

ment of these programs however has been dialogue and interplay between the poor and leaders of the business and labor communities such as never existed before. We remind members of this committee that the administration's proposal for funds for the War on Poverty amounts to only 2% of the administration's total budget. When compared to other items in the budget it becomes even more startling. The OEO programs amount to only about 40% of the space budget and the cost to run the War in Vietnam for one month is more than the cost to run the War on Poverty in the United States for one year.

3. We also believe it is important to have a broad-based involvement in the community action programs. Therefore, we would oppose the plan to increase matching local funds from the present 10% to 20%. The effect of this increase would hurt independent community groups the most, stifle imagination and innovation in the poverty communities themselves, and be an unnecessary burden to local antipoverty committees.

4. We support the administration's request to increase the maximum amount of money available for demonstration and research purposes from 5% to 10%.

5. Since the War on Poverty is a new venture in terms of program, we urge Congress to consider making mandatory annual reviews of local programs by independent agencies or universities and making these evaluations a matter of public information.

6. We are distressed over the lack of communication among cities and anti-poverty programs throughout the country in order to share their experience and knowledge on the War on Poverty. We hope the OEO will begin publishing a regular newsletter to be distributed to officials and civic agencies highlighting experimental programs and experience in various cities.

7. We also urge OEO to establish a regional office in Philadelphia in order to have a Federal official available on the scene who could attend regular meetings of the Philadelphia AntiPoverty Action Committee and provide information on Federal programs and policies. It seems amazing that a Federal program this large would not have a regional office and competent staff in the 4th largest city in the country.

Turning our attention to the Philadelphia AntiPoverty Program, we make the following points for your consideration.

1. Some of Philadelphia's programs have been extremely successful. Most of these, however, are administered apart from and independent of the Philadelphia AntiPoverty Action Committee. The Opportunities Industrialization Center is the largest program, and perhaps the best. It pre-dated Philadelphia's AntiPoverty Program and is run independent of the official committee. The other major successful programs have been the ones administered by the Board of Education and the Archdiocese schools. In 1965-66, Philadelphia received a total of \$16,276,111.00 for antipoverty programs. Of this amount, the Opportunities Industrialization Center and the public and parochial schools received a total of \$12,707,881.00.

2. The elections of the 12 community action councils of 12 members each has been useful. While the percentage of poor people involved in these elections has been a disappointing 5-6%, we support the election process as a useful educational instrument and the best way of getting representation from the poverty communities into decision making positions.

3. Administratively, the program in Philadelphia has had serious problems. It is now going through its third reorganization in three years, partly due to an opinion by the Citizens Charter Committee that the current structure is in violation of Philadelphia's Home Rule Charter. ADA has supported a non-profit corporation as the most useful structure for the program for the past three years. Not only does this allow broad community participation but it also reduces the possibility of political interference and influence. We hope this is the recommendation that will be adopted by the panel now considering reorganizing the structure.

4. In terms of imaginative community action programs, Philadelphia has been sadly remiss. This has been largely due to the policy of the leadership of the Philadelphia AntiPoverty Action Committee which has been heavy handed in its relationship with the poverty communities, stifled independent thinking and discouraged program development.

5. Unfortunately, it seems at times that the Philadelphia program is being run more for political purposes than for the independent development of the poverty community. In late 1964, the Mayor issued an organization diagram for "The Mayor's AntiPoverty Program" dominated completely by a Mayor's Task