

to \$3500 per annum after training, and in New York City, total wages for a group of 172 trainees more than doubled after on-the-job training. Most of those receiving up-grading through such training represent departures from the welfare roles who have been made tax-producers in the process.

In addition, routine day-in-and-day-out Urban League job placements, at no cost to the government, ran to about 40,000 people in 1966. At an average annual income of \$4000 for such new jobs, this comes to \$160 million annually in new and expanded national income.

Our National Skills Bank, which opens up new jobs for Negroes and makes up-graded opportunities available to Negroes whose skills are being under-utilized—which is, again, operated *without* government funds of *any kind*—registered 39,698 people in 1966, made 28,506 referrals and 9,656 placements. Typical results include a young government worker who is now a \$9,500-a-year analyst for a drug firm and an \$85-per-week clerk who became a \$120-a-week secretary; again, with an obvious rise in local tax payments. In one community alone, the earning power of the Negro community rose \$2 million per year as a result of Urban League up-grading.

In the summary, however, let it be said that the immediate issue at hand in the war on poverty is clearly and simply the continued existence of the Office of Economic Opportunity as an independent agency. Those who would eliminate it would turn their backs on more than 30 million Americans who live in poverty and who look to the economic opportunity program as a way out of misery and human degradation for themselves and, most certainly, for their children. The Nation's promise to the poor as enunciated in 1964 is embodied in the OEO and to destroy the OEO would destroy that promise.

In order to right the social wrongs of centuries, in order to lift the burden of poverty, we must now, in order to redress the balance of history, succumb to an excess of feeling, of courage, of caring and of decency. The time is ripe. The resources of a rich nation requires it. As a cause, the eradication of poverty has the sympathy and devoted attention of the American public. The future of a society that would call itself civilized is at stake.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE ON THE WAR ON POVERTY PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER, AND POVERTY OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE

The National Urban League is pleased to make available to the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, as per its request, the following report on the Urban League's nation-wide experience in, and observations of, the war on poverty for inclusion in the record of the Subcommittee's hearings as the Subcommittee sees fit.

This report covers information supplied by 79 of the National Urban League's 82 local affiliates in cities¹ in 33 States and the District of Columbia. The National Urban League also has regional offices in Akron, Atlanta, Los Angeles, New York and St. Louis serving all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and a Washington Bureau.

A total of 1,253 anti-poverty programs are reported in these 79 cities, of which 999 are funded by the Office of Economic Development, 253 by the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and one by the Justice Department. For the purposes of this report, the National Urban League sees the war on poverty as including, not only programs funded by the OEO, but programs designed to alleviate poverty, funded by major Departments, as well.

While we believe the material in this report to be of great interest it is not intended as exhaustive. Urban League executives reported on their communities in broad terms.

In the field of *education*, programs covered in this report include: Head Start, Tutorial, Adult Basic Education, Upward Bound, Day Care, Work Study and miscellaneous other programs. With the exception of Upward Bound, some of these programs are funded by the OEO and some by HEW. Upward Bound is funded by the OEO only.

¹ See Appendix I.