

I would like to leave my statement for just a minute to give you a case example of my own State, the State of North Carolina. Two years ago, at the beginning of this program, the State of North Carolina made State appropriations available for this program this current year and the year coming up.

We are overmatched on Federal funds and I have to go to the general assembly within the next 3 months—the budget is already prepared—for another program and another review.

My case is going to be a little bit weaker this time, gentlemen, because we don't have sufficient Federal funds to match with it.

So, I want to give you a case example of what can happen at the State level unless sufficient Federal funds for matching these programs are provided.

A State can lose interest and universities can lose interest and talent and capability for conducting a program at an effective level.

These figures that I have just mentioned on funding authorizations are not drawn out of the air; they are based upon careful and extensive study on what is needed to do the job and upon the rate at which capabilities can be developed.

Also, at the time our association testified on behalf of the State Technical Services Act 3 years ago, it was with strong conviction that the act should provide not only for the dissemination of technological developments but also should make possible similar programs dealing with the science of management.

We believe the act permits this interpretation, but in order to clarify the point, we would urge that the Congress, without amending the act, would state its "sense" that the managerial sciences are included within the scope of the program.

This is critical because it is management which must make the decisions which bring about the adoption of new technology and application of new technological developments.

Therefore, it seems to us to be altogether logical that the program should be concerned as well with the processes of management as with the technology with which management has to deal.

If the Congress, however, feels that clarification requires amendment to establish this end, we would support this action.

Finally, and especially in view of the New England experience with a regional approach as cited above, we urge that the legislation be amended specifically to authorize increased and more direct funding for regional programs.

This may be accomplished through additional special-merit funding or through increased Federal support of regional programs with more than 50 percent matching as an incentive to regionalism.

In any event, we recommend strongly that it may be made possible for regional arrangements to be funded directly, subject only to the approval of the several State agencies participating in the regional plan.

We thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today. We feel that the accomplishments and effects of the State Technical Services Act have been most encouraging. We are ready and eager to continue; we respectfully ask that you make it possible for us to do so.

Mr. Moss. Thank you, Dr. Turner.