I assure the committee we are going to have to explore this. I think this may very well be incidental to the most significant aspect and the thing that is overriding in my judgment, which is the recommended $200 million ceiling.

In the Secretary's report, the Secretary indicates that in their estimates of what will be required, I think it is $3.6 billion over the next year, that we are going to have to find from other sources some $540 million.

Now, I am not aware as to any specific recommendations as to where we are going to find this $540 million. Apparently certain activities would simply be delayed, or we will go the general appropriations route, although the Secretary this morning seemed to exclude the latter by saying he preferred to go the route of financing these from the fund. If this is true, it seems to me inadvisable to place a ceiling of $200 million thereon.

Also, though the situation in the news may not be the best at the present time, we would be writing into the statute itself a $200 million limitation, a specific figure, for a period of 5 years. It would seem to me more appropriate to pass S. 1401 as originally introduced, taking the additional revenues from the Outer Shelf, from mineral leasing, and from the miscellaneous forest receipts that are unearmarked, and put them into the fund.

The Appropriations Committee would then, due to the nature of conditions at any one time, appropriate therefrom. There is no mandatory situation imposed upon the Appropriations Committee to appropriate the total amount of the fund, and heretofore, we have not had any ceiling thereon.

Appropriations have simply been relative to the revenues that accrued to the fund from sources already there. I would prefer this, and our organization certainly is strongly against putting a $200 million ceiling, thinking of the best of all possible worlds, if the Vietnam crisis and the North Korean crisis and some other crises subsided within the next few months, we would be in a far better posture to accelerate our activities here, and meet some of our needs, if we didn't have this limitation.

If a ceiling is written in, it means we have to come back to the entire legislative process again, and reauthorize the new figure, or at least have the ceiling removed. An objection has been made that this procedure allocates a tremendous amount of money into the fund that would be encumbered, and could not be used for any other purposes.

The act itself specifies that if this is not appropriate, over a period of time—I think the stipulation is 3 years—the amount is returned to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

If there is a continuing period of time where the amount of money accruing to the fund is in excess of what the Appropriations Committee deems advisable to appropriate, it would still go back to the Treasury, and it is not locked up, or put in a posture where it can't be utilized for the general purposes of the Treasury.

These, I think, are the salient points.

The other problem that I wanted to call to your attention, which has been partially explored during these hearings, is the fact that the items that are listed in S. 2828 are not provided at Government expense at the present time. These kinds of services, by and large, are provided by