

In a WashingtonExaminer.com opinion piece, Tad DeHaven, a budget analyst at the Cato Institute, pushed for the termination of the U.S. Small Business Administration.



Getty Images

The piece, published earlier this week, argues that SBA guarantees backing small-business loans are a form of "corporate welfare" for the banks, rather than a means to give credit to businesses that can't get traditional bank loans. Says DeHaven: "Small businesses with sound business plans and solid prospects should be able to raise debt and equity capital through private means."

But supporters have long pointed to the <u>success of the program</u> in helping small firms that have trouble finding capital that they need. Especially in tight credit markets, when banks are most averse to risk, SBA loans have been a popular option.

The debate isn't new. For years, think tanks have been debating the cost and benefits of the SBA's loan-guarantee program. Even before the economy tanked, Bloomberg Businessweek entertained the idea of <u>axing the SBA</u> in a June 2007 article, citing the pros and cons of such a move.

Now, with so many ideas being floated on how to cut the federal budget, the argument is becoming hot again. An August <u>survey</u> from Rasmussen Reports shows that 58% of likely U.S. voters don't believe the federal government should provide loan guarantees to banks. Only 23% say it should and 19% are unsure.

Readers, do you think the agency should be cut?



Copyright 2008 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved

This copy is for your personal, non-commercial use only. Distribution and use of this material are governed by our Subscriber Agreement and by copyright law. For non-personal use or to order multiple copies, please contact Dow Jones Reprints at 1-800-843-0008 or visit

www.djreprints.com