

complete local administration, without either State or Federal supervision. Doubtless the greater number who have adhered to this viewpoint will not go so far as to recommend a complete return of administration of relief and public assistance to local government, but there are those who would welcome it in the area of general relief. In considering any such proposal, however, it is well to look at our experience of the past few years, and also our experience in public health and public education. If we begin with the assumption that state financial participation is essential, then we must reason to the conclusion that each needy person in the state, no matter where he lives, is entitled to a minimum availability of funds and a minimum standard of administration.

It is not necessarily true that by this type of state leadership we sacrifice our belief in local government and local self-determination. I do not believe there is any state in the union where people subscribe to this principle of local government more than we do in Maryland. But we achieve this through certain carefully thought-out practices which work toward an efficient and satisfactory combination of local-state efforts. In Maryland we believe, and believe strongly, in local administrative boards. The program is too new, the untried areas too many, to attempt to operate without the leavening influence of lay opinion. We place the primary direction of the program in the hands of an administrative board of seven citizens, carefully selected by the county commissioners from a list of eligible persons submitted by the State Department. The executive director of the county is responsible to the members of that board, and they in turn are answerable to the State Department.

The State Department promulgates general rules and regulations within which the local board is free to make additional policies not contrary to the State plan. The State Department periodically audits accounts, maintaining a staff of field supervisors whose duty it is to see that the local unit conforms to State requirements. By this combination we believe that we assure to the citizens of our State a measure of desirable uniformity, and a capacity for State-wide planning which would not otherwise be possible.

The basic conception of State-local relationship, as developed in Maryland, is that administrative responsibility should rest primarily on the local political subdivision, which should also bear some part of the financial burden; the function of the State Department should be advisory and supervisory over the local administrative bodies.

I believe that some of the same character of relationship can be created between the State and the Federal Government. At times certain actions taken by the Federal departments may seem to permit too great Federal control. There is a danger that we may jump to too hasty conclusions, that we do not study carefully enough the purpose behind these acts, that we may very well find ourselves opposing constructive moves which would tend to strengthen, rather than undermine, the hand of the state. It goes without saying that the Federal agencies are grappling with perplexing problems, as likewise are the states. They should be measured and judged by the sincerity of their intentions and objectives, and by the amount of thought and study which goes into their decisions. Present and future conditions may require that the states look to Federal financial participation and the setting of minimum standards of performance by the Federal agencies, combined with a positive leadership in general direction. At the same time the states can maintain their conviction that a high degree of self-determination on the part of the states is imperative.