

As a whole, the Great Society programs are mainly² intergovernmental in nature. They provide funds by grant or loans to states and communities to carry out programs. These programs are more and more being initiated and controlled by the national government; the trend has been toward centralized planning-programming-financing, with dollars and directives to the agencies carrying out the programs at the community level.

Indication of this is especially clear in the area of public assistance. In January 1967 the Appendix to the federal budget for 1968 said:

Legislation will be proposed *to assure* that public assistance payments more nearly meet the economic needs of recipients, *to require* all States to provide assistance to families with children who are impoverished because of unemployment of a parent, to provide incentives for employment, and to improve work and training programs to help restore recipients to independence. [Emphasis added.]

About the same time further evidence of emphasis on central planning came in the President's Economic Message:

State standards of need are miserably low . . . I ask the Congress to require that each State's payments at least meet its own definition of need; and that its definition should be kept up to date annually as conditions change. With minor exceptions, payments under public assistance are reduced dollar for dollar of earnings by the recipient . . . I shall therefore ask Congress to enact payment formulas which will permit those on assistance to keep some part of what they may earn, without loss of payments.

By early August, 1967, legislation implementing some of these policies was underway when the Ways and Means Committee reported H.R. 12080 to the House of Representatives. This bill, the "Social Security Amendments of 1967," with regard to aid to families with dependent children, would *require* each state: to develop a program to get adults and children not in school into employment; to make day care and other child welfare services available to permit mothers to work or take work training—with the commendable aim of getting the families off the assistance rolls; to establish community work and training programs; and to have an "earnings exemption"—money which would not be deductible from assistance payments, and thus a work incentive. (See pages 12 and 13.)

Grant requirements themselves generally limit state independence of decision, but other circumstances also tend to minimize potential for state control and responsibility. The very multiplicity of programs does this because there is generally no single focus at state level for coordination of responsibility. The many direct federal-local programs, which in effect by-pass the states, also work against a stronger or independent state position.

A study by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare released in June 1966 leaves no room for doubt that comprehensive central planning of public welfare is anticipated. The Council's report was entitled, "Having the Power, We Have the Duty." The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reprinted a summary of the report which was called "National Blueprint for Public Welfare"; and HEW's cover letter distributing this reprint said:

The Council's National Blueprint for Public Welfare provides a workable solution for dealing with many of the nation's unresolved social problems.

The major recommendations of the Council were:

A national minimum standard for public assistance payments below which no State may fall;

A nationwide comprehensive program of public assistance based upon a single criterion: Need;

A uniform, simple plan for Federal-State sharing in costs of all public welfare programs which provides for equitable and reasonable fiscal effort among States, and recognizes the relative fiscal capacity of the Federal and State Governments;

Comprehensive social services readily accessible, as a right, at all times to all who need them;

All welfare programs receiving Federal funds administered consistent with the principle of public welfare as a right.

The Council's proposal for comprehensive social services envisions "provisions of essential services to all individuals and families *without regard to income.*" [Emphasis added.] Provision would be through public welfare agencies with HEW staff and resources enlarged to implement the entire program. This implies

² A predominance of the community action programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity are private, non-profit corporations set up for the purpose, and here the involvement of state or local governments as such is nominal.