

Mr. Moss. Without objection, the statement will be received for the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DONALD E. MARLOWE, P.E., CHAIRMAN, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the National Society of Professional Engineers of H.R. 16824, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations under the State Technical Services Act.

My name is Donald E. Marlowe. I am a registered professional engineer and presently am serving as Chairman of the Research and Development Committee of the National Society of Professional Engineers. By way of further identification, I am Dean of Engineering and Architecture at Catholic University, and also serve as Chairman of the Advisory Committee for the State Technical Services Program in the District of Columbia.

The National Society of Professional Engineers is a nonprofit organization composed of 53 state and territorial professional engineering societies with more than 500 chapters and over 66,000 members, all of whom are qualified under applicable state engineering registration laws. Our membership includes professional engineers engaged in virtually every specialized branch of engineering practice and type of employment—education, private practice, industry and government.

We appear today in support of the State Technical Services Program. We believe the federal assistance provided to the states under the Program is playing an important part in helping to stimulate the efficient use of engineering technology throughout the country, and is highly beneficial to business, industry, and the general public. We urge that the Program be continued.

In 1965 it was our privilege to testify before this distinguished Committee to express our Society's support for establishment of the State Technical Services Program. We thought then that the proposal was an excellent one and would be of great benefit to industry, to the engineering profession, and to society as a whole. We had some concern that certain language in the enabling legislation as originally drafted might be interpreted to set up federally-financed technical services in competition with engineers in private practice, and suggested amendments to avoid this possibility. Administration officials assured us that what was intended was a technical information dissemination program, to help stimulate more efficient use of scientific and engineering information. Congress, in turn, adopted clarifying amendments to assure that the Program would not operate in competition with private consulting engineers.

Because of our strong support for the basic purpose of the State Technical Services Program, coupled with our initial concern that it might provide federally subsidized technical or engineering services in direct competition with private firms or individuals, we have closely observed the development and progress of the Program since its inception. We are happy to report to the Committee that based on our observations we believe the Program is well on its way toward achieving on a continuing basis the purposes set forth in Section 1 of the Act—that is, wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology in business, commerce, and industry—but without interfering with the privately developed and privately operated technical services provided by consulting engineers.

We are convinced, in fact, that in addition to helping stimulate more efficient use of engineering technology in business and industry, the Program has actually generated increased business for engineers in private practice. We have witnessed a number of cases where increased awareness of technical possibilities by businessmen, apparently as a direct result of the Program, has resulted in their retaining consulting engineers when they probably otherwise would not even have thought of doing so.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that the State Technical Services Program is an excellent one, and is beneficial to the general public, business, industry, and the engineering profession. We believe the Program is operating in the interest of the economic well-being of the nation, and should be continued.