

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967 3711

in mind that disorders such as we have experienced in Newark and other cities are caused by deep problems in housing, education, and jobs, further complicated by the scars of years of discrimination."

Riots are in a great sense a convulsion, an upheaval, which at the bottom of it has people crying for help and for consideration.

There is no mayor anywhere in America who can say he wants the elimination of the antipoverty program . . . programs such as our legal services project, Headstart, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, our year-round preschool, and our summer recreation programs are all now indispensable parts of our community's life.

And let there be no mistake about it, Newark and all our cities would be worse without these programs.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Mayor, City of Newark.

JULY 29, 1967.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
*Chairman, Education and Labor Committee,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*

Employees and enrollees in the Detroit community action program have been very helpful in minimizing the effects of the riot. No known employee of either the CAA or its delegate agencies have been involved in the riot. Only three enrollees out of almost 5,000 in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Youth Service Corps, and other youth antipoverty efforts, have been accused of involvement in the rioting and looting. Had it not been for the effectiveness of the antipoverty program in providing needed services and building bridges of communication in the community the riot might have been worse. Urge immediate passage of the pending 1967 Economic Opportunity Act amendments in order to expand badly needed programs.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor, Detroit, Mich.

U. S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1967.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: Professor Richard T. Frost of Reed College, who for the past year has ably served as national director of the Upward Bound program, has written me a persuasive letter in support of the continuation within the jurisdiction of the Office of Economic Opportunity of the Upward Bound program.

Professor Frost has high praise for the administration of the Upward Bound program by the OEO. He reports that "Shriver's leadership and cooperation was almost perfect." Furthermore, Professor Frost notes:

" . . . the colleges and universities responded with good proposals far beyond our best hopes. In fact, the response was so good that in fiscal '66, we had to reject about 60 colleges purely for lack of funds. In '67, the number went to 125 rejections. That's a lot of colleges, but more importantly a lot of slum kids, who did not get a chance."

Professor Frost continues:

"There is, as you know, a strong effort on the part of many members of the House to legislate a transfer of Upward Bound to the U.S. Office of Education. I think that this would be a serious mistake at this time.

" . . . There are at least two reasons for my strongly-held view.

"1. Upward Bound partakes of the special competence of the Community Action Program. It is an integral part of CAP. As such, colleges find the recruiting of the right kind of target youngsters much easier. Moreover, as a poverty family makes its first contact with OEO via Upward Bound, the other problems of the family are "surfaced" and other local CAP resources can go to work. Beyond this, the neighborhood resources of CAP are indispensable to a good follow-up program for UB students who have been at a college for the summer, and, as you know so well, without a good follow-up during the regular school year, the gains of a summer are quickly washed away.