

The problem of divided labor markets is likely to be most serious in metropolitan areas in which the nonwhite unemployed are concentrated in the central city, part or all of the suburbs are in another State or States, and job opportunities are in the suburbs. If there is discrimination against Negroes in the suburbs, there will be a tendency for less than full cooperation on the part of the suburban employment office, in spite of informal and formal procedures and organizational devices for assuring such cooperation.

In these circumstances, it might be expected that Negro applicants would register in all available employment offices regardless of their residence, since that is their right. Many of the unemployed, however, are also the undereducated, unskilled, and semiskilled who are not likely to seek additional contact points for employment in two or more different State employment offices. Thus, if the employment office in the place of their residence—for example, the central city—does not help them find a job, they are unlikely to look for help elsewhere. If there is less than full cooperation between the central city employment office and the suburban office, the unemployed person is, for practical purposes, out of reach of the registration service of the suburban office.

Where these difficulties result from divided State administration, the Commission urges the State and Federal Governments to work more effectively in assuring coordinated action in the metropolitan areas. As heads of State administration, Governors should see to it that their State employment agencies wholeheartedly support such coordination. Cooperative agreements, such as that now in effect in the Washington, D.C. area, should be negotiated in interstate metropolitan areas. For these to be more than paper agreements, however, every effort should be made by responsible Federal and State officials to assure that they actually produce a full flow of information and service over State lines in the metropolitan area.

2. PROMOTING ADJUSTMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTIONS

Many basic recommendations of the Commission, described above, emphasize the need for adjusting local governmental boundaries, functions, and financial powers in metropolitan areas to meet changing needs. These measures would substantially reduce the impact of many factors that make it difficult for local government to cope with disparity problems. Recommendations seeking to ease local government boundary problems have urged: (1) simplified statutory requirements for municipal annexation of unincorporated territory; (2) stricter State standards for new incorporations; (3) control of the formation of new special districts; (4) authorization for interlocal contracting, joint performance of urban services, and voluntary transfer of functions among city and county governments; and (5) authorization and encouragement for the establishment of metropolitan councils of governments, metropolitan planning agencies, metropolitan study commissions, and metropolitan service corporations to perform governmental services that call for areawide handling.

Other Commission recommendations seeking to strengthen local governments functionally and financially have urged (1) that units of general local government—counties, cities, and towns—be given all