

remarks, is whether or not we can really maintain a viable democracy. Will the man in the street come to the point where he feels that government is so big and far away that it is insensitive and unresponsive to his concerns?

Therefore, isn't it possible to suggest that by the year 2000, since that is the date the futurists seem to be using, we may well see that the only hope for maintaining a really effective, functioning democracy in our country, in the sense of a responsive democracy, is by decentralizing many of the functions that are now carried on from Washington, let's say? But isn't it possible to suggest that we are really not going to be able to call on the States, the regional organizations, the metropolitan areas and neighborhood communities to serve effectively and sensitively and responsively to the citizens' needs unless we get first-class, well-educated, well-trained men and women to help carry out these functions?

That is just a rhetorical reaction on my part. In other words, what I am suggesting is that the kind of effort this legislation today represents may well be the key to whether or not we are able to maintain a democratic society in this country.

Do you have any comment on that?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree more. I have to assume that the international problems of the United States are not going to go away. The Federal Government of the United States has the prime, almost exclusive, responsibility for the foreign affairs of this Nation. This means that top levels both in the legislative and executive branches must devote, over the years, a vast amount of attention to the problem and on the overriding problem in my estimation, of world peace.

This means, in turn, that the successful conduct of our domestic programs if they are going to be viably conducted will have to devolve increasingly upon State and local authorities; it seems to me with whatever help in Federal funding and guidelines, but the day-to-day administration must increasingly take place at the level of State and local and regional governments.

Without an adequate manpower resource to carry out these very difficult and complex functions, it is very hard to see how the society can keep together and can develop the kinds of responses to the problems that face us that are urgently needed.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I should have thought in view of that analysis that those who are genuine in their opposition to what they call centralized government here in Washington and are anxious that these programs be really controlled at the local and State and regional levels ought to be strong supporters of this kind of legislation. In this respect, why is it, in your own experience, Dean Bailey, that we have seen no greater effort on the part of local and State government, to cite the two most obvious examples, to support programs of the kind advocated in this bill?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have to speak at the moment as a former mayor of a city, Middletown, Conn., in the early fifties. I know that the day-to-day preoccupation of local governments and of State governments and their own shortage of manpower has made it very difficult for them to see how they could spring loose some of their own people for short course training at midcareer in-service level.