

I do not think that money per se is a cure for anything. I think that money properly directed is a cure for many things and hence, I would like to have the Government face the war on poverty and strengthen it, face the problems of community development or the improvement of American life generally, including education.

But I would like to have the Government do this by aiming at the problems rather than simply distributing money. This is the thing.

Senator JAVITS. Do you believe in the categorical grant idea, as juxtaposed to the general purpose—

Mr. ULMER. I certainly do.

Senator JAVITS. So that you would increase, if we needed to, and we certainly need to, the whole existing Federal concept?

Mr. ULMER. Yes; I think I would. I, however, am deeply conscious of the need for coordination of the many plans that we now have afoot. Many of them are really operating only nominally rather than actually, but I do believe in the principle of categorical grants, yes.

Senator JAVITS. So that when I said that you would leave things as they are, I was substantially correct. You would leave them as they are in the State and the Federal establishments. You might increase the amounts, you might add other programs, but the essential structure by which these activities are supported you would leave intact?

Mr. ULMER. I find myself very reluctant to see myself in the position of leaving things intact, because I would like to see many things changed that are now operating in one way or another.

I would like to see the Federal Government move much more forcefully into the field of education than it has today. I would like to see it move much more forcefully into the area of welfare than it has today, even nationalizing welfare. I do not believe this is leaving things intact.

Senator JAVITS. Well, let us say, aside from emphasis, amount, and general Federal effectiveness, you are leaving the structure as it is, isn't that undeniable?

Mr. ULMER. Well, would you say that nationalizing welfare is leaving the structure as it is?

Senator JAVITS. Nationalizing welfare completely? I think it is just advancing to where we are now pretty much. Most of the programs now have an element of Federal support. I mean it is getting now to where there is practically no welfare program that doesn't have some element of Federal support.

Mr. ULMER. I would say if you want to use those words, I won't object further.

Senator JAVITS. You are not going to quarrel further.

May I ask you this, gentlemen, whoever in the panel wishes to answer, as a fact, is it not true that there is a drive toward the general purpose grants in the Federal Government which will be very harsh on the categorical grant programs unless we give it some opening to the right, as it were, as through the tax-sharing formula, because I wish to call the attention of the panel to the fact that because of such drive in the House of Representatives, we are now faced with a bill on elementary and secondary education which has broad areas of general grant ideas, also that the whole teacher's corps has just been overhauled to eliminate the Federal control and it is now right in the hands of the local people.