

would tighten administrative standards consistent with the needs of expanding programs; expand audit and fiscal responsibilities; would help in the elimination of red tape and certain real barriers to efficient and cooperative efforts; and remove some of the maze of potentially inconsistent technical requirements with which local agencies are now sometimes saddled.

Most importantly, the proposed amendments would seek a basis for expanding private participation, particularly in the area of job-creation. By and large, in the economy of this nation, people who ultimately escape poverty and again self-sufficiency will do so through employment which only the private sector can provide.

My major overall criticism is that we, as a Nation, are, in effect, using a sling shot for a job that calls for nuclear weapons, applying band-aids in the curious expectation of arresting an advanced cancer.

Fundamentally, we have most of the necessary legislative devices available to use in the war on poverty. The basic need now is to apply these measures on a scale massive enough to actually solve the problems we're all concerned about. Two billion dollars per annum is not enough to do the job. Fifty billion dollars would be more like it.

A further criticism I would like to place on the record is that all too often, given the limitations on funds, administrators of the war on poverty have been forced not to act, but to react. Too often, they have found themselves reacting to crisis, such as a riot in Watts, tending to convey the impression that rioting is a necessary prelude to eligibility for poverty war funds.

It will be tragic if the impression is allowed to grow further that it is necessary to have a civil disturbance in order to get necessary attention to local problems and services, as so often seems to have been the case.

A further mistake, in the opinion of the Urban League, has been the almost consistent practice of channeling funds for programming purposes into entirely new local structures created for the purpose of receiving funds. These structures have most often been hastily conceived, hastily manned, and have generated great controversy over who was to make policy.

I would hasten to add that many, perhaps most, of the established voluntary agencies needed challenging, needed to be forced to re-examine existing programs and to reconsider whether or not they were actually reaching the most disadvantaged citizens, and whether or not their policy-making bodies were, in fact, sufficiently representative.

But I am firmly convinced that it would have been better, rather than to have set up duplicating and competing new structures to carry out programs, to have established coordinating bodies which would have served as channels through which funds were advanced to existing agencies with their years of experience and know-how, providing only that they met necessary criteria as to program, clients served, and broad representation at policy levels as well as in personnel utilized.

It is particularly interesting to note that the civil rights agencies, some of which have a half-century or more of experience in dealing with the problems the war on poverty is designed to attack, which have thoroughly representative boards, and the established confidence of the community, were given little, if any, of the poverty war funds at a time when, had they been, they would have been greatly reinforced in their positions through being able to implement some of the tangible programs sought within the ghettos.

It would have served to increase their influence in channeling understandable anger and impatience which erupts in the ghettos into constructive rather than destructive directions.

Paradoxically, as much as some of these agencies and organizations have been left out of the picture, they are still the first ones to whom the authorities turn when civil disorder threatens to replace realistic and orderly procedures, and the first ones upon whom extremists turn with the charge that they do not deliver on the meat, bread and potatoes issues fast enough.

And yet there is no mistaking the expertise of such agencies. The Urban League's record, both in and out of the war on poverty as formally structured, is informative. On-the-job training programs conducted by Urban League affiliates in strategically located cities across the country, funded by the Department of Labor, have been a spectacular success.

In 1966, some 4000 people received on-the-job training and subsequent placement through Urban League channels. In St. Louis a group of 350 trainees, the vast bulk of them "hardcore" unemployed before training, were earning \$3000