

3754 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

1. WILL BETTER PLANNING AND COORDINATION RESULT?

Poverty is a tremendously complex problem with many interrelated efforts required to deal with its causes. The overall planning and coordination of these many programs clearly requires a specific effort such as the OEO.

2. WILL BETTER PROGRAMS RESULT?

The OEO with its singleness of purpose and sole responsibility has come up with some novel and effective approaches to reach the *causes* of poverty—these transcend the specific areas of responsibility of the various departments. Although the OEO has had its shortcomings, its “batting average” has been very high on creative and worthwhile programs, particularly in view of the uncharted seas in which it is navigating.

3. WILL LOWER COSTS RESULT?

In my judgment, the sense of purpose plus the management and coordination functions of the OEO are worth many times the modest administrative overhead involved. Without the overall direction provided by the OEO, the monies expended by various departments, each going their own way, would result in far greater confusion, duplication, and less effective use of public funds. To me, the OEO performs the most important function of analyzing the “cost effective ness” of various potential programs and allocating the limited funds authorized by Congress to the most promising activities.

In our manufacturing business we estimate it takes three years for a new product to reach the profitable stage. Certainly a complex and pioneering program such as the War On Poverty, now showing tangible results, can be expected to take much longer to reach maximum effectiveness.

It does seem likely that with the passage of years after the pioneering period is largely concluded, the function of the OEO can be reduced or eliminated. But I must conclude that elimination of the OEO function *now* would be a major and likely fatal blow to our chances of succeeding in this great endeavor.

My plea to you is therefore to support the continuance of the OEO for at least several more years. I do believe its activities should be constructively evaluated and modified by Congress where necessary for greater effectiveness. But to strike it down today just as it is showing real results would in my view be a tragedy to our country.

I will welcome your reaction to the above thoughts.

Respectfully,

R. H. CARTER, *President.*

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF GROSSMONT-CAJON VALLEY,
August 7, 1967.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The League of Women Voters is opposed to abolishing the Office of Economic Opportunity or transferring any of its major programs to other agencies. We feel that programs dealing with the problems of the poor should be handled by one agency for more effective coordination and implementation.

Many of the Community Action Programs in our area are still in the beginning or planning stages and it is too soon for a true evaluation of the results and their effect on the community. This is a time for specific evaluation and reform, not a time for drastic changes and cutbacks. The original intent of the program must not be weakened, and there must be increased funds, not earmarked, to carry out these programs.

The League of Women Voters of Grossmont-Cajon Valley urges your support of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 as Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and when the bill reaches the floor of the House.

Sincerely,

Mrs. OLIVER GALBRAITH III.
President.