

the granting of, financial assistance to the needy as simple and automatic as possible. One method of accomplishing this is through the use of the so-called declaratory application. This means that when the applicant provides the information as to his circumstances, and on that basis is eligible for assistance, we accept his word as to the validity of the information. In other words, we would not check out every eligibility factor as we have always done in the past. We have tried this experiment in Minnesota in three of our largest counties, and it has been tried in many other States. New York City, as Mr. Ginsberg mentioned, is one. It has been demonstrated conclusively that applicants almost always are honest. We have no higher incidence of illegal or improper grants under this method than we have where we check out every detail in every case. Through the use of this declaratory application system, the time of large numbers of caseworkers can be saved—to be spent on providing services where those are needed by the recipient in addition to financial aid. It also enables us to make extensive use of subprofessionals, as a substitute for trained caseworkers.

Adoption of the proposals I have outlined would, in my opinion, substantially reduce the costs of administering the public assistance program. Many functions now required of trained caseworkers would be eliminated, or simplified, and we could obtain the maximum utilization of our public agency workers—assigning each to the task which he is competent to perform.

In our desire to insure that everyone in this country is provided money he needs to maintain a decent standard of living, I feel that somewhat unconsciously we tend to regard the provision of money as the answer to all the problems of the public assistance recipient. To be sure, a guaranteed minimum income would enable millions of people to meet their own needs and solve their own problems, but there are millions of others who desperately need social services of one kind or another. Money is not enough.

This is one of my concerns about the notion that the guaranteed minimum income will answer all the problems of the poor. They will still have marital difficulties, child-rearing problems, mentally or physically handicapped family members, housing problems, school dropouts, a need for training and/or employment, and a host of other problems. A poor family should not be compelled to have their lives run by a social worker just because they need financial aid. At the same time, there should be some agency to which they can turn for social service when they need it. And this I see as the legitimate role of the public welfare agency.

Our experience with the title V program of the Economic Opportunity Act has shown us that, with the assistance of skilled social workers and counselors, many so-called hard-core people who have been given up as hopeless can be stimulated and encouraged to take training and enter the labor market. After 3 years' experience with title V, we now have hundreds of people in Minnesota who are self-supporting, and who, prior to their involvement in that program, were longtime relief cases with employment records or a lack of skills that precluded their ever getting a job.

While there is a great deal of criticism being expressed—which in many respects I consider justified—about some of the 1967 Federal welfare amendments, particularly with respect to the aid to families