

EDWARDS

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 9

APRIL 20, 1971, TO APRIL 27, 1971

(PAGES 10871 TO 12302)

SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER,  
" NEED FOR IMMEDIATE PROGRESS  
ON CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL  
AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM "  
APRIL 26, 1971

mornings, when it runs to 40%. No matter, it's illegal to fire anyone. The president has called for extra hours of voluntary work by copper miners, saying, "Each pound of copper that is produced will help prevent the economic disaster into which they (sic) are trying to drag us." Yet, mine output in January was down 8,000 tons from a year ago. In the countryside Indians and farm workers have taken "land reform" into their own hands through armed occupation of large estates. Farmers, expecting confiscation, are sending out of the country money they otherwise would spend on seed and fertilizer. Herds of dairy and beef cattle are being slaughtered, and food shortages loom.

In a recent interview with a Time correspondent, Dr. Allende warned: "Don't put up roadblocks for us. The worst thing would be if we were to fail, not because we are inept, but because artificial roadblocks are put in our way." Fair enough. Chile is plunging hell-bent down the road to poverty and serfdom. Let the U.S. keep hands off.

#### POW DAY IN INDIANA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, we have long been concerned for the safety and prompt release of American prisoners of war. Until the President designates a specific date for withdrawal from Vietnam, the action that would most help these prisoners we must do all we can to focus attention on the plight of POWs, in order to press for their fair treatment.

I have sought to give the problem proper emphasis by speaking out repeatedly on this subject, and I am a co-sponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, a resolution which would create a joint committee to investigate the treatment of POW's in Vietnam.

Today, I wish to share with the Senate a proclamation by the State of Indiana to declare April 28 POW Day in Indiana. I hope this continued concern will bring comfort to both servicemen and their families.

I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas, nearly 1,600 members of the Armed Forces of the United States are officially listed either as missing in action or as prisoners-of-war in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, these men have suffered and continue to suffer pain, imprisonment, deprivation of their rights, prolonged separation from their loved ones, and the peculiar mental and physical anguish which is the unique lot of the prisoner-of-war; and

Whereas, their wives, children, parents and other relatives in the United States suffer with them the agony of separation and of loneliness; and

Whereas, these men have carried out, and continue to carry out their duties to their country in accordance with their principles and pursuant to directions of the American people whom they are defending; and

Whereas, it is entirely just and in accord with humanitarian instincts that we, the American people, remember these men, cherish their contributions to our security, and pray for their safety and their speedy return to their homes and families;

Now, therefore, I, Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 28, 1971, as "Prisoner of War Day" in Indiana, and I urge all citizens to show their respect and concern for these servicemen and to join me in praying for their release.

#### NEED FOR IMMEDIATE PROGRESS ON CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM

MR. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Wednesday of last week, it was my great pleasure to appear before the House Appropriations Subcommittee presided over by a gracious, industrious Representative, Mrs. JULIA HANSEN. She was very kind to set aside some time for me to present a few thoughts in support of the pressing need for increased funds at the National Air and Space Museum and the National Museum of Natural History, which are two of the most important components of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. President, this Nation has for too long been negligent in providing for a decent and dignified place in which to display its great technological advances in the field of flight, which includes both manned air flight and space explorations. One recent development serves well to illustrate the deplorable delay in embarking upon this project. Only a week ago, I received word from the estate of Orville Wright, which informed me that it has been waiting for 23 years now for the construction of a new U.S. National Museum for Air and Space Exhibits. In my testimony before Mrs. Hansen's subcommittee, I revealed the fact that the Wright estate had only agreed to bring back the Wright brothers' 1903 "Kitty Hawk" plane from its long exile of honor in England in the expectation and upon the firm promise that it would be placed in a second-to-none U.S. air museum. And yet, Mr. Harold Miller, who is coexecutor of the Orville Wright estate felt compelled to write to me:

It is now 23 years later. The plane is exactly where it was on December 17, 1948, and it is far worse, not better, off than it was when it came here from its 20 years abroad.

Mr. President, it is high time we, the American people, lived up to the promise given to the memory of Orville and Wilbur Wright. To this end, I went before both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees handling Smithsonian funds and made the strongest plea I knew how on behalf of this important project. It is encouraging to me that Dr. Ripley, who is secretary of the Smithsonian, is displaying a new and encouraging attitude toward construction of the building; and in fact, he has now set a firm deadline of July 4, 1976, which is the 200th anniversary of American independence, as the date for opening the new air and space structure.

Also, Mr. President, I made an appeal for increased funds at the museum of natural history which has been encountering difficult budgetary problems of its own in recent years at the same time that its workload has doubled, and I hope the Congress will show an alert interest in the needs of this museum as well. Mr. President, because this is a matter of interest of all of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of my remarks delivered before the House subcommittee be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SCIENCE BOOST NEEDED AT THE SMITHSONIAN (Statement by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Madam Chairman, it is my purpose today to ask that the Committee support the full appropriations sought by the National Air and Space Museum and the National Museum of Natural History.

Madam Chairman, last year when a House Subcommittee conducted a sweeping investigation of the Smithsonian, I presented documented evidence establishing a serious decline in support for these two museums. My testimony pointed to the strange fact that while the total Federal budget for the Institution had doubled within six years and the number of full-time employees had jumped by more than 700 positions, and while the Smithsonian had plunged into the creation of entire new units, such as the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, the Archives of American Art, the Office of Academic Programs, and a Division of Performing Arts, the National Air and Space Museum and the Museum of Natural History were slipping downhill in the degree of support they received from the Institution.

For example, at the end of the 1970 fiscal year, the museum of flight had only 31 employees, yet Congress had appropriated funds for 41. At the same time, the Museum of Natural History had 103 scientists supported by 87 technicians. Yet three years earlier the Museum had 111 scientists and 90 technicians.

The Air and Space Museum did not have a director for 18 months; while over at the Museum of Natural History, the Department of Vertebrate Zoology could not even offer its scientists a research allotment equal to that provided to graduate students.

Though I do not intend to rekindle these old coals today, I do feel it is essential the requested increases for these museums should be viewed against the backdrop of years of inadequate support. For the one essential ingredient of their reconstruction program is the willingness of Congress to appropriate the full added monies which these museums have sought.

Madame Chairman, the top priority item in the National Air and Space Museum budget is the \$1.9 million earmarked for planning and redesign of a new museum building. This request is combined with a firm deadline of July 4, 1976, which the Smithsonian has selected for opening the new structure.

Unfortunately, the building project has been on dead center for five years now. The authorization statute itself does not contain any limitation. Nor did the House of Representatives offer any reservations. The only legislative hang-up is found in a single sentence inserted in the Senate Committee report on the 1966 authorization law.

That sentence simply reads: "The Committee expressly recommends . . . that appropriations should not be requested pursuant to H.R. 6125 unless and until there is a substantial reduction in our military expenditures in Vietnam."

Madame Chairman, in my opinion, this language is no longer binding. Certainly it has no effect at all on any action which the House might take. Also, I feel it has been superseded by intervening events. For one thing, it was written before the first manned lunar landing, which did so much to excite public interest in America's space exploits. For another, Congress did not add any similar restriction when it approved \$2.9 million for renovating the Smithsonian's Renwick Gallery. Or when it provided \$2.6 million for refurbishing the original Smithsonian building.

Nor did Congress impose any tie between Vietnam and the \$7 million it appropriated for restoration work on the National Portrait Gallery or the \$15 million it is laying out for construction of the Hirshhorn Museum.

Why the National Air and Space Museum should be singled out from all other Smith-

sonian projects and told its construction must be deferred is beyond me. In any event, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has recently announced it does not object to the Smithsonian's request for redesign funds, so we will not run into any jurisdictional conflict at this time.

Which brings me to the fundamental question of why a national museum of flight is needed in America. One purpose, of course is to tell the story of America's achievements in flight. Furthermore, with our nation expanded almost to the limits of its explorable land, the story of space pioneering displayed at the Air and Space Museum might be an excellent means for recharging our national energies.

The need for a central museum of air and space objects has never been in doubt among our friends overseas. Britain has an outstanding aerospace display on an entire floor of its London Science Museum. In addition, a new RAF Museum building is nearly completed. Also, the Deutche Museum in Munich contains a huge hall devoted to air and space displays nearly as extensive as our own. For their part, the French have on show in Paris six to ten times as many original aircraft and flight objects as we do. Italy is installing a major Air and Astro Museum at Turin. Even small Switzerland is developing an impressive Museum of Transportation at Lucerne, which can compete on close terms with what the United States now presents in the air and space field.

An American citizen returning from a tour of these museums, situated in nations one-fourth the size of our own, might easily feel a sense of embarrassment at how his country compares. Why our nation does not even have a permanent home for its collections. We have a small tin hangar in which aviation exhibits have been shown since 1919 and some temporary space in the 90-year old Arts and Industries Building, and that is it.

Madame Chairman, I have just received in the mail a most poignant request for construction of a distinctive flight museum. On April 13, I heard from Mr. Harold Miller, who is co-executor of the Orville Wright Estate. Mr. Miller relates that the Estate only agreed to return the Wright brother's 1903 Kitty Hawk plane from its long exile of honor in England "in the confident expectation that there would be a second-to-none U.S. Air Museum in which it would be the premier Exhibit, displayed in a setting appropriate to its unique character and merit like the crown jewels."

Mr. Miller adds: "It is now 23 years later. The plane is exactly where it was on December 17, 1948, and it is far worse, not better, off than it was when it came here from its 20 years abroad."

Madame Chairman, I think it is high time the American people lived up to their promise to the memory of Orville and Wilbur Wright. I believe we, as representatives of all citizens, should immediately initiate some progress toward the erection of a dignified museum worthy of this country's pioneering genius in manned flight.

And for reasons of plain dollars and cents, it looks as if the only way this project can get off the ground is by going the route of a redesign. Because from a cost of \$40 million when the building was first authorized in 1966, I am told the expense would now exceed \$70 million.

Madame Chairman, as you may know, the original architect, Gyo Obata, claims it is feasible to develop a proper museum at a lower cost. In fact, he has estimated the rough dimensions which such a scaled-down building might have.

Madame Chairman, you may be interested to know the length could be nearly the same, 730 to 760 feet compared with the original 784. The height will stay near 97 feet, which is important because this would preserve the

opportunity for installing some full-sized rockets or rocket sections inside the building. Most of the reduced scale would come out of the width. The new building might be 160 to 190 feet wide compared with 250 feet for the original plan.

While this would mean the floor area would be cut in half, I am told the actual exhibition space would be reduced by less than one-fifth, leaving 254,000 square feet for this prime purpose. This is more than three times greater than the maximum area which could be used for exhibits in the two buildings which presently house flight displays. And assuming the ground might be broken by sometime in calendar year 1972, construction itself could be held at a cost below \$40 million.

Therefore, from what I have learned, the revised plan retains so much of the original form at a lowered cost, I believe it deserves our support.

My only reservation concerns whether it is necessary to obtain reapproval of the building from all the planning and art and traffic commissions which have a hand in Federal construction. But if these bureaucratic avenues should threaten to stifle the project in a web of red tape, I know Congress could shortcut this route by enacting overriding legislation or even by returning to the original, approved design.

Incidentally, I notice the Smithsonian is confronted with exactly this problem in regard to its proposal for changing the location of the Hirshhorn sculpture garden. According to the Washington Star, the National Capital Planning Commission ordered the revised version to go back for more study and one member of the Commission even appeared ready to reopen the whole issue of whether the museum should have a separate sculpture garden at all. With this warning in mind, I hope the Smithsonian will have its ducks in a better row when it undertakes a redesign of the Air and Space project.

Next, Madame Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the museum's request for additional operating funds. The museum has requested an increase of \$105,000 for carrying out its operations in 1972, and I can confirm this amount is honestly required. In fact, even if the full amount of staff and program funds are appropriated, the museum will receive less than 1.7% of the overall Smithsonian budget for salaries and expenses. For a museum that draws one-third of the Smithsonian's visitors—4½ million persons—this allotment is not at all proportionate to the unit's proven importance. Accordingly, it is my sincere hope the Committee will not cut one penny out of its already minuscule allotment.

Madame Chairman, I would like to turn my attention now to the Museum of Natural History. From the early years, when the first Secretary of the Smithsonian, Joseph Henry, made pioneering discoveries in science, the Institution has generally held pure scientific research in high regard. During the mid-1960's, however, the course of the Smithsonian's priorities began to shift. As Paul Oehser writes in his recent history of the Institution: "Today, in contrast, the humanities are demanding an increasing role in Smithsonian programs . . ."

It is during this period that the Museum of Natural History began to fall back. Doctor Richard Cowan, director of the museum, has documented this problem publicly at the House investigation hearings last summer.

Dr. Cowan testified that the lack of adequate technical assistance for his scientists results in an almost "criminal mismanagement of human resources" because highly trained scientists are required to waste their time doing routine chores.

He also confided that the employment picture at the museum is worse than it was several years ago. Dr. Cowan charged: "The

available pairs of hands, both professional and supportive, are fewer now than four years ago." His statement was backed by a specific example of the cannibalism which ate away one-third of the staff of the Department of Vertebrate Zoology at the same time its workload was soaring.

In addition, Dr. Cowan exposed the severe and sudden drain on his museum's budget caused by an unusual shift in Smithsonian policies which makes the museum purchase items that formerly had been provided to it without cost from the Institution's Supply Division. As strange as it seems, the museum must now purchase such basic things as storage bottles and cases and some 400 other items which are essential for its operation and were formerly supplied free to it. Why the museum must even purchase many of its own reference books because the Smithsonian Library will not supply them. I might add, Madame Chairman, that given this odd situation, the Institution's decision to request an increase of far more money for personnel than it did for books at its Library is extremely curious.

Madame Chairman, I can reveal today there is another cost which will be unexpectedly dropped on the museum's hard-pressed budget. From now on the museum must not only pay for supplies and materials used in work performed for it by the Smithsonian's Building Management Department, but also for the costs of labor! It should be noted, Madame Chairman, that the Buildings Management Department possesses its own separate budget of more than \$9 million. Nevertheless this one arm of the Smithsonian will begin charging all other Smithsonian components for basic work done for them, such as converting office space into laboratory space, moving a desk, or installing a bookcase.

Madame Chairman, the situation has become so bad I must report today that the change in supply and service practices instituted by the Smithsonian management has cut non-salary operating funds at the Museum of Natural History by up to a quarter of a million dollars. The loss of funds formerly charged to the Buildings Management Department alone is about \$100,000.

Accordingly, Madame Chairman, I hope you will look at the requested increases in the budget of Natural History not only from the perspective of the need for correcting several years of decline, but also with the realization the museum has been loaded down by sudden and unexpected expenses for which it has been given no additional funds.

Madame Chairman, this completes my comments on the Smithsonian's Federal budget. The only advice I might add is the suggestion the Committee may wish to request a full disclosure from the Smithsonian on its private financing. It is my understanding the pool of private investments, gifts, and grants now returns about \$18 million annually; and it seems fair to inquire whether this sum is being spent wisely so as to keep Federal expenditures at a minimum. For example, is the Smithsonian getting a sensible return on its holdings of over \$32 million in stocks, bonds, and endowment funds? Could more privately funded employees be engaged at units which seriously need them, such as the Air and Space and Natural History Museums? Is it proper for the Institution to embark upon money losing projects, such as the museum shops and "Smithsonian Magazine" were in 1970, thereby leaving a gap to be filled by Federal appropriations in other areas which could have been financed by the Smithsonian itself?

Madame Chairman, this type of information was given to the House investigating subcommittee last summer, and I think it would be helpful if you might institute the practice on a regular basis.

This concludes my statement.