

clear understanding was that all these 34 acres were given that value and the same State Department witness testified that so much of this tract to be offered to the foreign governments would be sold to these governments at a market value of around \$20 to \$30. This can be corrected out.

Do you know of any other value the State Department has been given by GSA for that land west of the proposed site?

Mr. LYERLY. I had heard at one time that some of it would be possibly in the range of \$8.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Moody, would you know? Has GSA given any such figures to the State Department people?

Mr. MOODY. I would not mind saying, Mr. Blatnik, that the values of the interior parcel would be the site of the embassies and is considerably lower in our judgment than the \$20 to \$30 that was given for the 8 acres.

Mr. BLATNIK. The reason I ask that is because one site, and I am not advocating it and I am not urging it at all, but I do want to mention one that is proposed and I understand looked over by the OAS people was the Tregaron site where the total cost for the land would be only \$3 million and the acreage would be $2\frac{1}{2}$ times what they get out here and at \$20 to \$30 per square foot, that is subject to alteration and not binding, and I do not want to use that as an authoritative figure.

As I say at Tregaron the OAS can have $2\frac{1}{2}$ times more property than was proposed here at a cost of about \$3 million whereas the land here at the proposed site is \$20 to \$30 per square foot. What is the acreage?

Mr. GRAY. Eight acres.

Mr. BLATNIK. It could run into \$6 million, \$7 million, or \$8 million.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Blatnik, not hearing the testimony myself I am sorry I cannot validate that statement, that could not be correct at \$20 to \$30 per square foot for land because this committee previously heard testimony that the new buildings, the ones such as the Forrestal Building and the new HUD are being erected at a cost of \$22 to \$23 per square foot building cost. It just does not seem compatible.

Mr. BLATNIK. The \$20 to \$30 used yesterday was given by a State Department witness.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, that is true.

Mr. BLATNIK. So it just does not make sense to me, not only the dollar amounts are way out of line, unrealistic, but also the purposes and the function. They call it an international center which is not a center; merging two problems which are serious problems and both ought to be resolved and merging them together for convenience of solution but no convenience as I can see to OAS and I wonder as to the other embassies that will be located up there that have nothing at all to do with the OAS. Their business is downtown with the White House and the State Department.

Mr. GRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAY. In other words, you feel that these two organizational groups, the OAS and the various countries who want to build chanceries are not necessarily compatible and do not need to be in the same site?

Mr. BLATNIK. Not at all. It is for the convenience of the State De-