

from them in terms of technical meetings, in terms of supporting the expenses of participants in technical meetings, and in terms of printing and issuing the handbooks that result from such technical meetings. The third way in which we have financial support from them is in terms of fellowships.

We have had half a dozen fellows from the underdeveloped countries go and work with progressive laboratories primarily in European countries because it costs so much more to send someone from Africa to the United States and UNESCO is a bit tight with its money. It doesn't have a great excess to spend in any case, so they are generally distributed throughout the European laboratories. We have had some support in this latter regard from the FAO. On the international scale both UNESCO and FAO are supporting actively the development of this program.

Mr. DADDARIO. What shape are we in at the present time financially to get our own part of this program working? What are our present problems, Dr. Cain?

Dr. CAIN. If I may start by commenting on Dr. Ketchum's recent statement by the international agencies, I would like to point out that these are funds on the international scale that are comparable to about a third of the million that you referred to a while ago for the U.S. National Committee. They have to do with planning and programing, organization and administration. These are not research funds and so far we have been without these research funds.

Now, the ongoing overhead for the U.S. National Committee, and let us say it has been running about a third of a million, has been raised at least in the last year by transfer from Federal agencies into one pocket. There is some resistance to this. There are even budgetary policy statements against this way of running an operation. I myself would like to see the administrative part recognized and carried without assessment on the agencies because they are going to have enough trouble raising money anyway. With respect to the financing, again I have to draw a distinction between the financing of in-house programs and the financing of extramural programs by nongovernmental scientists. Here is where the most difficult problem lies. I would like to illustrate how it is working in Interior and at the same time the limitations under which the Interior Department finds itself. I suggested to Secretary Udall and the late Mr. Larsen, who was Interior's budget director, that each of the appropriate bureaus in Interior identify what it is doing that is part of the IBP program or closely IBP related. I have the information for the planning of the fiscal 1969 budget from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries which I think is a good illustration if I can very briefly state it to you.

Mr. DADDARIO. If you would.

Dr. CAIN. The scheme that we settled on is very much like what you have just discussed with Dr. Bennett, a feeling of the Bureau of the Budget. Instead of asking for a Department of the Interior line item for its IBP work, we decided that each agency would prepare its budget in a normal way including increases where warranted for more activity along certain lines. Then we could attach to the budget as an appendix for each bureau where it is appropriate a statement about that part of the budget which is IBP. The Department budget trans-