's Compensation had been centrally budgeted in the Office of the Treasurer which distorted this Office's costs, therefore, the budget was distributed to the units. The Committees approved reprogramming funds from the National Air and Space Museum, Assistant Secretary for History and Art, and Assistant Secretary for Public Service to the Office of Protection Services. Funds for utilities and telephone costs for additional units were relocated to the Office of Plant Services. The Office of Horticulture was moved from the Office of Plant Services to the Assistant Secretary for Museum Programs. (See Page A-56 of justifications.) A new line item, the Office of American and Folklife Studies was created with funds formerly in the Assistant Secretary for History and Art and the Division of Performing Arts. (See Page A-74 of justifications.) The final distribution of Office of the Registrar resources was made. Further minor changes were made in the distribution of exhibits capabilities. These reorganizations result in the following changes:

Science

Workmen's Compensation	+\$65
NASM/Protection	-136
NZP/OPLANTS	-32
Registrar/NMNH	+98
Exhibits/NMNH	+50
	<u>+\$51</u>

History & Art

Workmen's Compensation	+\$8
Registrar/NMHT	+25
American Studies/Folklife	-53
Assistant Secretary/Protection	-25
	<u>-\$46*</u>

Public Service

Workmen's Compensation	+\$1
Anacostia/Exhibits	-4
Division of Performing Arts/Folklife	-74
Assistant Secretary/Protection	-15
Anacostia/OPLANTS	-15
	<u>-\$107</u>

Museum Programs

Workmen's Compensation	+\$3
Horticulture	+566
Registrar/NMNH	-98
Registrar/NMHT	-25
Exhibits/Anacostia	+4
Exhibits/NMNH	-50
	<u>+\$401*</u>

Special Programs

Workmen's Compensation	+\$1
Folklife/American Studies	+53
Folklife/Division of Performing Arts	+74
	<u>+\$128</u>

Administration

Workmen's Compensation	-\$78
Protection/NASM	+130
Protection/Assistant Secretary for History and Art	+25
Protection/Assistant Secretary for Public Service	+15
OPLANTS/Horticulture	-566
OPLANTS/NZP	+32
OPLANTS/Anacostia	+15
	<u>-\$427</u>

* Does not add due to rounding.

FISCAL YEAR 1977 INTERNAL ADJUSTMENTS

Senator STEVENS. As regards the \$568,000 increase in the personnel compensation listed under the internal adjustments, we would like to have you break down the application of those funds by position or man-years. It seems that most of the decrease associated with the congressional reduction in the contingency fund has been applied to contractual services. Is that right?

Dr. RIPLEY. Mr. Yellin.

Mr. YELLIN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

In addition, there is one other factor involved. At one point we thought we would contract for certain items having to do with the MMT. Rather than do that, we are going to do the shipping and purchasing ourselves, and, therefore, the amount in the object class for contractual services shows a decrease.

Senator STEVENS. Will you tell us, just for the record, what contracts were dropped in the original program?

Mr. YELLIN. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

FISCAL YEAR 1977 INCREASE IN PERSONNEL COMPENSATION

The \$568,000 increase in personnel compensation from the fiscal year 1977 estimates in the Institution's fiscal year 1977 budget request to those in the fiscal year 1978 request was based on an analysis of the Institution's lapse rate undertaken prior to the development of the fiscal year 1978 budget. This analysis projected that a trend toward reduced time in filling vacant positions would enable the Institution to realize some 38 more staff-years in fiscal year 1977 than originally anticipated. The current hiring restrictions and potential Executive Branch personnel ceiling reduction, however, will likely reverse this projection.

Contract reductions associated with multiple mirror telescope

Contractor	Purpose of contract	Contract reduced by estimated amount of
Philco Ford	Fabrication, testing and installation of optical support system.	\$156,000
Do.....	Housing for multiple mirror telescope.....	32,000

TRAVEL AND PERSONNEL LIMITATIONS

Senator STEVENS. There seems to be a \$5,000 increase in travel in excess of the limitation established by congressional reduction; is that true?

Mr. YELLIN. No, sir. Our travel limitation is \$600,000 and this is the amount that we have allocated this year.

Senator STEVENS. What about the \$5,000 increase?

Mr. YELLIN. We are within the congressional allocation with the \$600,000 and we have established internal controls to assure that the Institution will remain within that limitation.

Senator STEVENS. Were any of the personnel compensation funds used to fund any employment in excess of the congressional provision for permanent positions or the Smithsonian's own temporary employment estimates for last year?

Mr. YELLIN. No, sir.

REORGANIZATIONS

Senator STEVENS. Did you find it necessary to shift any of the units, such as horticulture, folklife or performing arts between activities within the midyear of this fiscal year? Have you shifted the funds back and forth?

Mr. YELLIN. Yes, sir. The funds, however, are being used specifically for the purposes that we justified them in last year's budget.

However, certain reorganizations have taken place. The most notable is horticulture and that is fully explained in this year's budget submission.

Senator STEVENS. Is it reflected in the 1978 program budget?

Mr. YELLIN. It certainly is, sir. And explained in detail.

Senator STEVENS. You don't feel that it was a reprogramming?

Mr. YELLIN. Not at all, sir, because the money is being used precisely for the purposes for which it was justified in the past, only now it is located under the Assistant Secretary for Museum Programs where in the past it was in the Office of Plant Services.

FOREIGN CURRENCY GRANTS TO SMITHSONIAN EMPLOYEES

Senator STEVENS. With regard to grants to the Smithsonian employees, we asked about the number of foreign currency grants that were going to the Smithsonian employees last year, and your report for 1976 and the transition quarter indicates that 7 of the 8 grants for museum programs went to Smithsonian employees and an overall 14 of the 37 grants listed went to Smithsonian employees.

In view of that number going to your own agency, why don't you just ask for a direct special foreign currency program for Smithsonian employees and not have Smithsonian employees participating in grant programs?

Dr. CHALLINOR. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer that. We feel that the grants that go to Smithsonian employees are indeed competitive grants and that the Smithsonian employees should compete with their peers in universities and elsewhere for these grants.

Senator STEVENS. Don't you think that you are deterring other people from asking if seven out of eight grants go to your own employees and yet you insist on peer review and competition from outside people?

Dr. CHALLINOR. The grants on the Museum Programs to which you refer, I believe are those that were involved primarily with the folklife festival involving small grants of about \$3,000 each to send Smithsonian staff abroad, to Egypt and to Poland and perhaps elsewhere to negotiate with the local authorities for people, folk artists and craftsmen to come to America for the Bicentennial programs that we had on the Mall.

Senator STEVENS. Well, 14 of the 37 total grants that were made went to Smithsonian employees.

Each year I am told that the reason that we go through this funding process is we want peer review and competition. Well, if that is so, there are a lot of people out there submitting a lot of applications that are not getting any grants because we still have a substantial number of them going to the Smithsonian employees.

Now, why can't we establish a grant program, somehow or another, where you administer foreign currency funds for your own employees and have the nonemployees compete with each other?

Could you give us a list of the people who competed with the Smithsonian employees and where they are from?

Dr. CHALLINOR. We certainly can, Mr. Chairman.

As I say, all these grants that you are referring to are usually in the \$2,000 to \$3,000 bracket and we have the list and exactly what they were referring to. Numerically they seem to be disproportionate, although in actual dollar amounts or dollar equivalents, the totals are very small.

Senator STEVENS. I am not quarreling with the grants. I am just asking if they really did compete with somebody. Did somebody compete with them in the application for those grants?

Dr. CHALLINOR. I will get that for you and explain that in detail.

Senator STEVENS. And if they didn't, again, my request to you is to consider asking for the money directly and not go through this device of setting up money into a separate foundation in order to——

Dr. RIPLEY. We would be happy to submit that.

Senator STEVENS. I don't recall that we have ever denied that.
[The information follows:]

SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Smithsonian Scholars Should Compete With Their Peers at Other Institutions for Research Grants

The Smithsonian feels strongly that Smithsonian employees should compete with their peers for use of funds under the Smithsonian Foreign Currency Program. The Smithsonian, as a consequence, does not seek a special foreign currency fund which would have the effect of protecting its scholars from the rigorous discipline of competition.

Smithsonian scholars are not provided funds from the budgets of their departments to cover their individual professional research. Grants to Smithsonian scholars like those to scholars at other research institutions, support field work undertaken with the permission of department chairman. Smithsonian employees must carry on such research to maintain their professional standing. In doing so, they also make substantial contributions to the collections and the public services of the United States National Museum.

Smithsonian employees receive no personal compensation from such grants, but receive funds to pay for travel and essential field expenses only. Most expend some of their personal resources in the process of bringing to publication the results of their research.

The process of making decisions to award foreign currency grants is the same for Smithsonian applicants as it is for those outside the Institution. This process, called "peer review", is practiced by the Smithsonian as it is practiced by other federal research grants programs. It involves the review of scholarly proposal by experts intimately familiar with the problems proposed for study and by advisory councils of scholars chosen from institutions across the country for their own achievements in the disciplines concerned. Each reviewer prepares a written critique of each proposal and rates each numerically, recommending for or against funding. Panel discussions seek a resolution of differences among reviewers and result in a summary recommendation to the Program. The Program seeks to fund each proposal receiving a favorable recommendation but when funds are insufficient supports projects in the order of the average of Council members' numerical ratings.

The record of Foreign Currency Program awards for FY 1976 and the Transition Quarter shows that some 63 awards totalling \$1,108,626 equivalent were made to institutions other than the Smithsonian and that only 13 awards totalling \$263,374 were made to the Smithsonian. Three of those Smithsonian awards under Museum Programs (nos. 33, 34 and 37 in the FY 1978 Foreign Currency Program Budget Justification) supported one project, the Festival of American Folklife. They were tabulated separately in the budget supplement because they concerned three separate foreign countries. These Folklife awards, supported the work of five scholars only one of whom was a Smithsonian employee; four other institutions were involved. Awards to the Smithsonian, like those to other grantees, frequently support teams composed of scholars from many institutions and not from the grantee institution alone.

In Fiscal Year 1977 thus far, 73 awards totalling almost \$2,148,000 equivalent have been made for research to United States institutions other than the Smithsonian. Twelve awards for research totalling \$279,000 equivalent have been made to the Smithsonian itself.

SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Non-Smithsonian Competitors for Research Funds
FY 1976 and Transition Quarter

ARCHEOLOGY AND RELATED DISCIPLINES

American Institute of Indian Studies, Chicago IL - Martha Ashton
 American Institute of Indian Studies, Chicago IL- Edward Dimock (2 proposals)
 American Institute of Indian Studies, Princeton NJ - Frank Bennett
 American Museum of Natural History, New York NY - Walter Fairservis Jr. (2 proposals)
 American Research Center in Egypt, Princeton NJ - Paul Walker
 American University, Washington DC - Geoffrey Burkhardt (AIIS)
 Boston University, Boston MA - Gouri Banerjee (AIIS)
 Brandeis University, Waltham MA - Marguerite Robinson (AIIS)
 Brooklyn College, NY - Edward Ochenschlager (ARCE)
 Brooklyn Museum, NY - Bernard Bothmer (ARCE)
 Brooklyn Museum, NY - Michael Botwinich (ARCE)
 Brown University, Providence RI - Amy Catlin (AIIS)
 California State College, Sonoma CA - Laxmi Tewari (AIIS)
 Carleton College, Northfield MI - Russell Langworthy (AIIS)
 Claremont Graduate School, CA - James Robinson (ARCE)
 Colgate University, Hamilton NY - Warren Ramshaw (AIIS)
 Columbia University, New York NY - David Gitomer (AIIS)
 Columbia University, New York NY - Nathaniel Wander (AIIS)
 Columbia University, New York NY - Alex Wayman (AIIS)
 Dartmouth College, Hanover NH - Daniel Neuman (AIIS)
 Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies - Margaret Alexander
 Eastern Michigan University, Ann Arbor MI - John Hurd (AIIS)
 Goerge Mason University, Annandale VA - Doris Srinivasan (AIIS)
 Harvard University, Cambridge MA - Muhsin Mahdi and Dimitri Gutas (ARCE)
 Harvard University, Cambridge MA - Sidney Schuler (AIIS)
 Harvard University, Cambridge MA - William Smith (AIIS)
 Harvard University, Cambridge MA - Gary Tubb (AIIS)
 Kansas State University, Manhattan KA - Janet Benson (AIIS)
 Kansas State University, Manhattan KA - Jeffrey Greenhut (AIIS)
 Kansas State University, Manhattan KA - William Richter (AIIS)
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA - Paul Kiparsky (AIIS)
 New York University, NY - Donald P. Hansen (ARCE)
 North Texas State University, Denton TX - T. R. Hays
 Oakland University, Rochester MI - Carlo Coppola III (AIIS)
 Ohio State University, Columbus OH - Constance Conway (AIIS)
 Queens College, Flushing NY - Suzanne Hanchett (AIIS)
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale IL - Jananabrota Bhattacharyya (AIIS)
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas TX - Angela Close
 State University of New York, Binghamton NY - Gail Mirza (AIIS)
 State University of New York, Binghamton NY - Edward J. Vander Velde Jr. (AIIS)
 University of Alabama, University AL - Dattatreya Kulkarni (AIIS)
 University of Arizona, Tucson AZ - Edwin Allen Richardson (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Harold Arnold (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - George Dales
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Richard Frasca (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Lynne Hansen-Bede (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Richard S. Kennedy (AIIS)
 University of California, Davis CA - Faith Boucher (AIIS)
 University of California, Los Angeles CA - Speros Vryonis (ARCE)
 University of California, Los Angeles CA - Hemalata Weisblat (AIIS)
 University of California, Santa Barbara CA - Gerald Larson (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - John Engler (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Joan Erdman (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Richard Herrell (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Charles Lenth (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - James Lindholm (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Choudri Naim (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Whabiz Merchant (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Donald Nelson (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Carol Prindle (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Frances Pritchett (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Kathi L. Rose (AIIS)

SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Non-Smithsonian Competitors for Research Funds
FY 1976 and Transition Quarter

University of Chicago, IL - Kanika Sircar (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Douglas Twells (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Kent Weeks (ARCE)
 University of Cincinnati, OH - Samuel Noe, Jr. (AIIS)
 University of Cincinnati, OH - Barbara Ramusack (AIIS)
 University of Denver, CO - Stephan Levitt (AIIS)
 University of Florida Gainesville FL - Gene R. Thursby (AIIS)
 University of Kentucky, Lexington KY - W.Y. Adams (AIIS)
 University of Louisville, KY - Stephanie Jernigan (AIIS)
 University of Maryland, College Park MD - Charles Butterworth (ARCE)
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - John H. Broomfield (AIIS)
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - Kari Gluski (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - Philip Engblom (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - David Nelson (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - Jennifer C. Post (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - George Cardona (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Clifford Jones (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Richard Lariviere (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - David O'Connor (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Donald Redford (ARCE)
 University of Texas, Austin TX - Rex Edwards (AIIS)
 University of Texas, Austin TX - Sandra Eveland (AIIS)
 University of Texas, Austin TX - Gail Minault (AIIS)
 University of Texas, Austin TX - Raymond Owens (AIIS)
 University of Texas, Austin TX - Colleen Valenzuela (AIIS)
 University of Utah, Salt Lake City UT - Bam Dev Sharda (AIIS)
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville VA - Ruth Gabriel (AIIS)
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville VA - Peter Hackett (AIIS)
 University of Washington, Seattle WA - Margaret Nowak (AIIS)
 University of Wisconsin, Madison WI - Joseph Brenning (AIIS)
 Washington State University, Pullman WA - Fekri Hassan

SYSTEMATIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BIOLOGY

Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia PA - Thomas Uzzell and Chris Spolsky
 Conservation Foundation, Washington DC - Phyllis Meyers
 Duke University, Durham NC - William Culbertson
 Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology, Kaneohe HI - Albert and Dora Banner
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas TX - Bob Slaughter
 Texas Tech University, Lubbock TX - Dillard Carter and J. Knox Jones
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Robert Ornduff
 University of California, Riverside CA - John A. Moore
 University of California, Santa Cruz CA - Kenneth Thimann
 University of Maryland, College Park MD - Rita Colwell
 University of Maryland, College Park MD - John Corliss
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - J.B. Burch
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - Philip Gingerich
 Utah State University, Logan UT - Frederick Wagner

ASTROPHYSICS AND EARTH SCIENCES

Duke University, Durham NC - Orrin Pilkey
 University of Chicago IL - David Schramm
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Henry Faul
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Robert Weeks

MUSEUM PROGRAMS

American Association of Museums, Washington DC - Grace Morley
 Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh PA - James Swauger
 Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore MD - Joseph Czeszochowski

SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Non-Smithsonian Competitors for Research Funds
FY 1977 1/ARCHEOLOGY AND RELATED DISCIPLINES

Amherst College, Amherst MA - Susan Lewandowski (AIIS)
 American Institute for Indian Studies, Chicago IL - Barbara Aziz
 American Institute for Indian Studies, Chicago IL - Frederick Asher
 American Institute for Indian Studies, Chicago IL - Edward C. Dimock, Jr.
 American Institute for Indian Studies, Chicago IL - Judith Gutman
 American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY - Ruth and Stanley Freed
 American Research Center in Egypt, Princeton NJ - Paul Walker
 American Schools of Oriental Research, Cambridge MA - Philip King and Thomas Newman
 American Schools of Oriental Research, Cambridge MA - Frank Cross and John Pedley
 Brandeis University, Waltham MA - Marvin Davis (AIIS)
 Brandeis University, Waltham MA - David Zilberman (AIIS)
 Brown University, Providence RI - Ricardo Caminos
 Brooklyn College, NY - Leonard Gordon (AIIS)
 Brooklyn College, NY - Edward Ochsenchlager (ARCE)
 Brooklyn Museum, NY - Bernard Bothmer (ARCE)
 Claremont Graduate School, CA - James Robinson (ARCE)
 Cleveland Museum of Art, OH - John Cooney and Arielle Kozloff
 College of the Holy Cross, Worcester MA - Judith Blank (2 proposals-one AIIS)
 Cornell University, Ithaca NY - Mary Katzenstein (AIIS)
 Cornell University, Ithaca NY - Gerald Kelly (AIIS)
 Davidson College, NC - Robert Kaylor (AIIS)
 Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, Washington DC - Margaret Alexander
 Harvard University, Cambridge MA - Randall Michael (AIIS)
 Indo-U.S. Subcommittee on Education and Culture, New York NY - Marshall Bouton
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore MD - Hans Goedicke
 Lebanon Valley College, Annville PA - Perry Troutman (AIIS)
 New York University, NY - Donald P. Hansen (ARCE)
 New York University, NY - Carol Radcliffe (AIIS)
 Northern Michigan University, Marquette MI - Zacharias Thundy (AIIS)
 Ohio State University, Columbus OH - Susan Buchanan (AIIS)
 Oakland University, Rochester MI - Richard Tucker (AIIS)
 Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick NJ - Mary Carras (AIIS)
 Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick NJ - Rhoda Goldstein (AIIS)
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas TX - Fred Wendorf
 Temple University, Philadelphia PA - A. Sarma
 University of Arizona, Tucson AZ - Robert Varady (AIIS)
 University of Arizona, Tucson AZ - Evelyn Varady (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Stuart Blackburn (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - James Ebin (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - George Hart (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Mary-Ann Lutzker (AIIS)
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Kent Weeks (ARCE)
 University of California, Davis CA - Faith Boucher (AIIS)
 University of California, Los Angeles CA - Jill Cogen (AIIS)
 University of California, Los Angeles CA - Cynthia Dubin (AIIS)
 University of California, Los Angeles CA - Speros Vryonis (ARCE)
 University of California, San Diego CA - Frederick Bailey (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Norman Cutler (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Daniel Ehnborn (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Pierce Gardner (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Janet Johnson and Donald Whitcomb
 University of Chicago, IL - Cynthia Livermore (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Rekha Morris (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Gloria Raheja (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Kristine Rogers (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Marsha Tajima (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Douglas Twells (AIIS)
 University of Chicago, IL - Louis Zabkar

1/ Estimated as of May 20, 1977

SMITHSONIAN FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Non-Smithsonian Competitors for Research Funds

FY 1977 1/

University of Hawaii, Honolulu HI - Gerald Reardon (AIIS)
 University of Hawaii, Honolulu HI - Lynette Wageman (AIIS)
 University of Louisville, KY - Stephanie Jernigan
 University of Maryland, College Park MD - Charles Butterworth (ARCE)
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - Peter Granda (AIIS)
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - Vishakha Walker (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - Frederick Asher (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - George Boynacki (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - Indira Junghare (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - Rocky Miranda (AIIS)
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN - Ram Dayal Munda (AIIS)
 University of Missouri, Columbia MO - William Noble
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Helen Baig (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - James Moore (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Eliot Stern (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Donald B. Redford (ARCE)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Lise Vail (AIIS)
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Richard Young (AIIS)
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles CA - Catherine Glynn (AIIS)
 University of Texas, Austin TX - David Iglehart (AIIS)
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville VA - Richard Barnett (AIIS)
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville VA - Ruth Gabriel (AIIS)
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville VA - Catherine Howell (AIIS)
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville VA - Murray Milner (AIIS)
 University of Washington, Seattle WA - Theodore Adams (AIIS)
 University of Washington, Seattle WA - Frank Conlon (AIIS)
 University of Washington, Seattle WA - Karen Lang (AIIS)
 University of Wisconsin, Madison WI - Edward Bastian (AIIS)
 University of Wisconsin, Madison WI - Joseph Elder
 University of Wisconsin, Madison WI - Donald Johnson (AIIS)
 University of Wisconsin, Madison WI - Robert and Beatrice Miller (AIIS)
 University of Wisconsin, Madison WI - Leonard Zwilling (AIIS)
 Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, NY - Walter Fairservis, Jr. (ARCE)
 Washington State University, Pullman WA - Fekri Hassan
 Yale University, New Haven CT - Susan Bean (AIIS)

SYSTEMATIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BIOLOGY

Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia PA - Thomas Uzzell
 California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco CA - William Eschmeyer
 California State University, Fullerton CA - James Dale Smith
 Chicago Zoological Society, IL - Dale Osborn
 Fort Hays Kansas State College, KS - Richard Zakrzewski
 Howard University, Washington DC - S. Taseer Hussain
 Los Angeles Natural History Museum, CA - Camm C. Swift
 Texas Tech University, Lubbock TX - J. R. Goodin and David Northington
 University of California, Berkeley CA - Donald Savage
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - J. B. Burch
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI - Philip Gingerich
 University of South Carolina, Columbia SC - Wade Batson
 University of Toledo, OH - Harold Allen
 University of Washington, Pullman WA - Donald Farnier
 Utah State University, Logan UT - Frederick Wagner
 Yale University, New Haven CT - David Pilbeam
 Yale University, New Haven CT - Elwyn Simons

ASTROPHYSICS AND EARTH SCIENCES

Ohio State University, Columbus OH - R. R. Wing
 University of Chicago, IL - David Schramm and W. D. Arnett
 University of Colorado, Boulder CO - John Van Couvering
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - Henry Paul
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA - H. N. Kritikos

MUSEUM PROGRAMS

American Research Center in Egypt, Princeton NJ - Paul Walker
 Association of Living Historical Farms and Agricultural Museums, Washington DC -
 G. Terry Sharrer
 Brooklyn Museum, NY - Bernard Bothmer (ARCE)
 Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh PA - James Swauger
 Franklin Institute Science Museum, Philadelphia PA - James Harrington
 Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore MD - Joseph Czeszchowski
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas TX - Bob H. Slaughter

1/ Estimated as of May 20, 1977

LOANS OF SMITHSONIAN OBJECTS

Senator STEVENS. Well, I have to go to another meeting, Dr. Ripley. We have some additional questions that we are putting off with regard to the matters that were discussed at the first hearing pending an opportunity to review them with the chairman and with Senator Jackson. I am sure that you are familiar with Senator Jackson's letter.

Let me ask you one question, though, about that. The Smithsonian does loan items to Members of Congress, I know, to put in their offices. It seems to me that I have seen some.

Do you have a loan program for items to private individuals or any private museums?

Dr. RIPLEY. No, not to private individuals. We do make loans for exhibitions and that sort of thing.

Senator STEVENS. I mean personal loans. Are any of these things in personal homes out in Washington or anywhere else?

Dr. RIPLEY. Not that I have ever been aware of. It has been traditional that the National Collection, for example, would loan objects to the White House, to the immediate surrounding executives of the White House and, from time to time, to the Supreme Court or Members of Congress.

Senator STEVENS. Yes. I have seen some from time to time. And it seems that I had something myself at one time, something that was related to Alaska and I have seen some things in the White House, too.

Dr. RIPLEY. These, of course, may come back and forth because we have the right under the law to act as the recipient of objects which are in the White House which may become——

Senator STEVENS. Well, the question asked me was whether you loaned them out to private individuals for use in their homes or to private corporations just for the purpose of exhibiting and not on the basis of loaning to another museum or to another institution. Are there any of these that are loaned? For instance, to Cabinet officers for their homes that they acquire here or any personal homes outside of the White House? I don't consider the White House a personal home.

Dr. RIPLEY. I am not sure whether or not we loaned an object in the past to the new home of the Vice President, Mr. Mondale.

Senator STEVENS. I would consider that to be a national home, too.

The statement was made to me that some individuals thought there were items from the Smithsonian in personal homes of employees here in this area.

Dr. RIPLEY. We would be very glad to know about it, Senator.

Senator STEVENS. I didn't know about it, but I don't think that is the policy, but I thought that I would ask you.

Dr. RIPLEY. It is not the policy.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. We will submit additional questions.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the department for responses subsequent to the hearing:]

Joseph Henry Papers

Question. Your justification mentions completion of the third volume of the Joseph Henry Papers, and supplemental work on a microfilm publication. How far are we from seeing the end of this project? Will there be additional requests in future years?

Answer. As currently planned, the Joseph Henry Papers project will entail a series of 15 scholarly volumes. Inasmuch as it has taken an average of approximately 16 months to prepare the first several volumes, one can safely say that this project will continue for a number of years yet. We would not foresee significant requests for further program increases unless the level of support we have been fortunate enough to enjoy from outside sources should cease--something we do not now anticipate.

Question. Will you reach a point in this effort where you can be supported solely by outside sources? I note that you currently have grants from the Humanities Endowment, the National Academy of Sciences and the National Historic Publications and Records Commission.

Answer. That is a goal that would be marvelous to achieve, but considering the question realistically, the answer would have to be no.

Museum of History and Technology

Question. Under the Museum of History and Technology you propose an increase of 5 positions and \$211,000 for new space both at the museum proper and at the Arts and Industries building. Since you plan to keep these exhibits open and make use of the new space available, can we assume that this is a permanent increase?

Answer. Yes, this would be a permanent, as opposed to a one-time, increase.

Question. And the new positions and funding will give you all that is required? You will be up to full force?

Answer. Yes, this increase would give us the wherewithal to maintain these new exhibition spaces in an appropriate manner.

Archives of American Art Printing

Question. You are asking for \$20,000 for printing of Archives publications. This would be in addition to the \$25,000 available from trust fund sources, is that correct?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. Why can't you increase the amount from trust funds?

Answer. The trust funds of the Archives of American Art are raised largely through the untiring efforts of its Board of Trustees.

Unfortunately, however, fund raising has not kept pace with the rate of inflation. While it is anticipated that the Archives will be successful in raising a quarter of a million dollars again in fiscal year 1978, it has become clear that new projects, to the extent the Congress finds them as important and worthwhile as we do, will have to rely upon appropriated funds for their financing. This request for \$20,000 for printing costs represents such a case.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum

Question. You are proposing a new exhibit at the Anacostia Museum on Ancient African Kingdoms. Have you sought any private funding for this exhibit?

Answer. No, the Museum has not sought any private funding nor does it plan to seek such assistance. The \$60,000 requested will enable us to cover all costs associated with the Ancient African Kingdoms exhibit.

Collections Management Study

Question. Under your Assistant Secretary for Museum Programs you are seeking an additional \$40,000 for management study work related to the Museum Support Facility. If the study will be available in early fall, why do you need FY 1978 funding?

Answer. The Collections Policy and Management Study to be completed early this fall will gather and analyze a large quantity of information about existing practices and procedures of collections management, and will contain recommendations for consolidation, coordination, and refinement of these practices. It will not be possible during the time allocated for the study to develop all of the procedures needed to implement all of the recommendations to be contained in the final report. On the basis of the data already gathered, it is clear that continued effort will be required in the future to expand upon the information assembled and to develop methods to implement the recommendations as they apply to specific conditions in the Museum Support Center, and in the museums on the Mall. The \$40,000 will be used in the coming fiscal year to support activities that will be necessary in this regard.

Question. You indicate that the \$40,000 will also be used for printing and assembling the report. I thought that the \$125,000 we gave you last year was the total cost for the study. What happened to cause an increase in your original estimate?

Answer. A portion of the existing budget of \$125,000 for the Collections Policy and Management Study will be used for the developing and printing of the report. Even allowing for these expenditures, however, it does not appear at this moment that all of the \$125,000 will be spent or obligated by the end of this fiscal year, and the unused portion cannot be carried over into FY 1978. Therefore, funds are requested for FY 1978 to permit continuity in the effort to refine and implement the report, as has been explained. A portion of the \$40,000 request will be used to assemble additional and specialized data and to prepare supplementary reports.

Office of Horticulture

Question. Why did you move your horticultural services division from Plant Services to Museum Programs?

Answer. Horticultural activities at the Institution have come to play an increasingly important role in the exhibition programs of the Institution. Horticulture is an historic discipline with close ties to decorative and fine arts studies as well as to the botanical sciences which are centered in the National Museum of Natural History. Examples of these interrelationships and ties can be seen in the horticultural component of the 1876 Centennial Exhibit in the Arts and Industries Building and in the recently developed Victorian Garden adjacent to the Smithsonian Castle. As a discipline, horticulture possesses great potential for research and educational activities. Special tours and training programs centered on horticultural exhibits have been established as part of our services to the visiting public.

Although the Office of Horticulture will continue to maintain the grounds of the Institution, its exhibit, research and educational activities can be better developed and executed in close cooperation with other units of the Institution specializing in similar activities which are under the purview of the Office of Museum Programs.

Question. You already have a horticultural staff of 26 positions--what specific workload increases justify the 3 additional gardeners and the secretary contained in your request?

Answer. To maintain the horticultural exhibits in the Victorian Garden, and the interior plant and floral arrangements for a large number of exhibitions in the many galleries of the Institution, it is necessary that the Office of Horticulture propagate and transplant large quantities of flowers, create floral arrangements and provide necessary daily attention to all plant materials to assure proper growth and prevent loss. Assistance is needed in the greenhouse operations to assure the timely production of these plants, and assistance is needed on the grounds to enable the floral beds to be maintained properly. Clerical assistance is needed to support the office staff and to meet the increased typing requirements associated with the research, tour, and education activities undertaken by the Office of Horticulture.

Smithsonian Libraries

Question. For your libraries you are requesting 1 new position and \$105,000 to improve cataloging, availability and acquisition of materials. With all the planned system improvements, why do you need another position?

Answer. The planned system improvements, while enhancing the Libraries' acquisition operations and reducing the cataloguing backlog are, in themselves, insufficient to eliminate completely the annual growth in uncatalogued volumes. Of approximately 14,000 volumes acquired each year which require cataloguing some 6,000 have not been catalogued by any other American library and therefore must have an original cataloguing performed by the senior professional library staff. Since the present staff is able to catalogue only approximately half of these

volumes, the uncatalogued backlog is increasing each year by 3,000. The position requested for FY 1978 would participate in the more routine cataloguing work, thereby freeing the professional staff to concentrate on the intellectual, time-consuming efforts required for full, original cataloguing.

Question. \$10,000 of this amount is to upgrade your automated acquisitions system. Is the current system really that inadequate?

Answer. The present automated acquisition system was initiated in the mid-1960's. Currently, it cannot provide a number of management tools nor a number of products and data listings which would substantially enhance its service to users. Benefits and products which could be realized with the proposed system improvements include: a listing of current acquisitions, machine-produced notices to dealers and publishers of materials not received as well as automatic notices of material completed and ready for binding, computer printouts of the Libraries' serial holdings, full listing of free materials requested to monitor their receipt, the elimination of duplicate book orders and a purchasing cycle that can respond in a timely fashion to the needs of library users.

Traveling Exhibition Service

Question. For your traveling exhibit program you are proposing nearly a 100 percent increase in funding--from \$104,000 to \$206,000--and two additional permanent positions. Can't some of this increase be covered by rental charges?

Answer. Imposition of higher rental charges on SITES exhibits would defeat efforts to make at least 50 percent of these shows available to smaller museums for \$200 or less. The increased Federal support requested will make it possible for SITES to increase the proportion of new shows which can be rented for under \$200. A major goal of this program is to achieve the widest possible distribution of exhibitions. This cannot be accomplished without keeping rental costs within the reach of the hundreds of smaller institutions which make enthusiastic use of them. This increase will also make it possible for SITES to produce more new shows based on Smithsonian collections.

Question. What do you fund with rental fees and gifts? Does that money pay for any positions?

Answer. All income derived from rental fees and all income from grant sources is applied to the development of new exhibits or to refurbishing established exhibits for continued circulation. Such income pays not only for positions, but for other production costs including design and material expenses associated with the production of new shows. Fourteen permanent positions are supported by rental income.

Question. Why don't you give us a breakdown for the record showing the private and federal support for the traveling exhibit program, and detail the uses of these funds. Include positions funded from both sources.

Answer. The following information details the private and federal support of the Traveling Exhibition Service in FY 1977.

Federal Base FY 1977--\$104,000

Funds available to SITES in its federal base are used to support personnel charged with central core functions for management of all SITES operations and for development of exhibitions initiated by SITES and drawn from Smithsonian collections.

Six positions are supported by the federal base at a cost of \$93,000, an amount of \$9,000 is used primarily to cover initial shipping and insurance costs, and some \$2,000 is applied to necessary travel associated with the program. In addition to SITES federal base, in FY 1977 some \$18,000 in Smithsonian Bicentennial funds has been made available for costs associated in closing down special Bicentennial activity.

Personnel Funded from Federal Base (as of May 1, 1977)Full-time Permanent (6)

Administrative Officer GS-12
Registrar GS-7
Shipping Coordinator GS-6
Education Coordinator GS-9
Exhibits Specialist GS-7
Exhibits Specialist GS-5

Grants and Contracts--\$512,000 to date

Funds received through grants and contracts are used to design, produce, package, and insure new exhibitions.

Personnel Funded from Grants and Contracts--ARBA(as of May 1, 1977)Full-time Permanent (2)

International Program Coordinator IS-13
Exhibits/Public Relations Coordinator IS-9

Temporary (1): Clerk-typist IS-4

The following list itemizes the grants and contracts received by SITES during FY 1977, with the source, amount, and exhibits developed or to be developed with these funds.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Exhibitions</u>
American Revolution Bicentennial Administration	1977 \$154,000	Personnel costs, \$55,000; production costs, \$49,000; and shipping and insurance costs, \$50,000 for: Folk Woodcuts from Brazil's Northeast Belgian Gunmaking and American History (Belgium) Twenty-two Polish Textile Artists Silverworks from Rio de la Plata (Argentina) The Human Form (Wotruba) (Austria) Hungarian Art Nouveau Salzberg Festspiele! (Austria)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Exhibitions</u>
National Science Foundation	1977 \$28,000	Production costs only, for the following exhibits: Pollution Energy Ecology
Office of Coastal Zone Management	1977 \$315,000	Production costs only, for "It's Your Coast", Four Exhibitions: 1-N.E. Coast 2-Mid-Atlantic & S.E. Coasts 3-Gulf Coast 4-Great Lakes
National Endowment for the Arts	1977 \$15,000	Production costs only for: America's Architectural Heritage (3 copies)

Rental Income--\$430,000 (estimated)

This income is used for the support of 14 positions at a cost of \$248,000. These positions coordinate and develop new exhibits, prepare related educational material, and coordinate and monitor tours of existing shows currently on the road. The balance of rental income is used for contracts for design, research, photography, editing, and graphics services; for travel; for preparation of the catalogue and newsletter to promote and advertise the shows; and for insurance and shipping.

Personnel Funded from Rental Income (as of May 1, 1977)

Full-time permanent (14)

Director IS-15
Program Officer IS-12
History Coordinator IS-11
Exhibit Coordinator IS-11
Science Coordinator IS-9
Science Coordinator IS-7
Scheduling Coordinator IS-5
Accountant IS-7
2 Clerk Receptionists IS-4
2 Exhibit Coordinator IS-9
Educational Coordinator IS-9
Exhibits Coordinator IS-7

Temporary (2)

Editorial Assistant IS-7
Clerk IS-4

Folklife Studies

Question. Under American and Folklife Studies you are proposing a large increase--from \$133,000 currently available to \$233,000. We will require additional information on this increase. For example, with no increase in positions why should travel jump from \$1,000 to \$4,000?

Answer. Approximately one-third of the requested increase of \$100,000 would finance the Smithsonian's share of a proposed tri-partite outreach program the outlines of which have been agreed to by the new American

Folklife Center of the Library of Congress, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Smithsonian. In brief, the three organizations will cooperate in establishing a program to involve a local community within the United States in the creation of a folklife festival program modelled on the Smithsonian's annual Festival of American Folklife. The requested increase in travel authority will help fund the travel costs associated with this program.

Question. The justification is not very specific in other areas. Please provide a detailed breakdown of the \$30,000 increase for contracting as well as the large increases in supplies, equipment, and printing, and submit that breakdown for the record.

Answer. We currently plan that the Folklife Unit will have three principal tasks in Fiscal Year 1978: folklife festival preparation, continued research and publication, and cooperative work toward the joint outreach program described above. A breakdown of the requested increase for contracting, supplies, equipment, and printing between these activities would be as follows:

	Folklife Festival	Research & Publication	Outreach Program	Total
Contracting	--	\$11,000	\$19,000	\$30,000
Supplies	\$20,000	1,000	1,000	22,000
Equipment	--	5,000	5,000	10,000
Printing	10,000	13,000	2,000	25,000

Principal contracting activities would be for processing and editing film, preparation of recordings and, for the Outreach Program, securing the services of field research specialists. Supplies, almost entirely for the Folklife Festival, would include all the production materials necessary for mounting of the Festival, from lumber and canvas to the materials needed by the practicing craftsmen to demonstrate their skills. Equipment costs, divided evenly between the research and publication activity and the proposed outreach program, would be for tape recording and playback equipment required for proper audio documentation and subsequent research. And the requested printing funds would support the publication of festival brochures, monographs, and research findings.

Office of the General Counsel

Question. Under the General Counsel's Office you have \$15,000 earmarked for several things--supplies, law library maintenance, seminar attendance. I wonder if you could provide us with a more specific breakdown for the record.

Answer. The Office of the General Counsel is requesting an increase of \$15,000 in Fiscal Year 1978 for the following "other object" classes:

Rent, Communications & Utilities (including the lease of a copying machine used extensively in the daily operations of the OGC and as an adjunct to the law library facility; messenger service for the daily delivery of the Congressional Record and urgent intracity deliveries; telegrams, cables, and international calls).....\$3,000

Other Services (including staff attendance of legal seminars on such matters as administrative procedures, employee-management relations, contracts, civil rights; and repair of typewriters and other office equipment).....\$4,000

Supplies and Materials (including subscriptions for such periodicals as U.S. Law Week, Fair Labor Practice Manual, Congressional Index, Congressional Quarterly; as well as office supplies and materials necessary in the daily operations of the OGC)..... 5,000

Equipment (including purchase of books for the permanent law library collection; and replacement of worn-out equipment)..... 3,000
\$15,000

Treasurer's Office

Question. You have \$30,000 under the Treasurer's Office for additional computer time to keep pace with expanding accounting needs. With a new system to modernize the accounting process we wonder why you need ever-increasing computer time. How much in total will be spent on computer usage by the Treasurer's office?

Answer. Computer time includes the cost of data processing, paper, and microfilming. While the new system has improved the accounting process, the product (monthly financial and statistical reports to all levels of management) is more in demand. The cost of computer useage for FY 1978 is projected to be \$100,000.

Question. Have you compared the cost of the new system with the old way of doing things?

Answer. The new system is a part of an accounting improvement program initiated several years ago. Heretofore, the accounting system consisted of an automated allotment ledger and manually maintained general ledger and other records. Through increased computer use the Treasurer's Office, which includes the Accounting Division and the Office of Programming and Budget, has been able to meet the demands of a growing Institution while holding down increases in its own staff. For example, since Fiscal Year 1973 while the federal operating budget has increased by almost 75 percent and the number of employees has increased by 25 percent, the staff of the Treasurer's Office has increased by only one, from 35 to 36 employees.

Question. Is the new method cost-saving?

Answer. We believe the new system will produce cost savings by enabling us to hold the line on employment within the Treasurer's Office and to provide better financial management within the Institution.

Personnel Administration

Question. You are asking for \$45,000 under Personnel Administration, and again you provide a list of things you propose to accomplish with the increased funding. How much will go for employee training?

Answer. Of the requested increase of \$45,000, \$4,000 will be used for additional employee training.

Question. Why don't you give us a detailed breakdown of the full \$45,000 increase requested for the record.

Answer. The \$45,000 increase breaks down as follows:

Employee training	\$4,000
Rental of larger capacity photocopier	1,000
Purchase of reprints of Civil Service Commission standards and regulations	2,000
Supplies and materials and computer usage	16,000
Salary costs of existing staff	22,000
	<u>\$45,000</u>

Management Analysis Office

Question. You want \$28,000 and one new position for the Management Analysis Office. How many people are already in this Office?

Answer. The Office currently has 10 federal and 2 trust fund employees.

Question. The additional funding, some \$8,000, is to provide supplies and a duplicating machine for the Office since it has moved. Where are your management people located if not on the Mall?

Answer. Our Management Analysis Office is located in space at L'Enfant Plaza, a distance of two city blocks from the Mall. Several of our central support units, such as the Office of Supply Services and the Accounting Division, are also located in space at L'Enfant Plaza.

Security System

Question. You are asking for another \$100,000 to continue conversion to a Smithsonian-owned security system. You mention an additional \$400,000 will be required to complete the conversion. When do you plan to request the remaining funding?

Answer. A request for additional funding will not be necessary. If the \$100,000 request is approved for FY 1978, the base for Protection Services will then contain adequate funding for conversion to a Smithsonian-owned security system by FY 1982.

Question. How many buildings will be covered by the system by the end of FY 1978?

Answer. If the additional \$100,000 is approved, by the end of FY 1978, we expect to have 5 buildings covered, including the Arts and Industries Building, the Smithsonian Institution Building, the Freer Gallery of Art, the History and Technology Building, and the Natural History Building. While certain components of the system will be installed in our other buildings, we will still be dependent upon ADT and its computer for notification of problems in those buildings. The remaining buildings will be phased into our system each year with our total Smithsonian-owned security system completed by FY 1982.

Space Requirements

Question. I notice from your statement that you are asking for an increase of \$78,000 to pay for higher rental rates at L'Enfant Plaza and 1111 North Capital Street. How much in total do you pay for rent at buildings other than those on the Mall?

Answer. Currently, the Institution's total space rental program costs \$2,172,766. This includes \$1,568,076 of Federal appropriated funds and \$604,690 of contract and grant and other trust funds. These rentals include among others the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory at Cambridge, Massachusetts and Mt. Hopkins, Arizona and the Smithsonian Magazine and the Archives of American Art in New York City.

Question. What offices or bureaus are located at these sites?

Answer. The following offices and bureaus are located at sites off the Mall:

- Oceanographic Sorting Center
- Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.
- Archives of American Art
- 41 East 65th Street, New York, New York
- 87 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Massachusetts
- Radiation Biology Laboratory
- Rockville, Maryland
- Anacostia Neighborhood Museum
- Anacostia, Washington, D.C.
- Smithsonian (various administrative activities)
- L'Enfant Plaza, Washington, D.C.
- Smithsonian Service Center (various program, storage, and distribution activities)
- 1111 North Capital Street
- Washington, D.C.
- Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory
- 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- New England Storage Co., Boston, Massachusetts
- 185 Alewife Parkway, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Summerville, Massachusetts (storage)
- Mt. Hopkins, Arizona
- Smithsonian Magazine
- Graybar Building, New York, New York
- Science Information Exchange
- Madison Bank Building, Washington, D.C.
- Interdisciplinary Communications Program
- 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C.
- Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute
- Ancan Building, Canal Zone
- National Portrait Gallery
- 1525 S. Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
- Fort Pierce Bureau
- St. Lucie County, Florida
- Horticultural Services, Old Soldiers Home, Washington, D.C.

Question. With all the building in the Smithsonian, why is it that you require additional space in private buildings?

Answer. The Smithsonian presently occupies approximately 2,956,000 net useable square feet of space in museums, galleries, and other owned facilities in the Washington metropolitan area. This includes about 2,131,000 square feet of exhibits and collections storage space

and 825,000 square feet of office, laboratory, and other work space.

Over the years, the growth of collections, exhibitions, and other educational programs has steadily reduced the space originally available in our public buildings for office and laboratory purposes. The Institution has long relied upon rental space to alleviate this situation and in the past four years has completed a consolidation of rental space and created an administrative focus for better management of these resources.

Question. Give us a breakdown for the record showing what offices are located in private buildings in the Washington area, and how much space they occupy, and what functions they perform. Provide the annual rental rates in each case.

Answer. The following information breaks down offices located in private buildings in the Washington area:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Space Occupied (sq.ft.)</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>FY 1977 Annual Rent</u>
Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.	42,000	Oceanographic Sorting Center	\$229,668
Rockville, Maryland	40,000	Radiation Biology Laboratory	254,000
Anacostia, Washington, D.C.	15,000	Anacostia Neighborhood Museum	18,600
Madison Bank Bldg Washington, D.C.	16,300	Science Information Exchange	120,800
1717 Mass. Ave., Washington, D.C.	5,150	Interdisciplinary Communications Program	4,500
L'Enfant Plaza Washington, D.C.	50,000	Facilities Planning & Engineering Office of Supply (procurement) Svcs Grants & Insurance Administration Office of Audits Office of International Activities Smithsonian Research Foundation Accounting Division Natl Anthropological Film Center Institute on Immigration & Ethnic Studies Division of Performing Arts Folklife Program Management Analysis Office Reading is Fundamental	404,000
Smithsonian Service Center 1111 North Capital Street Washington, D.C.	160,000	Office of Plant Services Office of Supply Services	397,600

<u>Location</u> <u>Service</u>	<u>Space</u> <u>Occupied</u> <u>(sq.ft.)</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>FY 1977</u> <u>Annual</u> <u>Rent</u>
Center (cont'd)		GPO Print Shop	
		Duplicating Services	
		Fulfillment Center	
		Museum Shops Inventory Center	
		Internatl Exchange Service	
		Office of Exhibits Central	
		Smithsonian Press	
		Archives of American Art	
		Natl Collection of Fine Arts	
		Office of Protection Services	
		Smithsonian Archives	
		Collections Storage	
		Other Storage	
Old Soldiers			
Home			
Washington, D.C.	<u>30,000</u>	Horticultural Services	<u>13,000</u>
(greenhouses)			
TOTALS	358,450		\$1,442,168

Elevator Contract

Question. The Committee has received a letter from the Comptroller General concerning sole source procurement of elevator and escalator repair and maintenance contracts. How much of your federal contracting money is awarded on a negotiated basis rather than on competitive bid basis?

Answer. In FY 1976, all federal procurement actions totaled \$38,649,506. Of this amount \$1,121,780 (3 percent) were negotiated sole source under authority 41 U.S.C. 252 (c)(10)(1), and \$24,051,796 (62 percent) were competitively negotiated under authority 41 U.S.C. 252 (c)(3), P.L. 93-356. The remaining amount of \$13,475,930 (35 percent) was formally advertised.

Special Foreign Currency Program

Temples of Philae

Question. You indicate that \$1 million is for the last of four payments to preserve the Temples of Philae in Egypt. Do you anticipate any further funding requests in this area?

Answer. No. Current estimates are that the total cost of the project will be met with 1) the completion in FY 1978 of a United States contribution of \$4,000,000, 2) contributions from other nations now totalling about \$11,000,000, and 3) a contribution from the Egyptians who have pledged up to one-third of the total cost now estimated to be about \$21,000,000.

Multi-year Concept

Question. Of the remaining \$3.5 million, you state that \$1 million will be for new initiatives and \$2.5 million will be to continue ongoing work. Will that \$1 million for new programs eventually fall into the "continuing" category?

Answer. Some part of the \$1 million for new initiatives might well support programs which would eventually fall into the continuing category depending on a number of factors. The principal ones are the advice of the advisory councils concerning support for both new and ongoing projects and the amount of money available to the Program.

The FY 1978 request includes funds sufficient to permit some multi-year funding of demonstrably well-managed projects. Multi-year funding would remove such projects from the "continuing category"; and, as a rule, funds would not be requested in subsequent years to support such projects.

The mix of projects supported by the Program changes from year to year. For example, it is currently estimated that 10 new multi-year projects known to be in the planning stage will be submitted for funding from the FY 1978 appropriation. On the other hand, four ongoing, multi-year projects are expected to terminate with final awards made from those funds, while 19 current multi-year projects will continue. In addition, 12 one-year projects are currently expected to seek funding next year. Of course, there are always a number of meritorious proposals that are not anticipated as well as a varying number of first-rate fellowship applications.

Question. Most of this funding, then, will be directed to continuing ongoing work. What happens if the request is not granted? Would you divert some of the funds to new efforts or merely continue the ongoing work?

Answer. Ongoing work, determined by the Program's annual scholarly review to be progressing satisfactorily, would normally take priority over new projects in the allocation of the excess foreign currency appropriation. In FY 1977, however, because of the lively demand, project budgets, both ongoing and new, have been reduced proportionately across the board in order that particularly meritorious new projects might receive support. Some of these projects have been postponed for lack of funds the previous year.

Cooper-Hewitt

Question. Please supply for the record the total federal funding going to the Cooper-Hewitt in 1977 and in your 1978 program. We want figures comparable to those in the GAO report.

Answer. The total federal funding for Cooper-Hewitt in 1977 and in 1978 is as follows:

Cooper-Hewitt Museum
Appropriated Funds

(\$ thousands)

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Operating Funds</u> ^{/1}	<u>Bldg. Renovation</u>
1977 (Est.)	\$ 608.0	\$80.0
1978 (Est.)	<u>636.0</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	\$1,244.0	\$80.0

/1 Includes amounts from Smithsonian centralized units (Libraries and Protection) which will be obligated on behalf of the Cooper-Hewitt Museum.

Chesapeake Bay Center

Question. What is the total of all federal funding programmed for the bay center in 1978?

Answer. The total of all federal funding is as follows:

Chesapeake Bay Center for
Environmental Studies
Fiscal Year 1978 (Est.)

<u>Object Class</u>	<u>Appropriated Funds</u> ^{/1}	<u>Federal Research Grants</u>
Salaries and benefits	\$520,500	\$388,900
Travel	8,000	6,500
Transportation of things	-	-
Rent, communication, utilities	44,100	-
Printing	5,000	-
Other services	35,000	177,900
Supplies and materials	44,800	79,000
Equipment	43,000	67,700
Construction	-	-
	<u>\$700,400</u>	<u>\$720,000</u>

/1 Includes funds requested for the International Environmental Science Program which will be used to carry out studies at the Chesapeake Bay Center.

Question. We noted a news story last year that the Smithsonian is considering taking measures to prevent the further erosion and disappearance of Poplar Island. Where does that stand?

Answer. The Smithsonian has been considering measures to prevent further erosion of Poplar Island for the past five years. We have not solicited proposals or suggestions, yet many companies have approached us with ideas. The latest proposal includes making use of bailing wire tied around tires to stop erosion. In all cases the proposals have been in our opinion too costly. We continue to have discussions on how to meet this problem economically.

Question. Can we assume the Smithsonian will seek advance approval of the Committee before undertaking any significant preservation program on this island that might involve a federal commitment?

Answer. Yes, we would certainly seek the Committee's advance approval before undertaking such a program.

Question. How much did Smithsonian pay in total for the sailboat that was later sold for \$3,750, and why was it acquired in the first place?

Answer. In 1965, the Smithsonian purchased for \$124,000 a remainder interest in 17.5 acres of land known as Corn Island. This property was considered essential to the CBCES land acquisition program since it separated two larger parcels already being acquired and also fronted on the extensive marsh area of the Rhode River. The owners at the time were unwilling to sell the property outright, which was appraised at \$315,000 by a professional appraiser, but wished to retain the right to live on the Island for the balance of their lives. The consideration paid by the Smithsonian for this interest was \$25,000 to the owners, as well as the assumption of a \$68,000 mortgage on the house and a \$30,300 chattel mortgage on a 36 foot yawl, the "Ellida." The assumption of this latter mortgage, and therefore the acquisition of the yawl, was a necessary condition of the land transaction, required by the owner; this total arrangement was extremely advantageous to the Institution, which obtained control over this key portion of land at relatively low cost.

Question. Were any federal funds used in the Chesapeake Bay Center acquisition?

Answer. No federal funds have been used in the acquisition of land at the Chesapeake Bay Center; purchase moneys have come from foundation grants as well as unrestricted trust funds.

Question. Also on Chesapeake Bay, there has been some adverse attention given recently to the methods used by the Smithsonian to acquire and manage its bay research center lands on the Rhode River. The Committee is aware of a recent press release issued by the Smithsonian on the subject and invites you to include that in the hearing record.

Answer. The news release has been supplied for the record.

THE FACTS BEHIND SMITHSONIAN'S LAND ACQUISITIONS IN BAY AREA

"Residents of Maryland Bay Area Subsidized by Smithsonian," exclaimed the two column, front-page headline in the Washington Post for Monday, February 28.

There followed a lengthy article by Charles A. Krause, a Post reporter, centered about the Smithsonian Institution's efforts to assemble 2,600 acres of land for the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, one of the world's leading ecological research centers.

The article charged that the Smithsonian has in effect "created a vast subsidized housing and farming preserve" along the shores of the Chesapeake Bay in the "name of land conservation, science and the environment."

This conclusion is untrue, exaggerated and misleading. We believe it necessary to provide the facts in considerable detail to set the record straight. The truth is that the "vast subsidized housing and farming preserve" discovered by the Post involves only a few rural homes and certain related occupancy rights retained by the owners in the conditions of sale to the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian is not subsidizing any former owners of land purchased to establish the Center. In two cases, involving only 95.5 acres, the sellers offered only to sell to the Institution what are known in real estate terms as "remainder interests" under which they received life tenancy agreements. Long range, full-title will be held by the Smithsonian. Generally, the Smithsonian paid less than market value for the lands acquired to set up the Center.

A considerable portion of the article concerns the 17.5 acre property purchased by the Smithsonian in 1965 from Ernest N. Cory, Jr., known as Corn Island. Missing from the article is the fact, given to the Post reporter, that the Cory property, including a large modern house, had been valued at \$314,000 by a professional appraiser. The price paid by the Smithsonian for the remainder interest, which was all that Mr. Cory would sell at the time, was \$124,000, or nearly \$200,000 less than the appraised value. Instead of applauding the Smithsonian for acquiring land at relatively low-cost for conservation and research purposes, the article suggests that the Institution "lost" approximately \$26,000 on the deal when a yawl acquired from Mr. Cory as a condition of sale, was sold

two years after it was purchased. Incidentally, the 60-year old, 36-foot long, wooden yawl was not a 100 foot yacht as reported. This boat was later sold for \$3,750.

The article goes on to state that the Smithsonian, in acquiring properties for the Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, has "allowed former owners to farm for free," and in two cases agreed to "let former owners live free of charge in their former manor houses until their deaths."

It should be stressed that these arrangements were both legal and to the continuing advantage of the Smithsonian. The Smithsonian was fortunate to obtain the property since the owners at the time wanted to assure the preservation of Corn Island in its natural state, which tied in with the plans for the newly-developing Chesapeake Bay Center. This property separated two larger parcels that the Smithsonian already was acquiring. In addition, because the Cory property fronts on the extensive marsh area of the Rhode River, it was thus considered essential that Corn Island be acquired both for preservation as a part of the Chesapeake Bay Center and to insure the integrity of that particular land unit. However, the Corys also wished to continue to live on the island for the balance of their lives. So, the owners offered to sell to the Smithsonian only the right to ownership of the island upon the death of the survivor of either Mr. or Mrs. Cory.

For the benefit of their children, they also required that the Smithsonian could not assume full ownership until after a fixed period of 20 years (1985) even if both Mr. and Mrs. Cory died before the expiration of 20 years.

Mr. and Mrs. Cory wished to make a gift to the Smithsonian of a significant portion of the property; however, they could not afford to make a gift of the total remainder interest. The Corys agreed to accept \$25,000, and the assumption by the Smithsonian of two mortgages: one for \$68,000 covering the house; and the other for approximately \$30,000 for the yawl, the "Ellida."

The Smithsonian's other purchase of the right to ownership after

the owner's death was from Mr. Eric Steinlein, then in his 60's, in 1971. Mr. Steinlein held ownership of approximately 76 acres that also bordered the Rhode River and was between two properties already a part of the Chesapeake Bay Center. Mr. Steinlein would only offer to sell ownership rights commencing three years after his death or the death of his wife, Margaret Steinlein, (now deceased). Mr. Steinlein was not in a position to make any gift to the Smithsonian, and the lowest price he would agree to was \$120,000. The frame house occupied by Mr. Steinlein was appraised at \$12,000 in 1970; the price for the remainder interest in the land was approximately \$1,500 per acre.

The article states that the Smithsonian has permitted former owners to farm free of charge on properties of the Chesapeake Bay Center. No former owners of property acquired by the Smithsonian at the Center are farming on the Center's property. At present, three individuals farm approximately 270 acres of the Center's 1,700-acre land holdings. It has been the Smithsonian's intent to maintain this acreage in an active agricultural state so such land uses may be contrasted with old fields, mature forests and residential areas. Arrangements were made with these three farmers so the Smithsonian would not have to employ staff or purchase equipment required for farming.

The Smithsonian Institution's Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies is one of the nation's leading scientific and educational research facilities in ecological management and understanding.

The Smithsonian has worked closely with the University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins University, and the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences in developing this regional and national center. Funding for activities at the Center has been received from 10 major philanthropic foundations which have provided approximately \$1.5 million towards this endeavor. Also, such government agencies concerned with the environment as the National Science Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency have provided grants for various research projects at the Center. In virtually every case, site committees appointed by these agencies or foundations reviewed the relevant activities at the Center and found them to be worthy

of support. In addition, programs at the Center have been reviewed periodically by the Smithsonian's administration and have been found to be consistent with the Institution's scientific research policy.

Through the years, the appropriate committees of the U.S. Congress have been advised on a regular basis of the programs and plans for the Chesapeake Bay Center. The Smithsonian's proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1978, on which hearings will be held during the month of March before House and Senate subcommittees, requests an appropriation of approximately \$600,000 for operating expenses at the Chesapeake Bay Center.

As an institution concerned with the increase and diffusion of knowledge among mankind, the Smithsonian, of course, also is conscious of the need for accuracy and responsibility in reports of its activities in many and diverse academic disciplines.

I believe that a careful analysis of all of the facts by media representatives would clearly demonstrate a continuing record of legal and business-like steps to acquire property for the significant scientific research and educational purposes at the Chesapeake Bay Center.

CONCLUSION OF HEARINGS

Senator STEVENS. And we may get back to you after we have had the discussion with the chairman concerning Senator Jackson's letter.

The subcommittee will recess subject to the call of the chairman. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 10:25 a.m., Tuesday, May 3, the hearings were concluded and the subcommittee was recessed to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]



SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES



3 9088 01624 6258