

Mr. BROWN. I seem to be going around the bush with you over and over. Is it procedures or is it the money?

Mr. COSTON. It is both.

Mr. BROWN. When will the procedures be ready?

Mr. COSTON. Well, we are working on them now. I would hope they would be ready within the next 2 months.

Mr. BROWN. And you think then that you will be in a position to ask for the funds?

Mr. COSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN. How much are you going to ask for?

Mr. COSTON. \$12.5 million.

Mr. BROWN. In other words, we are talking about \$9 million for this and \$12.5 million to pick up—we are dropping out the \$10 million that was in the 1968?

Mr. COSTON. That is my understanding; yes, sir.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman yield?

I don't know why you get into that, Mr. Coston. I agree with the chairman 100 percent. This is a very simple bill. It has nothing to do with financing for any other year. It merely postpones for a year the action that this committee took.

You gentlemen, by your testimony—and I agree with the chairman having thought about it—got us off the track by projecting all these figures that have nothing to do with this bill. Why don't you just testify about the bill before us?

Mr. COSTON. Mr. Macdonald, I would be very happy to do that, but I do feel I have to respond to questions from the members.

Mr. BROWN. If I may, Mr. Carey, I would like to ask you about one point. You said one thing that I was struck by because of another committee on which I serve.

You want the funds, or you suggest that the funds which would be provided—on the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6—from the Congress should be provided on a long-term basis, unless the Congress decides to act to negate that authorization for funds. You say “unless the Congress took negative action to prevent such payment.”

What is your thinking behind this? Are you suggesting that negative action is harder for Congress to take than affirmative action?

Mr. CAREY. I think that the question runs to the stability of the financing of the Corporation. From that point of view, an assurance of a flow of funds is probably what we would all like the Corporation to have.

The way I express this alternative, assuming we were going into general revenues, maybe or maybe not going into taxes along with it, would be that one way of providing the stability would be to say that the Congress would provide for an automatic general fund appropriation into a trust fund and then be able to pull the string when it chose to.

But that isn't necessarily what I am suggesting here. That is one way to do it. Another way would be for us not to use the negative or string-pulling approach to it and simply say for x years, 3 years, 2 years, whatever the Congress in its wisdom decided, there will be so much money from general funds that the Corporation can count on. It really runs to the stability.

Mr. BROWN. Can count on from the Congress?