

68062059

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART BUILDING AUTHORIZATION

(90-33)

HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETIETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 16358

TO AUTHORIZE THE TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY
OF ART TO CONSTRUCT A BUILDING OR BUILDINGS ON THE
SITE BOUNDED BY FOURTH STREET, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE,
THIRD STREET, AND MADISON DRIVE NW., IN THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA, AND MAKING PROVISION FOR THE MAINTENANCE THEREOF

MAY 9, 1968

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works

GOVERNMENT DEPOSITORY
PROPERTY OF THE LIBRARIANS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOUTH JERSEY LIBRARY
CAMDEN, N. J. 08102

AUG 5 - 1968

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1968

OV. DOC.

44

P96/11

96-711

90-33

0453504

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland, *Chairman*

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota	WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois	JAMES R. GLOVER, Jr., New York
JIM WRIGHT, Texas	JAMES C. CLEVELAND, New Hampshire
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois	DON H. CLAUSEN, California
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania	ROBERT C. McEWEN, New York
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma	JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, South Carolina	HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, Wisconsin
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina	M. G. (GENE) SNYDER, Kentucky
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana	ROBERT V. DENNEY, Nebraska
RAY ROBERTS, Texas	ROGER H. ZION, Indiana
ROBERT A. EVERETT, Tennessee	JACK H. McDONALD, Michigan
RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, New York	JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
JAMES KEE, West Virginia	CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey	
EDWIN W. EDWARDS, Louisiana	
JEROME R. WALDIE, California	

COMMITTEE STAFF

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*
LESTER EDELMAN, *Counsel*
CLIFTON W. ENFIELD, *Minority Counsel*
SHELDON S. GILBERT, *Associate Minority Counsel*

STAFF ASSISTANTS

DOROTHY BEAM, *Executive Staff Assistant*
MERIAM BUCKLEY
ANNE KENNEDY
STERLYN B. CARROLL
ERLA S. YOUNG
STELLA SPAULDING

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois, *Chairman*

ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., New York
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois	ROBERT C. McEWEN, New York
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota	WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JIM WRIGHT, Texas	JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina	FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
RAY ROBERTS, Texas	HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, Wisconsin
JAMES KEE, West Virginia	ROBERT V. DENNEY, Nebraska
EDWIN W. EDWARDS, Louisiana	JACK H. McDONALD, Michigan
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California	JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey	
JEROME R. WALDIE, California	

STEPHEN V. FEELEY, *Clerk*

(11)

CONTENTS

H.R. 16358.....	Page
Statement of—	1
Walker, Hon. John, Director, National Gallery of Art, accompanied by Hon. Ernest R. Feidler, General Counsel, National Gallery of Art.....	2

(iii)

CONTENTS

Page

1

2

(iii)

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART BUILDING AUTHORIZATION

THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds met at 10:15 a.m., in room 2253, Rayburn Building, the Honorable Kenneth J. Gray, subcommittee chairman, presiding.

Mr. GRAY. The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds will please come to order.

The Chair and all the members want to welcome our distinguished witnesses this morning and the others in the room. The purpose of this hearing is to hear witnesses on H.R. 16358, introduced by Mr. Fallon and Mr. Gray, authorizing the trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct a building or buildings on the site bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive NW., in the District of Columbia, and making provision for the maintenance thereof.

(H.R. 16358 follows:)

[H.R. 16358, 90th Cong., second sess.]

A BILL Authorizing the trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct a building or buildings on the site bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive Northwest, in the District of Columbia, and making provision for the maintenance thereof

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the trustees of the National Gallery of Art are authorized to construct on the area reserved in section 1 of the "Joint resolution providing for the construction and maintenance of a National Gallery of Art", approved March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51; 20 U.S.C. 71), that is, the area bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive Northwest, a building or buildings to serve as an addition or additions to the National Gallery of Art: *Provided, however,* That costs of such construction shall be defrayed from trust funds administered by such trustee: *And provided further,* That the plans and specifications for such building or buildings shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

SEC. 2. Upon completion, the building or buildings erected pursuant to section 1 hereof shall be incorporated into and become a part of the National Gallery of Art, and all provisions of the "Joint resolution providing for the construction and maintenance of a National Gallery of Art", approved March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51; 20 U.S.C. 71 et seq.) shall apply to such building or buildings, to the site referred to in section 1 hereof, and to the activities of the National Gallery of Art carried on in such building or buildings and site, to the same extent as they apply to the original National Gallery of Art Building and its site and to activities carried on therein.

SEC. 3. All provisions of the Public Law 206 approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 193n et seq.), shall apply to the building or buildings

constructed pursuant to section 1 hereof and to the site referred to in section 1 hereof which shall for such purpose be held to extend to the line of the face of the south curb of Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, between Fourth Street and Third Street Northwest, to the line of the face of the west curb of Third Street Northwest, between Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Drive Northwest, to the line of the face of the north curb of Madison Drive Northwest, between Third Street and Fourth Street Northwest, and to the line of the face of the east curb of Fourth Street Northwest, between Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Drive Northwest.

SEC. 4. The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to transfer to the United States such jurisdiction as the District may have over any of the property delimited in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 5. In the event any privately owned or publicly owned utility located in the area delimited in the first section of this Act is required to be relocated or protected by reason of the construction on such area of any additional to the National Gallery of Art, such relocation or protection shall be at the expense of other than the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY. The first witness this morning is the Honorable John Walker, Director of the National Gallery of Art, accompanied by the Honorable Ernest R. Feidler, General Counsel, National Gallery of Art.

Gentlemen, we are delighted to have both of you here this morning to testify on behalf of this important piece of legislation and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN WALKER, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART; ACCOMPANIED BY HON. ERNEST R. FEIDLER, GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. I would like to make a brief statement in support of H.R. 16358 which is a bill to authorize the trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct an additional building or buildings for the gallery on the site reserved for that purpose in the gallery's chartering legislation; that is, in Public Resolution No. 14, approved March 24, 1937.

When Mr. Andrew Mellon made his gift to establish the National Gallery of Art for the benefit of the people of the United States, he foresaw, as did President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that the day would come when the gallery needed room to expand and to increase its services to the people.

They suggested that provision be made for this contingency in the legislation establishing the gallery, and the Congress wisely did so in the very first section of that law.

Over 31 years have since passed, and the growth of the gallery and of its services to the public and for their education has been such that today a new additional building is needed if the gallery is to continue to discharge properly its great cultural purposes.

I suppose that if one were to name the half dozen museums in the world with the finest collections of European painting and sculpture, the National Gallery of Art would surely be one of them and in American art it ranks with the greatest in this country; but I can vouch for the fact that none of the other five museums reached that stature in as short a period as did your National Gallery of Art.

The works of art in the original gift provided by Mr. Andrew Mellon comprised 126 paintings and 23 pieces of sculpture valued by the committees of the Congress at \$50 million. Today, the collection comprises nearly 2,000 paintings, 1,718 pieces of sculpture, and 26,958 items

of graphic arts; that is, drawings, etchings, lithographs, and other prints as well as many items of decorative arts.

The value of the collection is such that I should hesitate to attempt to express it in dollars. This growth in resources derives not only from great benefactions such as those that over the years brought to the gallery the Samuel Kress, the Widener, the Chester Dale, and the Rosenwald collections, but also from other donors and friends who are literally numbered in the hundreds and who are found in all parts of our country.

This amazing achievement has come about as a result of a very happy joint enterprise—really a uniquely American collaboration of private collectors and philanthropists on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other, working in a partnership to create and give life to a great cultural institution.

The Federal Government, for example, has never failed to meet its pledge to provide funds for the proper upkeep of the gallery and it is my firm belief that this has been a major contributing factor in convincing collectors that the National Gallery of Art is a fitting place to house their collections.

It is indeed most fortunate that Mr. Andrew Mellon's interest in the Nation's gallery passed on to his son and daughter, Mr. Paul Mellon and Mrs. Mellon Bruce. I am pleased to report to you that they have by unconditional and unrestricted gifts in the past year put the trustees in funds which the trustees deem sufficient to erect the new building or buildings on the reserved site.

Mr. GRAY. That is so important, Mr. Walker. You do have funds available now to do this?

Mr. WALKER. We do right now have funds in the gallery as the result of a gift.

Mr. GRAY. Congratulations.

Mr. WALKER. The amount of the gift has been announced. It is approximately \$20 million.

Mr. GRAY. It is very unusual.

Mr. WALKER. We have it. We are not asking for 1 penny of appropriated funds for the construction of this building.

Mr. GRAY. I apologize for interrupting you.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, very much, for interrupting me, so that I could emphasize this point.

Mr. GRAY. I just could not believe what I heard.

Mr. WALKER. When it is finished the addition will be, as is provided in the proposed legislation, an integral part of the National Gallery of Art and subject to the same legislation and provisions as is the present building.

Thus, after completion which we now estimate will occur probably in fiscal year 1973, the new building will be supported in the same way as is the present building. However, it is my personal opinion that this new construction will accomplish a saving of public appropriated funds. Were the Congress to try to provide for the gallery's growth inside the present building, the result would be not only an impairment of the beauty of what I deem to be one of the architectural gems of the city, but also inefficiency and crowding so that more funds would be required than would be needed to provide for the very same functions in a new building.

Furthermore, at present we are using unoccupied areas intended for exhibition space to house our expanding extension services. If you would come to the gallery, I would take you into some of the exhibition areas into which we have expanded and you would find them occupied with desks, chairs, and other items.

While all the activities of the gallery are growing and many will find needed expansion room including exhibition space in the proposed new building, I wish to make special mention of two. First, there is the extension service of the gallery which I mentioned and through which we seek to bring the gallery and its resources out to schools, church organizations, and civic groups throughout the 50 States and the territories. We do this by making available without charge slide lectures, exhibitions of reproductions of our paintings, motion picture films, and other materials. We want everyone to come to the National Gallery of Art and to become acquainted with the cultural heritage of Western art which it houses, but there are many people in the United States who cannot come here. We want to serve them too; we want to bring the gallery out to them.

Last fiscal year we reached outside Washington an estimated 1,700,000 Americans in 3,000 different communities. With the facilities and space of a new building we can we believe, double or triple that number. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that someday with the development of a proper art mobile, we shall be able to take important original works of art out to people who cannot come to Washington. We now send a lot of original art out of Washington to museums and galleries, but we hope to have an art mobile go around the country to reach areas where no such museums and galleries are available.

The second use of the new building to which I should like to give special emphasis is the housing of a great center for advanced study in the visual arts, a center and institution that would do for art history and related disciplines what the famed Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton has done for the physical sciences and the humanities. It will provide a meeting ground for teachers and scholars from all over the world.

We have the paintings and works of art here in Washington needed for such a center; it is incumbent upon us now to provide for the scholarship and research that should be attendant.

May I hasten to add that it is the intention of the trustees that the stipends of members of the center and of the participants in its fellowship program will also be met from private funds administered by the trustees, not from publicly appropriated funds.

The proposed legislation is relatively simple. The first section authorizes the trustees to build the building with private funds on the area previously reserved by the Congress for that purpose. The design of this new building, as was the case with the present building, must be satisfactory to the Commission on Fine Arts, and the plans and specifications must be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The second and third sections make it clear that the same laws and provisions will apply to the new building as apply now to the present building. Thus, the new building will be as integral a part of the National Gallery of Art as if it were a wing added to the present building.

Sections 4 and 5 were added at the request of the District of Columbia; section 4 to take care of any easements or other similar rights in the District of Columbia that might appear during construction and to prevent any possible unforeseen conflicts of jurisdiction; section 5 to make clear what was intended at all events by the trustees, that is that the District of Columbia will be put at no expense in relocating or protecting utilities, either public or private, occasioned by the construction.

Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions I shall try to answer them or to secure the answer for you. Thank you, very much, for affording me this opportunity to be heard.

Mr. GRAY. Fine, Mr. Walker. That was an outstanding statement, very concise, and to the point.

Let me ask you just a couple of brief questions before we go on to Mr. Feidler. What do you envision in the way of size of this building? I do not think you gave us the square footage.

Mr. WALKER. We are thinking in terms of 300,000 square feet.

Mr. GRAY. In the new building?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. GRAY. That will be equivalent in size to Union Station.

Mr. WALKER. Is that 300,000 square feet?

Mr. GRAY. 330,000 square feet.

Mr. WALKER. The building will be lower than the National Gallery of Art and it will harmonize with the gallery and the Capital complex of buildings. We shall insist upon that with the architect who will be chosen. We have not chosen an architect as yet.

Mr. GRAY. You have no plans at this time?

Mr. WALKER. We have none. We do not want to pick an architect and have him draw plans until we know that we can build our building.

Mr. GRAY. In any event it will be compatible?

Mr. WALKER. It must be compatible.

Mr. GRAY. Standing on the balcony of the Capitol Building the one thing that really stands out is the very prominent round top of the National Gallery of Art Building. I have conducted in 14 years here, thousands of people through the Capitol and they always inquire of me: What is the beautiful building with the round top on it?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to hear that. We are proud of that building and do not want to spoil it.

Mr. GRAY. I want to say I hope this will be compatible. Let me ask you one other question. What you are doing now with this land bounded by Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third and Madison Drive? Is that open space?

Mr. WALKER. This is open space. At the present time it is occupied by tennis courts and the property is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The tennis courts are under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. There is a corresponding space across the Mall where these tennis courts could be relocated if that is the desire of the Department of the Interior and the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY. Are you getting any opposition from these people?

Mr. WALKER. No. The Interior Department is very enthusiastic about the proposed legislation, and the District of Columbia has signified the approval thereof.

Mr. GRAY. How about the tennis players?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I personally will hope that the Interior Department will announce they will rebuild those tennis courts 2 blocks away.

Mr. GRAY. With 300,000 square feet you could almost put them inside. Let me ask you just one other question. Section 5 in the event any privately owned or publicly owned utility located in the area, limited in the first section of this act, is required to be relocated or protected by reason of the construction on such area in addition to the National Gallery of Art, such relocation or protection shall be at the expense of "other than the District of Columbia." Who is going to bear that expense?

Mr. WALKER. The trustees of the gallery would bear the expense out of our private building funds.

Mr. GRAY. Not being facetious, but on yesterday we had an Assistant Corporation Counsel here and we were hearing testimony on the proposed International Center you see on the board here and they said they were for the bill but so long as it did not cost the District of Columbia anything.

I was just wondering if they wrote this language here that you submitted, the location shall be at the expense of other than the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, Mr. Congressman, the last two sections, sections 4 and 5, were included in the bill at the request of the District of Columbia at the time the Bureau of the Budget was considering the proposed legislation and this language was exactly that suggested by the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY. I thought it was. I would like for the record to reflect that.

Mr. WALKER. I hasten to say this only makes clear what the trustees of the National Gallery of Art had intended to do at all events.

Mr. GRAY. Would you have any objection if the committee writes in this specifically that these costs are to borne by the National Gallery of Art?

Mr. WALKER. Not at all.

Mr. GRAY. I think we should do that.

Mr. WALKER. Very good.

Mr. GRAY. Otherwise that leaves a question to be answered.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Grover.

Mr. GROVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a reference on page 2 to the cost of such construction shall be defrayed from the trust fund administered by such trustees and I am to presume that is all inclusive to include architectural engineering and anything in connection with construction or planning.

Mr. FEIDLER. The provision is intended to cover the entire cost of construction of the building, including architectural and all other incidental costs of that kind.

Mr. GROVER. Reference was also made to the operating costs as also being made available from private funds. Is that all inclusive and projected at the present time?

Mr. WALKER. No, what I said was that the advanced scholars and similar people coming here will be paid for from private funds. The building itself will be maintained as the present National Gallery of Art Building is maintained; that is, by an appropriation from the Congress.

Mr. GROVER. We say "maintained"; we mean maintained and operated.

Mr. WALKER. That is correct. Maintained and operated, like heating, cleaning, and so forth.

Mr. GROVER. But also staffing?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir. Staffing is also included in maintaining and operating, but this does not begin until fiscal 1973 when the building is completed.

Mr. GROVER. Could we get into the record anticipated year-to-year operating funds?

Mr. WALKER. May I ask Mr. Feidler to speak to that?

Mr. FEIDLER. Of course you can understand it is somewhat difficult to work out a budget fund for a building for which not even an architect has been chosen, but we sought to do this because we felt we ought to know, and we felt that Members of Congress would want to know, what this fiscal problem would eventually come to.

We hired as a consultant, a well known public servant, Fred Lawton and asked him to make a study for us. He, as you know, was formerly director of the Bureau of the Budget. His estimate for the first year ran some \$500,000 with a gradual growing of the costs over the following years so that after 5 years, it would be \$700,000 and eventually about a million dollars per year.

Mr. GROVER. How does that compare with your current operating budget for the gallery?

Mr. FEIDLER. Our current operating budget is a little over \$3 million.

Mr. GROVER. Your current space is approximately what?

Mr. WALKER. About 500,000 square feet.

Mr. GROVER. Dollar for dollar, we will be getting a better cost efficiency ratio.

Mr. FEIDLER. Mr. Grover, I do think I should emphasize what Mr. Walker has also mentioned, and that is that we believe this will result in an eventual savings in appropriated funds. The gallery is growing; it is a viable, living organism. That growth is going to require things to be housed, and we intend to house them in the new building. It is our best estimate that this will be cheaper than to try to do that in our present building.

Mr. GROVER. I suppose past history would not rule out the prospect of foundation funds being made available even in the future for operating.

Mr. WALKER. Well, the foundation funds will be made available to take care of the people who are going to be working in the building, scholars, and graduate students, and so on. Those we will fund out of the private funds. We are already running a small center for advanced studies, in very cramped quarters at the National Gallery with funds provided by the Old Dominion Foundation, the Kress Foundation, and the Chester Dale bequest. This is the pattern we will have to follow with the new building. However, the regular operation and maintenance will be paid as it is at present, from appropriated public funds.

Mr. GRAY. Counsel Sullivan.

Mr. SULLIVAN. In connection with page 3 of the legislation—we were just talking about language to this effect: line 7, replace 3(f) "the cost of such relocation," strike out "the expense of other than the District of Columbia"; and include the following language: "defrayed from

trust funds administered by the trustees of the National Gallery of Art." Is that satisfactory?

Mr. WALKER. That is fine.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Denney from Nebraska.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Walker, the title of the bill provides for the authorization of the National Gallery of Art to construct the building and it says for making the provision thereof, for maintenance. Where in the bill is the maintenance thereof?

Mr. WALKER. I will defer to Mr. Feidler.

Mr. FEIDLER. The section 2 provides that all the provisions of the original statute setting up the National Gallery of Art shall be applicable to the new buildings so this becomes an integral part of the National Gallery of Art and in that original statute it is provided that the faith of the United States is pledged to provide funds for the maintenance of the National Gallery.

Mr. DENNEY. Is that an open end authorization in that statute that you referred to?

Mr. FEIDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENNEY. You are going to run into trouble on this on the floor and I would make a suggestion to the committee that if it is some specific way we can handle this, and I am not sure unless legal counsel can come up with something, but when you say making provision for the maintenance thereof that you can incorporate by reference to the previous statute that refers to something not in existence at the time that statute was enacted. I do not think that is good legislation.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think we can work that out for you, Mr. Denney. Leave it up to Mr. Enfield and myself.

Mr. DENNEY. Understand, I think this is a fine program but let us write a good law while we are doing it.

The second thing is why do you need authority to construct when you already have the land as originally set out under this provision of law that you refer to?

Mr. FEIDLER. The reason for that is title 40, section 68 of the United States Code which provides that before any building can be built on a reservation of the United States in the District of Columbia there must be express authorization from Congress. The language in the basic charter legislation of the National Gallery referred to this property as "reserved."

Mr. DENNEY. Not for the purpose of construction of additions?

Mr. FEIDLER. Reserved for the purpose of future additions to the gallery. Since it was "reserved" it becomes a "reservation" and the other statute, that is, U.S. Code, title 40, section 68, requires authorization; express authorization. That is why we are here.

Mr. DENNEY. Thank you. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SULLIVAN. In connection with section 2, the original law as drafted and unfortunately we do not have a copy before us, simply authorized the Government to maintain only those buildings and no others as was set forth in the 1937 statute in connection with Mr. Denney's question.

Mr. FEIDLER. It pledges the faith of the United States, on the completion of the National Gallery of Art, to provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep of the National Gallery of Art and the administrative expenses and costs of the operation thereof, including the protection and care of works of art acquired by the Board so that

the National Gallery of Art shall be at all times properly maintained and the works of art contained therein shall be exhibited regularly to the general public free of charge. For those purposes the original statute authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary. It is the thought in drafting this legislation that this building becomes an integral part of the National Gallery of Art.

Mr. SULLIVAN. In the 1937 act, was there a definition, specifically, of what the National Gallery of Art encompassed at that time?

Mr. FEIDLER. There was a provision in the first section that the site on which the building is now built is set aside and appropriated as a site for the National Gallery of Art.

In the very next sentence it says that the adjoining area bounded by the areas that we have here, sir, is reserved as a site for future additions to the National Gallery of Art.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Then, Mr. Denney, this is only off the cuff and without looking at the law, but I think Mr. Feidler has given us the answer to your question because in the 1937 act they have taken care of this provision that you are concerned with—a future addition. That is just from listening to his testimony.

Mr. DENNEY. I am calling attention to this: there is hereby authorized an appropriation for the operation and maintenance. That was passed in 1937 and this is 1968. I think we might get in a little trouble. I think we ought to spell it out more definitely in this bill. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. SULLIVAN. All right.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Enfield, the minority counsel.

Mr. ENFIELD. Mr. Feidler, if you look at section 2, please. If you start on line 10 after the words "National Gallery of Art." Place a period there merely saying "this building, when completed, shall be incorporated in and become a part of the National Gallery of Art." Would that be sufficient to bring it within reach of the 1937 law?

Mr. FEIDLER. I believe so, because what really follows the comma is really surplusage and repeats what is already provided.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I agree.

Mr. GRAY. You gentlemen would have no objection to us making these corrections then?

Mr. WALKER. Not at all.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We can remove lines 13 through 19 on page 2, Mr. Feidler.

Mr. FEIDLER. As far as I am concerned the effect of the proposed legislation is not changed by that deletion.

Mr. GRAY. Any other questions of these two distinguished witnesses?

Mr. FEIDLER. I did not hear your statement. Did you have a prepared statement?

Mr. FEIDLER. I have no further statement.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Some of the questions that I had have already been raised and answered and I think probably taken care of. I think we ought not to miss this time, Mr. Chairman, as pointed out to the members of the committee somehow in the report reflect that we in America are the beneficiaries of the tremendous gift here. This Gallery of Art is one of the greatest galleries in the world today already, and it is one of the youngest.

Mr. WALKER. That is true.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Already people come here from all over the world to view our art.

Mr. WALKER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. This is because we have had a generous spirit in connection with this gallery.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We early developed an appreciation among certain people of the cultures we have here and it is herein reflected.

Another notation, another point is the fact that this Gallery of Art is under good management.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In good hands and as far as I can see, looking forward to this addition you are going to have, we will certainly have even more traffic from foreign countries to America as a result of this Gallery of Art and I think this is a real development and a great tribute to you.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, sir. That means a great deal to us and inspires us to try and do a better job. We would like to thank all the members of the committee for inviting us here today.

I have written a book on the gallery. We only brought three copies. We did not realize how many members of the committee would be here.

Mr. GRAY. You realize now how important you are to all of us on the committee.

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to say this book is in Spanish, in German, and in French, and they are preparing an Italian version.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. GRAY. What is your annual visitation now?

Mr. WALKER. It is somewhat over a million and a half visitors a year.

Mr. GRAY. You feel without question this will increase?

Mr. WALKER. This will increase a great deal.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Grover, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. I did not hear your complete statement as I was a little late coming in, but following Mr. Schwengel's remarks, and let me say that Mr. Schwengel has been very, very active in a great deal of the planning for the buildings and quite a patron of the arts as our colleagues know, but many of the Members in the House, of course, while they appreciate the value of the taxpayers dollar and might very well be impressed by dollar values, have you any definite plans on what is to be located there, what works of art are to be located in this addition?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, we have planned this quite carefully. It will provide additional space for our library. It will provide space for temporary exhibitions. One of our drawing cards are these great exhibition sent over by European governments to be seen in the United States.

We have had showings from Austria, France, England, and from Iran, Turkey, and other countries. These great exhibitions start always at the National Gallery and then circulate around to other cities throughout the country. We have been very cramped in the space that we can allot to these and we want to show these works of art from abroad in a way that will make the ambassadors from those countries realize how much we appreciate their art. We will also move certain of our collections over there.

Mr. GROVER. Can we predict by its completion date the number of annual visitations?

Mr. WALKER. I would think it would greatly increase the amount of visitors to the gallery. Further, you see, we now reach 1,700,000 people outside of Washington through our extension service, and this service is certainly going to double or triple, so I expect we will reach possibly 4 or 5 million.

Mr. GROVER. I ask for that figure to project against the figures Mr. Feidler gave me before. The first 5 years the annual operating cost is to be \$500,000 and thereafter \$1 million and project that against an anticipated 7 million persons reached annually, it is a pretty low admission rate.

Mr. WALKER. I think it is.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I was real thrilled with your comment about traveling galleries.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Are there some in the world today that you pattern after or is this an innovation for America?

Mr. WALKER. The idea of a traveling art gallery has been very well worked out in the State of Virginia and the Richmond Museum has done this locally. So also has the State of Illinois. We have lent works of art to those artmobiles. We hope in the future to have our own artmobile which we can send around to various States. The funds for this, I hope, will come from foundation help.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. A second question, or observation. I was the author of legislation that provided bookmobile service to Iowa communities while in the Iowa state legislature.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It was tremendously successful.

Mr. WALKER. Yes. This is the pattern we would follow in the artmobile.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Great.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. GRAY. Thank you. You have been an excellent witnesses and you have a very excellent program.

Are there any other witnesses to be heard on H.R. 16358?

If not, we will proceed with further consideration of H.R. 16175.

(Thereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the subcommittee proceeded to other business.)

DATE DUE

[Empty rectangular box for date entry]