

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967 3755

CINCINNATI, OHIO, July 26, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Regarding the poverty program.

Since several people from Cincinnati are to be heard by your committee I feel I should put in a word. I speak as a Board Member and former president of the Council of the Southern Mountains as well as the Vice President of the Community Action Commission in Cincinnati.

As to the need for a poverty program I think there is no doubt. I hold great hopes for the Pilot Cities neighborhood service center idea. However, I do not believe that there can be much success in any program without involving the real poor thru some type of personal contact and making them part of the society around them in a Community Action type of program.

The traditional social service approach has just not reached the people at the bottom, many of whom can become a vital part of the society and economy. Unfortunately this takes a one to one, or one to a small number approach, and the one should be some one they can accept.

Considering that the traditional ways have not done much in some hundreds of years I think the War on Poverty has had pretty good success in developing new ideas in a couple of years and is now ready to build on its successes. It does need some careful evaluation so that its best ideas are widely used but I think the foundation is solid.

The poor are just becoming fully aware of the programs potentials for some real progress and a substantial cut now would be a cruel blow to people who don't have much hope anyway.

Sincerely,

STUART L. FABER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1967.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have followed closely the current hearings on the 1967 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act and have noted that during these Hearings there has been some criticism that the Small Business Administration is overly bureaucratic, slow to act, and nonresponsive to the needs of people in ghetto areas. My recent experience with the Agency leads me to quite the contrary conclusion, and I believe the Agency's action in connection with the recent social disturbances in the City of Newark, New Jersey, bears out this viewpoint.

You will recall that the disturbance began on July 12, and within the next few days extensive damage had been sustained by the many small businesses in the affected area. By Sunday, July 16, Andrew P. Lynch, the SBA Regional Director in the Agency's Newark Office had met with Governor Hughes and Mayor Addonizio and representatives of their respective staffs to pledge the full assistance of the SBA to help those small businesses that had been adversely affected to the full extent of the Agency's statutory capabilities. By Monday, July 17, working with city and state officials, SBA opened two special offices to handle inquiries from the small business community within the area of the disturbance. The Administrator of SBA, also on Monday, July 17, directed that very close liaison be maintained between Washington and the Newark Regional Office in order to avoid any unnecessary delays in providing assistance. By the end of the week more than 200 initial inquiries had been handled by the special offices in which the people were given information as to the type of assistance available, the data required, etc.

In my opinion, the positive, rapid, and effective action of the SBA office in Newark does not indicate that the Agency is either bureaucratic, slow to act, or nonresponsive to local needs. I wish, therefore, to direct this matter to your attention in order that the record may reflect Newark's recent experience with the SBA in this particular moment of need.

Sincerely,

HON. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.