

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a little more facts and figures on this, if you could.

Mr. GRAY. Well, that is a legitimate question. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota as a subcommittee chairman, I can tell you how this matter started. It started through the officials of the Organization of American States approaching the Office of Protocol and other officials in the Department of State and making their needs known to the people. Various countries contacted the State Department expressing an interest in building new chanceries, and this initial contact primarily came to the District of Columbia government, and many of the areas that they had selected were not for that purpose and the chairman is familiar with that fiasco, the location of the Russian Embassy, et cetera.

It all started with the request of the OAS and these various countries. Then when the National Capital Planning Commission became involved in the thing, they looked at a number of sites, as Mr. Bozarth pointed out, and all of them cost an awful lot of money.

The original Sealtest site was the first preference of the Organization of American States, because it was in close proximity to other facilities and the State Department and the Foggy Bottom area. They found out later on that this site was not large enough. Sealtest did not want to sell it, and then they settled on the Washington Circle area.

This, I might say to my distinguished friend in relation to Tregaron, Tregaron at that time was not available and was not considered. After the hearings developed in our subcommittee on the so-called Washington Circle area we had all these citizen groups protesting. Then the heirs of Tregaron came forward and came up with what I feel is personally a good figure if they wanted to consider purchasing it. They first talked about \$6 or \$7 million. We looked at it as a possible location and home for the Vice President.

Mr. Knott accompanied me here a year and a half ago to look at Tregaron. At that time they wanted \$6 or \$7 million. They have come down considerably.

As to who made the actual decision in the State Department I would have no idea and I am sorry that these gentlemen do not know. But just putting it very frankly, I think that the main consideration here has been the fact that this is Government-owned land.

The second consideration is the fact that as your subcommittee chairman, I frankly told the Department of State, with the temper of Congress as it is, I did not feel we could get a large monetary authorization through Congress. I will accept that responsibility if I am the one who has forced them to go to Government-owned land. It is no secret and I said publicly I would not try to guide any legislation out of this committee authorizing a large expenditure because this was only a \$750,000 authorization and only passed in the House by a mere 2-vote margin and took 2 years to do so and I did not feel I wanted to do battle with a \$5 or \$7 million authorization or something like that and frankly it had been branded as an international drinking tub.

In fact, I mentioned publicly yesterday that I had received over 1000 letters and we are introducing the bill at the request of the Department of State setting up an international center.