

it was not the Federal government's role in Vietnam but the Federal government's relationship to the states and its role in resolving urban conflict that was our number one concern.

Discussion of the critical problems of human and urban renewal, the need for major metropolitan investment, and the failure of Federal programs to date to produce meaningful solutions to urban dilemmas preoccupied the majority of our time.

Although our national economy has entered its eighty-first consecutive month of expansion, the Gross National Product has exceeded \$800 billion and the Dow-Jones average is predicted to reach 900 before the year's end, this unprecedented progress has been accompanied by an increasing polarization in wealth. This in turn has produced awesome and awful social implications. As the many with rising incomes and expectations have moved to the suburbs, the anguish and rage of the few trapped in the slums have become more obvious and overt. This summer racial violence in seventy-six American cities destroyed over \$100 million of *insured* property — and here I am citing only the loss of property, not the loss of the more precious commodity, life!

Although the Federal government vociferously expresses acute awareness of this problem, the 90th Congress has to date been plagued by indecision resulting in a *failure to act*. The national administration is under constant attack on urban issues. The President claims to have provided \$30 billion in Federal aid to the cities. Yet in testimony before a Senate subcommittee, his Budget Director, Charles Schultze, set the figure at \$10.3 billion — and even this lesser figure includes \$2.1 billion for the construction of urban expressways which hardly help the poor whose homes lie in interstate highways' paths.

Most deplorable of all is the plethora of Federal programs sponsored without evaluation or coordination, and without any attempt to assure continuity. The Federal government has widely scattered seed money and after a year or two withdrawn or curtailed support, leaving the city with its extremely limited resources to foot the bill. The city is forced either to cut off programs, raise already high taxes, or appeal for state aid. Thus, the state government — previously ignored by the Federal-city alliance — winds up holding the bag or the bill. This has been the pattern and this was the number one problem discussed at the National Governors' Conference.

Perhaps there is a measure of historical justification for this situation. State governments — prior to reapportionment — often failed to