

As a result of this legislation not being favorably considered, the Department of State and the GSA and the National Capital Planning Commission began looking for other areas in the District in which to meet the two primary problems that I just outlined, the relocation of the OAS and the establishment of a certain number of foreign missions in a new location.

I think, too, it is a little unfortunate that we refer to this as an international center. It is international in the sense that on the one hand we are talking about international organizations, and on the other hand we are talking in terms of 15 or 16 foreign governments who will locate missions there.

In this sense, it is an international center within this area comprising the southernmost part of the Bureau of Standards site.

I think, Mr. Blatnik, this is the development of the concept of the center and the proposed location of the missions and the OAS in this area.

Mr. BLATNIK. Offhand, you have a conflict in trying to get two non-compatible concepts together. The OAS as I see it is a concept, a regional, United Nations; is it not?

Mr. LYERLY. It is a regional organization of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BLATNIK. An area in which there are enormous problems and far too little attention and effort has been given to this problem. I think only now are we realizing how important this area is. It has related problems of research and population problems, economic development problems, educational problems, cultural and all the rest; yet none of these embassies, even though four out of the 16 may be South American countries, they are embassies to the White House and not delegations to the OAS and have no function or relation or anything in common with the OAS.

Again, there is contradiction. First of all, most of the countries have nothing to do with OAS or the regional concept. Four of the South American countries are considering going there. There are embassies to the White House. They have no relation to the OAS at all.

Just one quick question. These countries financially cannot afford these more expensive sites; and yet I am told that in open hearings yesterday the State Department witnesses testified that these 34 acres before us have been appraised by the GSA at a cost of between \$20 and \$30 per square foot. Can these countries financially afford that? That is about the highest cost I have heard of for any purpose, certainly including embassies. Can these countries afford that kind of money?

Mr. LYERLY. We do not contemplate that the cost of the chancery sites on the left side of the drawing shown here (see Exhibit No. 5, p. 48) would be quite that expensive. I understood that the \$20 to \$30 figure relates basically to the site for the OAS of the 8 acres which faces on Connecticut Avenue and which is in a commercial area. The figure there, and Mr. Moody can confirm this, would be considerably higher than the figure per acre or square foot for the proposed chancery sites along Tilden Street or along Reno Road or the other end of Van Ness Street. We would not anticipate that the cost to the foreign governments would be as high as \$20 or \$30 per square foot.

Mr. BLATNIK. Well, the State Department witness testified and my