

leashed by metropolitan development. Despite these current strains, the federal system continues to provide a sound framework for meeting the social and economic needs of metropolitan areas, in the view of the Advisory Commission. What is needed, however, is a continuing process of adaptation and a fresh look at the allocation of governmental responsibilities in the light of metropolitan conditions.

A fundamental point in the philosophy of the Commission, therefore, is that the problems of intergovernmental relations are not likely to yield to simple or sweeping solutions. Modifying the federal system is more a matter of making incremental changes based on a pragmatic approach to problems. Senator Muskie, a member of the Advisory Commission, observed recently:

I think the Commission was created in 1959 in response to a long-growing concern on the part of many people that the federal system was breaking down and that the State and local levels of government were weakening in their ability to deal with their problems. I think there was a feeling on the part of some that such a commission could find some magic formula; that in one or two strokes it could suddenly clarify the whole thing, reinvigorate State and local governments and roll back the tide of centralization in Washington.

* * * Members of the Commission * * * have found that this job of strengthening the federal system is a brick-by-brick proposition; that it calls for meticulous analysis and evaluation of the manner in which the system works * * *.³

Intergovernmental measures to cope with metropolitan problems cannot, therefore, be derived solely from a theoretical allocation of governmental responsibilities, but certain general principles can be developed to assist in the analysis of particular issues. The Kestnbaum Commission has provided several broad principles concerning a proper division of activities between the Federal Government and the States. The basic purpose of the division of powers is "to provide a climate that favors growth of the individual's material and spiritual potential."⁴ This is the proper use of governmental power, and a balanced division of authority requires effective and responsible government toward this end at all levels. Further, the Kestnbaum Commission noted:

The States have responsibilities not only to do efficiently what lies within their competence, but also to refrain from action injurious to the Nation; the National Government has responsibilities not only to perform, within the limits of its constitutional authority, those public functions the States cannot perform, but also to refrain from doing those things the States and their subdivisions are willing and able to do.⁵

These principles invite further questions: Which activities lies within the competence of the States? Which functions are the States and localities unable to perform? Within the framework of the federal system, is it possible to identify principles of State responsibility and State-local relations, as well as conditions justifying national action and a Federal Government role in metropolitan affairs?

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES AND STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

Particularly since the depression of the 1930's, local governments have learned to take their problems to Washington rather than to the

³ U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, *Hearings, Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965*, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965, p. 59.

⁴ Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*