

with its numerous and well organized set of economic interest groups; service stations, cement makers, oil companies, etc., public assistance operates in a political vacuum. The suggestion that executives have the key policy-initiating function is largely based on this observation.

Political interest groups who support the change would argue for its contribution to an objective and universal assistance program. Others, perhaps more conservative, support increased "services" as a solution to poverty. Liberals and Moderates of both parties might use this issue as a low-cost "bold new innovation in public welfare."

In Congress, viewpoints are sharply polarized. Declaration is permissible in a number of programs, e.g., Medical Assistance for the Aged, Medical Assistance 1965 Amendments) and the Title V (OEO) Work Experience and Training Programs. The 1967 Social Security Act Amendments urge simplicity of administration:

"The committee bill includes a requirement that States determine eligibility and provide assistance under their cash assistance program in a manner consistent with simplicity of administration and the best interest of recipients."¹⁸

Congressional voices can also be heard demanding exactly opposite policies. The Senate Appropriations Committee "strongly urge" (the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to) "direct the States" (that) "thorough checks including inspection of the premises, with the permission of the client, are required in all determinations of eligibility and continuing eligibility. . . ."¹⁹

The Congressional discensus and the sharply conflicted public opinion reflected there, operates as an important but ambiguous constraint on executive strategy. Before moving to a discussion of this strategy, it is useful to summarize the arguments usually advanced for Declaration:

1. Continuing and persistent staff shortages may be partially relieved;
2. The federal matching grant may increase from 50 percent "administration" to 75 percent "services";
3. Client dignity and functioning are enhanced;
4. Welfare Rights organizations' demands for rapid and objective decision-making can be met;
5. Eligibility determination is less subject to the interpretation of individual staff members;
6. Policies are reviewed, made more objective and rational;
7. The quality and quantity of services can be improved;
8. Staff members with advanced training may be employed at the direct service level;
9. A focus on service and agency streamlining may serve a political and public relations function as a "bold new innovation in public welfare;"
10. Experience with the use of declaration in M.A.A., M.A., and OEO Title V projects, show that the procedure is workable;
11. The 1965 and 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act contain language urging "simplicity of administration."²⁰

G. EXECUTIVE STRATEGY

Using rough and impressionistic measures of extent of change associated with Declaration, I have ranked the States by the extent of change introduced. Highest scores go to those States which restructured agency roles through separation of eligibility services; include AFDC in the system; instituted a permanent state-wide system; use for both eligibility determination and redetermination; and do not require an interview for eligibility determination. Though each may not have introduced these innovations, California, Maine, Pennsylvania, and New York City made the most extensive changes; followed in descending order by Connecticut, Colorado, Iowa, Wisconsin, Alabama, Michigan, West Virginia and Louisiana.

Returning to the three broad factors that served to indicate the probable extent of innovation; executive's motivation, resources, and barriers, this listing of States allows us to speculate about the factors that might explain the differ-

¹⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Finance, *H.R. 12080 Social Security Amendments of 1967, Decisions of the Committee Announced by the Chairman*, 90th Congress, 1st Session, 1967, p. 27.

¹⁹ U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1968*, Report No. 469, 90th Congress, 1st Session, August 1, 1967, p. 68.

²⁰ Jules H. Berman, "The Means Test: Welfare Provisions of the 1965 Social Security Amendments," *Social Service Review*, XL, 2 (June 1966), p. 173; and H.R. 12080, Social Security Amendments of 1967, *loc. cit.*