

counsel and guidance which the States expect from Washington as they build programs based primarily on their own resources and assessments of their own strengths and weaknesses.

For example, we have seen the effectiveness of field-service activities undertaken in North Carolina, Georgia, Michigan, Ohio, and other States and are encouraging the establishment of similar activities where they promise equal success but have not been considered.

As a result, in the 3 years of our work, the number of States with field-service programs has climbed from 12 to 35.

In the long run, I see the principal role of the Office of State Technical Services as, not a granting function, but one of teamwork with the States to assure that each State gains from the experience of every State and that the latest ideas and techniques for technology transfer are put to work promptly and cooperatively.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. My associates and I will be glad to answer your questions and furnish additional information.

Mr. Chairman, that is the end of the prepared remarks. Should I go ahead at this point to address your question in your opening statement?

Mr. Moss. I think I would like first to address myself to a matter I have observed in the statement of Dr. Kincaid and in your statement and that is the fact that you make a request for open-end authorization.

It has been the policy of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during my years of service to make no such grants of open-end authorization.

Therefore, I hope that you are prepared to address yourself specifically to the minimums felt essential for the 2-year period that you seek to have this legislation cover.

I do not see any reason for us to operate under illusions here. We are all aware of the fact that there is going to be a significant vote in the House tomorrow dealing with reduction in levels of expenditure and the imposition of additional taxes.

There is no question but that whatever is authorized is going to be reviewed with great care and deliberations by the Committee on Appropriations.

So I think it would be very helpful if you can now give us figures for 1969 and 1970 within the context of the situation now existing.

Mr. KINCAID. Mr. Chairman, I do not think our point at all is that we are particularly interested in open-ended authorization but instead we hate to see the authorization at a low level which we think will be discouraging to the participating States.

Mr. Moss. Would we be doing greater service to authorize at a high level when the States know that it is not going to be provided? Should there not be a greater measure of realism? Actually, in Mr. Reily's statement there is a clear request for an open-end authorization. It is always puzzling to me why we continue to have the request for open-end authorization made to this committee in view of the very consistent history of the committee in refusing to authorize, one, any open-end authorization, and two, to authorize for periods longer than 3 years.