Secretary UDALL. I am glad, if I may say so, to see my colleagues of the 84th Club gravitating to positions of power and seniority in the Congress.

Mr. GRAY. Well, thank you again, Mr. Secretary, and all of you.

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have a question.

On the matter of the rental, had you given thought or do you consider it advisable maybe to have an option to buy under certain circumstances? Is that envisioned?

Secretary UDALL. This is proposed in an amendment which we have suggested, that that option should also be available to the Federal Government if at some future time this is in the public interest and we can work out an agreement that would be satisfactory to the Congress.

Mr. GRAY. In that connection, Mr. Secretary, I would like to make the record very clear; as you know, as I mentioned earlier, we do have serious budgetary problems from several quarters. It would not be your intention now certainly for us to go to the floor and ask for a lease arrangement with any view in mind in the very foreseeable future of actually using taxpayers' funds to purchase this facility? This is not your intent, to recommend we give you this authority?

This is not an attempt to get lease authority with the intention to buy?

Secretary UDALL. I think we should say for the record, make this very clear, this first phase that we envision with the presentation we made here today, that we think the lease arrangement is a very good arrangement and probably if the Government wants to consider outright purchase at all, this would be 10, 15, or 20 years away.

Mr. GRAY. I want to make that clear. I do not want someone on the floor saying, "Really you say lease here, but I am sure you intend to spend $25 or $50 million of taxpayers' money." This is not envisioned at all?

Secretary UDALL. This is not envisioned in the whole first phase.

Mr. GRAY. Fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. One other question, Mr. Secretary. I want to comment first, I am happy that the Interior Department's people like you are in charge, more or less supervising and managing this operation.

In that connection, I would like to say, in addition, what the Interior Department and the Park Service have done, especially through Mission 66, has been a tremendous contribution to better understanding of our heritage. I do not know any better way to reveal this than through the park areas and recreation areas; they are part of the Government system.

It is having its influence in the States. They are following the same pattern. Right now Iowa is developing a project and studying something the Federal Government has done in Park Service. This is fine.

Now, on to a question: My experience indicates Members of the Congress have a tremendous interest far beyond anything I could imagine in the history of the heritage of our country, and I am wondering if you would have any objection to having a continuing committee from the Congress to work as sort of a board of consultants or advisers, so they cannot only help you in this way, but reflect the interest and experience of the Congressmen as it relates to the problems of the visitor? Would you have any objection to having that written in?