

3764 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Thus, it would seem to us that a dialogue between the public and private sectors in this endeavor will be useful and necessary to a successful poverty program. We strongly believe also that both the government and the private economy have a mutual interest—the government because of the sociological and political problems caused by poverty and private industry because of the waste inherent in poverty and the danger which such poverty poses for the free enterprise system.

Let me summarize our position.

The United Mine Workers of America and its members favor the poverty program of the federal government, in general, and the activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in particular. We do so because we believe that the existence of a large and growing body of poor in our nation is a waste of our human resources and a continuing source of danger to the economic, social and political fabric of our society. We feel that unless strong action is taken to eradicate this poverty and forestall the development of a permanent class of poor in America, that the entire nation is in grave danger. While we recognize that the effort will require the expenditure of money, we are also aware that such expenditures are long-term investments in our most valuable natural resource—our people.

Therefore, we respectfully urge that the Office of Economic Opportunity be strengthened and that its budget be adequate for its task. Surely, all Americans must recognize that the job at hand is an essential one and that all must support and encourage the work of OEO so that the final blot of poverty will be wiped from the American scene.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Springfield, Ohio, June 13, 1967.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
*Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PERKINS: On behalf of the Springfield, Ohio, League of Women Voters I want to urge your support of the Economic Opportunity amendments of 1967 (H.R. 8311).

We realize there's legitimate criticism about most new programs, and some initiated and administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity are no exception. However, these programs deserve a chance; it is too soon to give them up or seriously cut back. In particular, the OEO is needed as a coordinating agency on the national level.

Surely no one expected the Office of Economic Opportunity to have the age-old problem of poverty solved in a couple years. But it has initiated some excellent programs. Springfield has been fortunate to have an Upward Bound Program at Wittenberg University because the results have been gratifying to participants and community. Enable was another successful program here and all involved were disappointed when it was discontinued. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has helped more than 75 local boys and girls remain in school by providing part-time employment, and several local youths have completed training in the Job Corps.

Springfield's problems have not been solved, of course. We need another Day Care Center and would like to have some Neighborhood Centers to aid underprivileged families to live better and help themselves. The Springfield League has made a careful study of the Economic Opportunity Act and wants to see it strengthened, not curtailed. Above all, we want the Office of Economic Opportunity to continue as coordinator and innovator nationally.

Yours very truly,

PHYLLIS NEDELMAN, *President.*

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Boise, Idaho, June 13, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. PERKINS: We of the League of Women Voters of Boise would like to ask your support of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

Considering the scale of the problems to be faced and the fact that many communities are moving from the planning stage to the more expensive business of operating programs, the \$2.06 billion authorization requested for fiscal 1968 is