

cepted and standardized welfare payments are no less logical. Second, standardization could serve as a positive force, making it not only possible but profitable to remain in a rural, underdeveloped area. Once the uneducated, unemployed population is stabilized — at Federal expense — states and cities could afford to initiate meaningful programs at the local level related to local employment opportunities and manpower needs. How can you solve the job problem, when the unemployed won't stay put?

Finally, a national welfare program provides a healthy, economical alternative to present and proposed policies. Tremendous duplication already exists as a result of the Federal, state and local governments all being in the welfare business. The current Federal effort alone is a bewildering kettle of alphabet soup involving HEW, OEO, HUD and a cast of thousands. There appears little desire for coordination, evaluation or continuity. The pursuit of commendable objectives has all too often been perverted and obscured by deplorable abuses. The most recent incident reported just last week involved the expenditure of \$927,000 in OEO funds to support a Chicago street gang, the Blackstone Rangers. While this case may be exaggerated or extreme, disenchantment, disillusionment and dissension over poverty programs are widespread. Moreover, the intensive investment in palliative inner city projects reinforces the myth of urban opportunity drawing more people to the cities and consequently compounding the primary problem of impaction. All too often the well-intentioned but frantic giveaway schemes never help the poor because the money is intercepted and perverted to build militant political organizations.

I am a Republican whose career in public service has been confined to local and State government. My private beliefs and public experiences reinforce my confidence that the government closest to the people is the unit which can govern best. Yet, I am convinced that a national welfare program, administered and supported by the Federal government, is imperative to: (1) stabilize the nation's impoverished, uneducated and unemployed population; (2) relieve the cities and states of an impossible and insurmountable burden; and (3) free state and local governments to move forward with positive, constructive solutions within their fiscal and administrative capabilities.

The second concept requires a complete departure from traditional vision of what a city should and could be. It goes one step beyond present urban planning and renewal. It is daring, yet it is not new.