

Now, there are copies of that report which will be released later today. They have been given to you and the committee. And I have summarized them in my statement.

I think it is a pretty significant advance.

We had 15 of them ready about 6 weeks ago, and did release those. We are now working on the 20, and this is the first release of those.

I have, in my statement, summarized some of the results on a 20-city basis, but I point out that in doing that we really defeat the purpose of that approach, which is to get away from the averaging of a lot of matters, and to present the picture which will probably be most useful locally—to present the picture in terms of the situation in a particular city.

In my prepared statement, I have suggested some of what we are finding here.

Again, one of the biggest lessons is how much difference there is in the situation—so that you have unemployment rates today in Minneapolis-St. Paul of 2.2 percent, 2.3 percent here in Washington, but 5.6 percent in Los Angeles, and 5.4 percent in San Francisco and Oakland.

Just to take another illustration, when you get into the Negro unemployment rates, which we have referred to quite generally in their relationship to white unemployment rates, you find that Negro unemployment averages 2.3 times as high as white rates, and yet, here again, there are differences which are perhaps more important than anything else.

So that here in Washington, the ratio between Negro and white race is 1.6 percent—1.6 to 1, rather. In New York, it is 1.5 to 1. You turn to Cleveland, it is 3.1 to 1, which means three times as much. You go to St. Louis, and it is 4.2 to 1.

So we have really totally different situations.

Chairman PROXMIER. 4.2 to 1, meaning there are four times as many Negroes out of work as whites?

Secretary WIRTZ. Taking account of the difference in the size of the group.

Chairman PROXMIER. Sixty percent more in this city?

Secretary WIRTZ. That is correct. Or on a pro rata basis—taking account of the fact there are fewer Negroes, it is still true.

And then when you turn to the tables, too, you will get what I think is a very important lesson.

We have sort of escalated our figures about some of these matters by talking in percentages, which often seem to imply a good deal more than the facts show. And we forget that although this problem, for example, of minority group unemployment is exceedingly serious, it is still well within reach.

So, in my statement, I have suggested a little of that. If you take these 20 areas as a whole, the nonwhite unemployment in 1967 totaled 269,000. That is in the 20 cities. In these tables, incidentally, we have taken all 12 months of 1967, averaged those figures together. The 1967 average of those 20 cities' nonwhite unemployment is 269,000. It is surely within our reach, if we really go after it.

Incidentally, that is about half of the nonwhite unemployment in the whole country. We can scare ourselves sometimes with the percentages, and the figures, and forget that in a work force of 70 million to 75