

Protocol and our Bureau of Inter-American Affairs Office. We have had the two basic problems which have been of concern to the Department for a number of years.

One of these concerns is the need for a new site for the relocation of the Organization of American States. Presently, they are scattered in a number of buildings. They are paying a considerable amount of rent. They would like to get together into one building and the Department felt that since the headquarters site was located in the United States that we would like to make a donation or gift of a new site to consolidate all of the OAS activities into one building.

This was the first and primary purpose, I suppose, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. The real, urgent need for that?

Mr. LYERLY. Right. The other is the continuing concern of a number of foreign countries having missions in the city of Washington who have been unable to acquire adequate sites for their missions. Many foreign missions, of course, are located in residential sections and were established a number of years ago. The present law, however, restricts the location of chanceries in high residential areas.

Many foreign countries, mostly the small, newly developed countries are not able financially to locate in the higher priced commercial areas of the District of Columbia.

The Department has had a continuing interest in assisting these local needs of these foreign missions and the OAS, the two coming as they are, together.

Mr. BLATNIK. They did not come together. Somebody put them together. There are two unrelated problems as I view it and this is not any debate or conflict with you, sir; but I think it would be more correct—and I may be wrong, but whoever again was planning, not directly you—and I would like to talk further with those people because it seems to me that here are two important problems:

The OAS who urgently needs adequate facilities and a center of their own for a very clear-cut purpose, and all the work that goes with it; and it is a problem that should be undertaken at once.

The second and unrelated problem as I see it now was this continuing problem, continuing concern of these embassies, especially the newer ones and they do need help. They should have help, Mr. Chairman. I know that as an individual and a member of the subcommittee and the full committee that I will give them all the help they need to help resolve this problem.

But I do not see why someone from the State Department clearly for purposes of expediency would blend these two, for diverse purposes together. That looks like, and sounds like a nice drawing and Joe Moody says it is an International Center. Now that is not an International Center at all; is it?

Mr. LYERLY. Not really. Maybe I can go back one step further to explain that a couple of years ago there was proposed the International Center bill that would cover a rather substantial area in the Northwest portion of Washington north of Washington Circle and south of Dupont Circle which would have been made into a true International Center.

This met considerable opposition because of loss of property for tax revenues, the relocation of business establishments and persons living within that area.