

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATION ON AGING AND CONDUCT OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

JOINT HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING
AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
PART 2—WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 29, 1971



Printed for the use of Special Committee on Aging
and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1971

60-215

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island	WINSTON PROUTY, Vermont
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin	RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota	BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri	ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
ALAN CRANSTON, California	J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa	
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois	

STEWART E. MCCLURE, *Staff Director*
ROBERT E. NAGLE, *General Counsel*
ROY H. MILLENSON, *Minority Staff Director*
EUGENE MITTELMAN, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING

THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri, <i>Chairman</i>	
Mr. CRANSTON, California	Mr. BEALL, Maryland
Mr. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	Mr. PROUTY, Vermont
Mr. RANDOLPH, West Virginia	Mr. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
Mr. WILLIAMS, New Jersey	Mr. TAFT, Ohio
Mr. HUGHES, Iowa	Mr. PACKWOOD, Oregon
Mr. STEVENSON, Illinois	

JAMES J. MURPHY, *Counsel*
MICHAEL S. GORDON, *Minority Counsel*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey	WINSTON PROUTY, Vermont
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada	HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	JACK MILLER, Iowa
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine	CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah	PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota	WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana	EDWARD W. BROOKE, Massachusetts
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island	CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri	

WILLIAM E. ORIOL, *Staff Director*
DAVID A. AFFELDT, *Counsel*
JOHN GUY MILLER, *Minority Staff Director*

- Part 1. Washington, D.C., March 25, 1971
- Part 2. Washington, D.C., March 29, 1971
- Part 3. Washington, D.C., March 30, 1971
- Part 4. Washington, D.C., March 31, 1971
- Part 5. Washington, D.C., April 27, 1971
- Part 6. Orlando, Fla., May 10, 1971
- Part 7. Des Moines, Iowa, May 13, 1971
- Part 8. Boise, Idaho, May 28, 1971

(Additional hearings anticipated, but not scheduled at time of this printing)

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page.
Chaskes, Charles, president, National Association of State Units on Aging and executive director, Michigan Commission on Aging-----	121
Jackson, Hobart, president, National Caucus on Black Aged-----	133
Shore, Dr. Herbert, past president, American Association of Homes for the Aged-----	140
Eggers, Rev. William T., past president, American Association of Homes for the Aged-----	145
Walters, Thomas, president, National Association of Retired Federal Employees; accompanied by Arthur L. Sparks, director of Field Operations-----	149
Butler, Dr. Robert, psychiatrist and gerontologist, District of Columbia--	156

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1—Additional material from witnesses:	
Item 1. Letter from Hobart C. Jackson, chairman, National Caucus on the Black Aged, to Senator Frank Church, chairman-----	163
Item 2. Statement of Dr. Robert N. Butler to the Governors of the States, regarding selection of delegates to the White House Conference-----	163
Appendix 2—Additional material from organizations and individuals:	
Statement of Mrs. Elizabeth K. Lincoln, chairman, New England Association of State Executives on Aging, director, Services for Aging, New Hampshire State Council on Aging-----	164

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATION ON AGING AND CONDUCT OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1971

U.S. SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING
AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The joint committees met at 10:08 a.m., in Room 4232, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., the Honorable Frank Church, Chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, presiding.

Present: Senators Frank Church and Thomas F. Eagleton.

Committee staff members present: William E. Oriol, staff director; David A. Affeldt, counsel; John Guy Miller, minority staff director; Patricia Slinkard, chief clerk; and Peggy Fecik, assistant chief clerk.

Subcommittee staff members present: James Murphy, counsel; and Donna Wurzbach, clerk.

Senator CHURCH. Good morning. The hearing will come to order.

This is the second in a series of five joint hearings devoted to an examination of the AoA and the proposed budget for carrying on its activities in the coming fiscal year.

Our first witness this morning is Mr. Charles Chaskes, President, National Association of State Units on Aging, and Executive Director, Michigan Commission on Aging; well known to this Committee.

Mr. Chaskes, would you come forward please and take the witness stand?

Mr. Chaskes, why don't you just proceed as you think best, and then the questions will follow.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES CHASKES, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNITS ON AGING

Mr. CHASKES. Thank you, Senator Church.

As President of the National Association of State Units on Aging, I can say that every State executive has expressed utter dismay at two things, primarily the continual cutback of funds for community grant programs. They have been cut back some 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent in the last 3 years. This at a time when the general cost of government, and all other programs in government, have been increasing at the rate of anywhere from 6 to 10 percent per year, so that the cutback is really a great deal more than the 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent.

STRONGER ADMINISTRATION ON AGING NEEDED

But more importantly, we feel that the organization, the agency which was created by the Congress, which spent many years after the 1961 White House Conference on Aging, investigating and finally passing a bill, the Older Americans Act, which created an agency in the Federal Government to serve as a focal point for the needs of elderly, should be strengthened, not weakened.

Now we see this agency being absolutely torn asunder. We see various titles of the act, which the agency was empowered by the Congress to administer, being taken from it and given to Social and Rehabilitative Services, and we question whether this is not in direct violation of congressional intent.

I am not a lawyer, but I understand the English language, and I look at the Older Americans Act, and I see in title II—the first paragraph establishes an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—and it says that the Administration shall be under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

And then section 202 of title II goes on to say very explicitly, “it shall be the duty and function of the Administration to—administer the grants provided by this Act.”

Now I don't know how you can give any other interpretation to this language than this agency is created to do this job. And now, we see it dismembered; we see title IV being taken and put in with the SRS research and development programs. We see title V, the training grant, being taken and put in with the SRS training programs.

And, we see the continual cutback of the funds of the one title which is being left to the Administration on Aging to administer.

I don't think you can do what the act intended to do and what the Congress intended it to do, by making your agency smaller and smaller all the time. I think that in our scheme of things, there is a numbers game that is always played. An agency that administers many programs—an agency that has a large budget—certainly has more clout or muscle, or whatever term you want to use, than an agency that keeps cutting back.

AOA CUTBACKS IN STAFF

I understand that in the last 3 years the staff of this agency, of the Administration on Aging, has been cut from a high of 80 to a little more than 20 people. How can this agency do the job that Congress envisioned for it?

Now I think a good question to ask ourselves is, does there need to be an agency as a focal point for older people in the Federal Government? And I think the answer that Congress found in 1965, when it created the Older Americans Act—and the answer that all of us in the field know beyond any question of a doubt—is that there has to be. In any program where we are going to offer services in a community mix, older people will always get the short end of the services unless there is an advocating agency around to see that this is not so.

For example, let me call your attention for just a minute to the community mental health centers. We have created in every city of any

size a Community Mental Health program, which is funded by the Federal Government and State governments, and in a small degree by local governments.

AGED EXCLUDED FROM MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES?

The act that created the Community Mental Health program does not say that we will provide mental health services to the general population up to age 60. But, if you examine the program of any community mental health center, I don't think you would find 1 percent of their caseload people aged 60-or-over.

Social work educators will tell you the natural thing for a social worker, when they go into an agency, is to have an empathy for the younger person, for the mother with six or seven children. But they don't have the same empathy for older people.

We need specially trained people to have this empathy for older people, and their needs. We need an agency to see that all the services which Federal, State and local governments have to offer are made available to older people.

I don't think there is any question—I have a story I think which pretty much portrays this, and it's a sad story, but it's true. It pretty much portrays community attitudes and the need for an advocate agency for older people.

In our State there is a nursing home located between Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor, Mich., out in the country. And, an old gentleman who was a resident of this nursing home, and was physically all right, but having a few problems mentally with lapse of memory and so forth, had served for some 30 years as superintendent of schools in a town next to Ypsilanti. One day he wandered off from the nursing home and the management of the nursing home called the police for help to find the older gentleman.

They sent one policeman and a dog. And the manager said, "My goodness, how is one person going to scour 3,000 acres of woodland to try to find an older person?" The policeman said, "If it was a kid, there would be 75 policemen here, but this is what the chief said I should take."

And as a matter of fact, the dog "copped out" in about 3 minutes with a cut paw, and had to be taken away—so there was only the one policeman left to find this old gentleman.

Luckily they did find him.

The Community Grant program has given us an excellent opportunity—

Senator CHURCH. May I just interrupt at this point to say that indicative of the low priority of interest that is focused on the problems of the elderly of this country is the fact that three of the four tables that have been set out for the press are empty and I see people here, including young people, that have come in and they are standing. And I want to invite anyone who cares to sit down to come up and occupy the tables reserved for the press. One of them is in use over here at the right, but the others are not.

So anyone who needs or wants a seat, don't hesitate to come up and use the seats at the press table. Good.

All right. I am sorry to have interrupted you, Charles. Go ahead. Mr. CHASKES. I would like to point out that you might say the State agency directors have a vested interest—that this might be self-serving on their part. But I would point out, that since 1967 there have been three studies which have been authorized by various administrations.

STUDIES ENVISION LARGER ROLE FOR AOA

The first one was authorized by the previous administration, and Dr. Robert Binstock of the Florence Heller School at Brandeis University served as the study director. They spent a year investigating the title III program and the whole Administration on Aging. While the study was never published, Dr. Binstock, in a private conversation with me, told me very definitely that the study would support an even larger proposal for the title III program. He would support an even larger role for the Administration on Aging, and especially the title III program.

Then the Administration on Aging authorized a study by Greenblatt and Ernst of the State University of New York at Buffalo. I don't happen to know these two gentlemen.

They visited and investigated the program in 18 States, and in their report they use a parable from the Bible which says in effect, that unless one fertilizes a tree, it is not going to bear the maximum fruit, and they are very critical that the funds to carry on these necessary and worthwhile programs have not been forthcoming.

The third study to which I would direct this committee's attention is the report of this President's Task Force on Aging which was published in April 1970. It is the task force that Mr. Garson Meyer headed up, and I understand he is to be a witness later.

Their first recommendation, recommendation No. 1, says in part that the task force recognizes that:

In enacting the Older Americans Act, Congress intended the Administration on Aging to serve as a Federal focal point on aging.

The experience of the Administration on Aging during the last 4 years, however, makes it abundantly clear that interdepartmental coordination cannot be carried out by a unit of the Government which is subordinate to the unit it is attempting to coordinate—nor does the experience of the President's Council on Aging suggest that such coordination can be accomplished effectively through a committee.

They are saying that what we need is a strong agency. They go on to recommend actually that this agency be a part of the Executive Office.

I don't want to get involved as to where it should be, but I do want to reiterate that, in the opinion of all the State executive directors on aging, it should be a strong agency. It should administer programs, it should have the right to conduct whatever research is necessary; and also, to coordinate the research in other agencies as it pertains to the elderly. Also, it should have funds to train people to serve older people as needed.

The title III community program has been very effective—at least I have yet to see a project that didn't achieve what it set out to achieve. We found that for a little bit of money—\$14,000 or \$15,000—we could go into a community, organize a multipurpose center—a center that

older people were comfortable in coming to and using its facilities, a center that would offer all kinds of leisure time opportunities, and recreational opportunities; and, more importantly, would offer information and counseling services by a person to whom the older person has a close relationship.

There wasn't any bureaucratic setting that would make them go in "hat in hand" and be afraid of talking to the center director.

We find that with the bind that most communities are in today—with their incomes being so limited—and there being so many demands made on the incomes of communities, that unless we have the funds to help these communities create programs, and help them get these programs started, they won't be created and they won't start.

Senator CHURCH. May I just ask, Charles, at that point—I think possibility we can expedite things with a question and answer exchange here as these things come up, if you don't mind—one of the reasons that is given by the administration for reducing funding for the title III community programs is that these projects are usually very small product programs, such as meals for a group of older people in a given neighborhood, or a transportation experiment that reaches relatively few.

And so the administration argues that the new areawide model concept, with its wider base, will enable the AoA to meet in a more efficient manner the total needs of the elderly instead of doing it on a piecemeal basis in a very spotty way as it is now being done under the title III programs.

What are your views in regard to that argument?

Mr. CHASKES. Well, I would have to take exception to that viewpoint. We find, for example, that in larger cities in urban areas, no matter how well a center is planned or how large a center, that if it reaches 2 or 3 percent of its potential target audience, it is doing a good job.

AREA-WIDE PROJECTS CHALLENGED

In more rural areas, you find 50 or 60 percent of the target audience reached. We find the bigger the operation, the less likely the people are to use it.

You get this bureaucratic setting again, and you get the people that are once removed from the person that is providing the services.

The other thing that I would point out is, that there have been about 10 copies of guidelines for the areawide models and as far as most State agency directors are concerned, they feel that they have been written without any real experience by the authors in the basic community organization dynamics, the basic community byplays, the basic community resources being developed in these areawide models.

For example, I have a letter here from the Secretary's office to a CDA director, telling him they envision a project that employs 18 people. How do they know they are going to need 18 people? Maybe they only need 12, or maybe they will need 30.

The guidelines, the criteria that were developed under the community grant system are not present here. In the community grant system, in the title III projects, an applicant would make an application, the technical review committee would first determine its need—are there any other available sources to provide this service we are

talking about? They would determine its feasibility; they would determine the technical competence of the applicant agency to render the type service that it is talking about; whether it has the ability; whether it has people on its staff that have the know-how, and so forth.

And, they would also determine what chance this project has for continuation after the Federal funding period has expired.

For that reason title III has the declining support percentage. None of these things are given consideration in this areawide model.

In our scheme of things, there are several key words that seem to elicit a great deal of response today—ecology, model, volunteer.

These words seem to strike a resounding note in administrative hearts. We think that rather than having a cliché and rather than having a set model, that every community should be able to develop what it can best do.

Senator CHURCH. Charles, of course I agree that that is a sound approach, but I wonder—my own familiarity with some of the community projects that I have seen, actually visited and seen in operation, has been a very favorable one. The ones that I have known about seem to be very successful.

But they have been funded mainly through Federal funding. And the concept of the act was to provide money to get experimental programs started with the idea that then they could be sustained by local support of one kind or another, and Federal money could be withdrawn.

Yet we have had testimony—we had testimony only Friday—from very enthusiastic administrators of programs that have been successful in their neighborhoods that are soon to be cut off for lack of funds. And appeals were made to the committee to continue the Federal funding.

Well, I don't know how we can have it both ways. I personally think that we have a miniscule budget to start with, and the administration seems determined to cut it back still further.

I think that is a very regrettable thing and I personally want to do what I can to try and at least reinstate and maintain the present level of funding. But I am worried that we not depart from this concept, that we are trying to experiment with demonstration programs, and the end objective is to find ways that these programs can become self-sustaining.

Because, obviously, you take the good programs like the nutritional program—a neighborhood meal for elderly people two or three times a week—that has done fine things for those few who participate, but the most get no chance to participate, and the money isn't available on a scale that would enable the Federal Government to feed all the elderly people of the country. Nor would that be a desirable thing.

But if these demonstration programs are not set up on a basis that leads to self-sustaining action, then we are going to continue to have very spotty and unsatisfactory programs that reach only a very few people with never money enough to extend the benefits to everyone who ought to be equally entitled.

Mr. CHASKES. I agree with you 100 percent, but my point is, to substitute the areawide model for title III doesn't seem to be enhancing title III and making it available to more people, and there is nobody

that feels more strongly about the worth of the whole title III program. But I would place before you for your consideration—you are talking about an areawide model, and you are getting guidelines that say that you have to have a staff of 18 people, talking about a \$200,000 or \$250,000 minimum program.

FEDERAL MONEY NEEDED TO SUSTAIN PROGRAMS

You are talking about a local contribution of at least \$50,000. Well, while you have the second year model cities money available, you can match that \$150,000 Federal grant. But, look about you, Senator, and see what the financial condition of most of the cities are, and think, can they sustain this program if they don't have the model cities money to use to match?

I don't know too many cities that have \$50,000 lying around that they would be willing to put into the program for older people.

The trouble that we have experienced with title III is that they gave us the authorization to extend the programs another year, a fourth year, but didn't give us any money. They cut back on the money, so that they curtailed our ability, not only to carry on programs for a fourth or a possible fifth year, but also to do anything with new programs.

I don't think that the areawide model is a substitute for the Community Grant program, and I think that the Community Grant program is a sounder program.

In our State, for example, those community programs, started by title III, where the Federal funding has expired, have managed to carry on. They have managed to carry on by raising money, sometimes from bake sales—and the older people themselves have done all sorts of things to raise money to continue their centers.

Senator CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. CHASKES. And I think the fact that these things are going on is true testimony to the worth, and the meaning, and the value, of these programs to the older people themselves.

I am just saying that I don't think the areawide model is a substitute for the Community Grant program.

Senator CHURCH. I understand your point.

Charles, it has been suggested to this committee that the quality of State units on aging varies widely, and that some are little more than conduits for Federal funds.

Would you care to comment? You know our own operation, and you know the operations in other States. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. CHASKES. Senator, I think we could say the quality of the State health departments varies widely. The quality of State departments of labor varies widely.

But, I think that, with the backing of the Older Americans Act—with the training programs—that eventually a great many of these State agencies that may not be quite as sophisticated, or be doing quite the job that some other larger State agencies are doing, will be upgraded by being able to obtain the services of people that are trained.

TITLE V-TRAINED PEOPLE NEEDED

As a matter of fact, in our State, for example, we have rewritten our civil service requirements so that we use the people that are being trained under title V. Now if there aren't going to be those people available to us, we are painting ourselves into a corner; but, I think as this program comes on, that all State agencies will be strengthened.

I think that the directors and the program personnel get more experience and they learn one from another. This is the reason for national conferences. This is the reason that we have had training conferences; and, I don't think there are any State agencies that are so bad that they would support a theory of "let's do away with them".

I think you'd be throwing the baby out with the bath water, in that area.

Senator CHURCH. In the matter of funds, did I understand you to say that the AoA funding has been cut back by two-thirds?

Mr. CHASKES. In 1967-68, we had \$16 million nationally for title III projects. Of this, each State was allowed to keep 10 percent, or \$25,000, whichever was greater, for their administrative money.

Well, take 10 percent of \$16 million—\$1.6 million off that—so it meant we had actually about \$14 million nationally for title III projects.

The proposal for 1971-72 is \$5 million. This is almost a little more than a third. There has been a 60-percent reduction; and, a reduction at a time when every other program in the Federal Government and in most State governments has been expanding.

So that, I think, to say that our program has contracted by 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent is a conservative statement.

Senator CHURCH. We have a situation then where the AoA, which was originally established by Congress to play a very important role in programs for the elderly, has been constantly cut back in its funding and many of the responsibilities assigned to it originally under the act have been transferred to other agencies of the Government.

In your opinion— In fact the administration is now suggesting that there be further transfer of responsibility, which would really emasculate the AoA. It is now considering the establishment of a new voluntary agency, as you know, and apparently proposes to include in that agency two programs that are now authorized by the Older Americans Act—the RSVP program, and the Foster Grandparent program—transferring both out of the AoA and into this new volunteer agency.

I think the Peace Corps is to be a part of that, and VISTA is to be a part of it, and so on.

What is your reaction to that program?

Mr. CHASKES. I can't see it enhancing the programs for the elderly, to put them in an agency that is a mix of many, many agencies.

I think, once again, that we are saying two different things. I don't think the Foster Grandparent program and the RSVP program are one and the same thing. I think they serve two different purposes.

The Foster Grandparent program is a means of enabling older people to supplement their income. True, they supplement it by doing something that their lives have suited them for very, very well—giving tender, loving care to a child in an institution, and so forth.

I think the voluntary program—there are no employment opportunities in the volunteer programs. It's merely to provide volunteers with out-of-pocket expenses.

We have gone on record—the national association—we went on record 2 years ago at our meeting in December 1969, at Silver Spring. We went on record again, last December 1970, of how we would like to see RSVP operate.

NO NEED SEEN FOR NEW AGENCY

AoA hired an organization to investigate how the RSVP program should be administered. We went on record as saying that we didn't need another agency to go into the communities and create agencies to administer volunteer programs. We have, throughout the Nation, more than 1,000 multipurpose centers and programs that were run, some by title III funds, some by park and recreation departments, some by the UAW and other labor organizations, and so forth. These agencies now have the older people that are willing and able to volunteer, and want to volunteer, and to be able to give these people money to meet their out-of-pocket expenses, we think, would spread the whole RSVP program a thousandfold—compared to having to create an agency in every city to go out and find the people that would be volunteers and the places they would volunteer.

I don't know why this program would find a different attitude by society toward older people. In the example I mentioned earlier about the community mental health centers, I don't know why this program—if we create an agency to run all these volunteer programs—how, suddenly, society and the people running these programs are now going to give older people a higher spot on the totem pole.

I don't think creating another agency is going to do that. I think it's necessary to have a focal point for the elderly.

Senator CHURCH. I think you share my kind of skepticism. It seems to me, from the dawn of government and the recorded history of mankind, whenever no funds were to be made available for implementing or expanding given programs, and there were strong pressures for such funds, the device has been to reorganize. Which gives a certain semblance of action but it's the same old business still.

Either the program is there to be funded and expanded; or it isn't. And a lot of sleight of hand about reorganization to get more effective administration and that kind of thing is usually the substitute for lack of action, and seldom, if ever, produces the results in more efficient administration, and so on, that is claimed for it.

Charles, we have to get on with other witnesses, so I don't want to keep you much longer; but I have two questions I would like to ask.

FEW RESOURCES DEVOTED TO PROBLEMS OF THE ELDERLY

The first is, why, in your opinion, have we given so little part of our total resources and attention to the problems that face elderly people, when they constitute so sizable a part of our population, when they are suffering from an obvious lack of adequate income, and many of them are living in poverty, when we have so much to spend on other things? Why does this happen?

You have already testified that we started with the AoA and tried to set up a separate agency to deal with the problems of elderly, to render services and experiment with ways to improve the quality of their lives and living standards.

We have been cutting back and emasculating this agency ever since. And now we face proposals to practically reorganize it out of existence.

Why, in your opinion, is it possible to give such little attention to the problems of the elderly when we give so much attention to other things?

Mr. CHASKES. One would need the wisdom of Solomon to give that question the answer in depth that it deserves. And I don't claim to have that wisdom, sir.

But, I feel that the complexity of our society, and the rapid change of our society from rural to urban, has had a great deal to do with society's attitude toward older people.

When our society was more rural, no matter how old Grampa got, his wisdom was still of value. The son or grandson could say, "Grampa, do I put the back-40 in corn, or do I let it lie fallow, or put it in oats?"

But I can't picture, for example, my 15-year-old son—who is a product of this civilization, and who has all the attributes that we give to our bright teenagers today—I can't picture him asking his grandfather, "Grampa, what's a better fuel for a rocket, a solid propellant fuel or a liquid fuel?"

I think this has developed because of the complexities of our society; and, when we were more rural, there was always the big house and we always had room for grampa and grandma to live with us. And, as society became more urban and industrial, it presented a great many problems.

Also, I think that those older people that have sufficient income do rather well. But they do need opportunities—I have had multimillionaires, a retired General Motors vice president, as a matter of fact, become astounded that, after retirement, society didn't ask this gentleman to still be the campaign director for the United Givers Fund—or on the board of the symphony, or on the board of the art gallery. They asked the current vice president and executives of General Motors.

And I think no matter how much money older people might have, they still need a reason to get up in the morning. They still need things to do to add quality to their lives, and of course, those people on the lower end of the economic scale need these opportunities even more because they can't fend for themselves—they don't have the opportunity or privilege to make choices.

That's probably a very weak answer for your question.

Senator CHURCH. I think it's a good answer. And I recognize the question is a very big question.

FEDERAL OUTLAYS FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. CHASKES. I would like to make one other statement, Senator, and that is, I hear and read in testimony before this committee and other committees that, the administration looks at the larger view. That, for example, the amount of money being expended on older people now is \$32 billion as opposed to \$26 billion 3 or 4 years ago. This always just makes me fighting mad.

I remember at the White House Conference on Youth, the national president of the PTA said that we are expending \$1,800 per older person, and it's time we got the youth expenditures up there.

This is so wrong, because the money that is being expended on the older people is their own money, from the trust funds, that was put in there by them, or put in by their employers, as a result of their labor.

The increases granted in the last several years have been granted by the Congress, and have always been larger than recommended by the administration. As a matter of fact, in the Social Security trust fund, the older people are carrying on their backs those other people aged 72 and older, who didn't have enough quarters for complete coverage and are now getting a minimum Social Security check.

Senator CHURCH. It is true also, isn't it, that those increases have been little more than just to keep pace with the rising cost of living so that given the inflation problem there has been no net gain?

Mr. CHASKES. That is right; and I think we have to address ourselves, as it seems the Congress is doing, to getting the whole Social Security benefit system up to a meaningful base.

Senator CHURCH. I personally think we should strive to do two things. First, to make the Social Security system what it was originally intended to be, a basis for assuring older people in their retirement of a decent living, at least above the poverty level.

SUFFICIENT INCOME NEEDED—NOT ASSISTANCE

And second, I think we should abolish old age assistance and I think we should find a way to supplement the income of people who are living below the poverty level so they can be sure when they retire that they are going to have sufficient income to live in dignity and self respect, and not have to go hat in hand to a welfare agency and take the kind of supervision and harassment that that naturally involves.

I should think that would be the minimum this country could do.

Mr. CHASKES. I agree with you 100 percent, but I say that the added dimension that is necessary, besides the peace of mind and the security of income; is also an opportunity to live a meaningful life; an opportunity to enhance the self-esteem of the older person; and, to still give them a needed role in society.

Senator CHURCH. Yes; I am in full accord with that. Let me ask you one further question.

You said earlier in your testimony something that I think bears a great deal of attention, particularly when you consider how government works, how the various bureaucracies work in Washington, and how they come to have clout.

And you said that there seems to be a relationship between the amount of money spent and the amount of clout they have. I think that is true. And obviously the AoA has very little of either—money or clout.

And so some people who are interested in trying to help in the field of the elderly have suggested that we ought to try and pull together the services that are rendered to the elderly under one umbrella that has both money and clout.

And in that connection, Wilbur Cohen, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has made an interesting proposal concerning where to locate the AoA in the Federal structure.

I'd like to read you the proposal and then ask you for your own reaction to it.

WILBUR COHEN: TRANSFER AoA OUT OF SRS

Mr. Cohen writes, in a letter to me:

I believe the Administration on Aging should be taken out of the Social and Rehabilitative Services. There are three alternative locations which should be explored.

(a) Transferring the AoA to the Social Security Administration and making the Commissioner of Social Security the Commissioner of Social Security and Aging.

(b) Transferring the AoA to the Secretary's Office and placing it under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services.

(c) Transferring it to the Secretary's office and placing it under the supervision of the Under Secretary.

Could I have your reaction, as a final comment, to those proposals?

Mr. CHASKES. I would say that it should be directly in the Secretary's office. I say, even more strongly perhaps, that it should be in the Executive Office, with a meaningful relationship between the director. I mean kind of a Kissinger for the elderly. Somebody that has that kind of a relationship with the President. [Applause.]

If I can take just 1 more minute. We met on October 17 and 18, 1970, here in Washington with the National Planning Committee for the White House Conference. And on the Sunday that that meeting was due to break up, a young gentleman came in and Mr. Martin introduced him as being from the White House staff. His name was Morgan. He came from Arizona.

Mr. Martin said that the White House was going to create a National Domestic Council, akin to the National Security Council, which would advise the administration on domestic affairs and on the need for various programs.

Mr. Martin said that this man, Mr. Morgan, would represent our interests on this Domestic Council.

The question that came to my mind directly was, my gosh, why isn't John Martin representing us if he is Special Assistant to the President of the United States on the elderly?

This young man got up and talked for about 5 or 10 minutes, and told us what the concept of the Domestic Council was. And, then he ended his talk by saying "that he would be glad to answer any questions, but please don't ask him any questions about aging unless we wanted to see a grown man decimated."

That was the cruelest blow of all. Here was the man that was supposed to represent the needs of the elderly on a domestic council, acknowledging before God and the world that he knew nothing about aging.

"Please don't ask me any questions about aging, unless you want to see a grown man decimated." And that's an exact quote.

And so I think it points out why we need a strong focal point for the elderly.

Senator CHURCH. Thank you very much, Charles.

Mr. CHASKES. Thank you, Senator.

Senator CHURCH. I want to acknowledge the presence of Senator Eagleton who has joined us this morning. Senator Eagleton and I

are conducting a new experiment. He is a member of the Committee on Aging, but he is also the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the aging on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

We are combining the functions of the two—his being a legislative committee and this committee being a fact-finding committee—and thus we are trying to focus consideration on this matter in that way.

I am happy to welcome you, Senator Eagleton.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CHURCH. Our next witness is Mr. Hobart Jackson, president of the National Caucus on Black Aged. Mr. Jackson, we are happy to welcome you this morning.

You may proceed and then we will have questions.

STATEMENT OF HOBART JACKSON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CAUCUS ON BLACK AGED

Mr. JACKSON. I am Hobart Jackson, administrator of the Stephen Smith Geriatric Center of Philadelphia, and chairman of the National Caucus on Black Aged. I shall address myself in rather general terms to two major issues being discussed this morning, an evaluation of the Administration on Aging, and an evaluation of the conduct of the White House Conference on Aging to date.

First of all, I believe it has to be recognized that the current funding of the Administration on Aging, in the amount of \$32 million, is woefully inadequate to do the job at the Federal level that needs to be done, in behalf of elderly persons in this country.

The system, in my opinion, is already an impoverished one; and, to even contemplate cuts in an already impoverished system seems, to me, to be most inappropriate.

We must face, more squarely, the fact that if we expect to get services to people, we are going to have to pay for them. No amount of rhetoric and restructuring can replace the need for adequate funding.

Structure can only facilitate ultimate delivery of services when adequate funding and resources are available.

I think one of the difficulties that we encounter with an impoverished system is that it encourages us to want to restructure it periodically—without regard to the lack of needed commitment, will, and financial resources to do the job.

Certainly it's very difficult to generate much enthusiasm around structural changes alone. Perhaps the most devastating aspects of the impoverished system within the Administration on Aging shows up in the lives of those who are aged, black, and poor—in the ultimate jeopardy that they encounter in their daily lives.

If we are really serious, then, about doing something substantial for for older persons, a good start would be to appropriate at least the amount of the congressional authorization—\$105 million—rather than making a cut in the 1971 appropriations of \$32 million.

I do not consider the \$105 million a substantial appropriation, in light of the many needs of the impoverished elderly of this country, but it at least would be a start.

The Administration on Aging has never really been a viable part of the Federal Government, and never will be until adequately funded.

Incidentally, I think the 10-percent increase in Social Security bene-

fits is woefully inadequate; and, the 5-percent increase for persons 72 years of age and over—that were not technically covered by the system—an even worse indication of our lack of commitment in this country to older people—especially the elderly poor.

This kind of an increase does not even begin to give them any kind of a genuine choice among opportunities available to them; and it most certainly does not begin to meet their most basic and fundamental needs.

I would propose that, by legislative enactment, our Federal Government establish a guaranteed minimum annual income to all persons 65 years of age and over, without regard to that person's previous employment record or current capacity for employment, in the amount of \$6,000 annually, per person, and \$9,000 a couple—with the funds to come from our general revenue.

While I do not see structure as the key to delivery, I am concerned about the organizational changes that have taken place in recent years which seem to have minimized the effectiveness of the Administration on Aging.

INCREASE EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF AGED

I should like to make a couple of proposals that I feel would result in more intensive and comprehensive efforts on behalf of aging Americans, particularly by the various agencies within the Federal and State structure—and hopefully resulting in better balanced and more equitable delivery to the elderly of minority groups.

These two proposals are not by any means all-inclusive, and would need to be expanded. To some extent they represent the thinking expressed in a report, which was never published, of a Task Force on Older Americans during President Johnson's administration. Many more recommendations related to these problems are in that report.

One would be the appointment of a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to provide sustained leadership in helping to develop a much stronger overall policy focus and program coordination among the wide range of Federal agencies that affect the aging; and, to bring about more responsiveness on the part of these agencies to the current and future needs of aging persons, particularly the black and poor.

This office would have continuous and specific responsibility to conduct analyses and evaluations of policies and programs, throughout the Government, that are relevant to the needs of the aged. There is much more detail, of course, that could be spelled out.

Since the Deputy Assistant Director would not have the responsibility of administration of an operating agency, he and his staff would be free—unlike the Administration on Aging—to devote their full energies to the development of overall policy, focus, coordination, and governmentwide responsiveness to the aging.

His position, his visibility, and hopefully his prestige, would make possible the development of effective communications and relationship with the Secretary, and other influential officials within and outside the Department.

It is evident that the large number of Federal and State agencies that operate programs, that are important to the well-being of the elderly, are not really concerned to provide the kind of sustained and

comprehensive approach that is needed for effective efforts in meeting the needs of older Americans.

The entire field of aging is in a period of rapid growth, and development, and change that is characterized by splintered, often overlapping, and uneven development of governmental activities at all levels.

It is extremely important to provide greater focus and emphasis to the many fragments of governmental activity in the field of aging. Because governmental programs tend generally to be organized along functional lines, rather than by age segments, activities affecting any single target population are characteristically scattered throughout the departments.

The proliferation and distribution of responsibilities related to the aging, however, seem even more complicated than others.

EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Proposal No. 2; there should be the development of a measure for achieving more equitable representation, of older Americans and minority groups, on the governing and advisory boards of the Administration on Aging, and State agencies on aging—so that these minorities may participate much more fully in the shaping and direction of State programs.

These State agencies should be required, in my opinion, to revise their State plans to include some definite provision for older persons and members of locally relevant minority groups, at least proportionate to their numbers in the population; but, preferably more than that, because of the multidimensional aspects of the problem, to serve on governing and advisory bodies.

The executive of each State agency should be required to file an annual statement naming the members of the appropriate bodies, and describing the group that each of these members represents or identifies with.

Unfortunately, the goals of the State agency programs in the field of aging tend to be the usual statement of broad objectives—that are quite fashionable among professionals. I feel that these State agency programs could be greatly enriched if the professionals responsible for them were more closely attuned to the needs articulated by older persons and minority groups.

It, at least, would guarantee that the professional staff would be exposed to a wider range of considerations and perspectives in reaching ultimate decisions.

The limitations of formal provisions are recognized; but, nevertheless, such provisions should certainly direct more attention to the needs of the elderly, of minority groups, in a number of States.

The State plans need to be strengthened and revised, and a specific outreach component to minorities should be included. While particular attention should be given to the needs of older blacks and Puerto Ricans; and, in some sections of the country, additional attention is also required for the special needs of Mexican-Americans and Indians. We also need to increase substantially the number of black-trained professionals and paraprofessionals in the field of geriatrics and gerontology, as well as those of other minority groups.

There are certainly many other recommendations that we could make related to the Administration on Aging, but we will now move

on to the consideration of the White House Conference on Aging, because of time limitations, especially relating to the adequacy of the preparations for the conference.

At a January 1971 meeting of the National Caucus on Black Aged, it was decided to prepare a critique of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. This critique is to be developed from materials provided primarily by caucus members, based upon their direct experiences and observations.

To be of timely and constructive service, the critique will be completed and made available to interested parties approximately 3 months prior to the White House Conference on Aging.

We have been able to put together some of the responses received to date, which seem to indicate the following. However, it should be pointed out that our final document may differ from these findings in some respects.

CRITIQUE POINTS OUT SHORTCOMINGS OF WHCA

One, partisan politics have intruded into the White House Conference activities in ways that are considered to be inappropriate, detrimental and confidence-eroding. One of the most frequently stated of all objections was that information about one's political party affiliation, or orientation, was required as a precondition to involvement.

The frequency of this experience suggests a systematic intrusion of politics into activities that are represented to the public to be purely humanitarian or scientific-professional.

Two, the Conference structure has been characterized as overly rigid. As a result, it is felt that the participants have been unable to offer their most potentially useful productive and constructive contributions.

Three, pre-Conference activities have included resentment of the fragmentation into virtually noncommunicating workshops; and a general sense that strong efforts were being made to control both discussion and outcome.

This restructuring tends to rule out sustained searching, and presents the real danger that recommendations will embody mostly platitudinous rhetoric and not real substance.

Despite all of the attention that has seemingly been given to conference structure, many of the actual meetings have been characterized by, or plagued by, failures or breakdown in organization—lack of adequate funding is frequently mentioned as a factor here.

Four, the background materials provided; and, especially the questions asked of participants in the forums and other pre-Conference meetings, have come in for severe criticism.

In essence, members believe that many forms and confused issues have been raised or implied—and perhaps with a preconceived purpose. Frequent objections were made to the relevancy of the qualifications of those who prepared background material for discussion. It was felt that many of them did not approach the problems of the elderly at the appropriate level.

Some of the most severe criticisms pertained to what was viewed as rigid or leading questions.

Five, concern for disadvantaged minorities among the elderly has had only very token and inconsistent representation. This applies both to the background materials and Conference structure, and to the actual representation of minority group aged themselves.

There has been no special emphasis on these specially deprived segments.

On the most general level, members of the caucus seemed to have reached the conclusion that there is a great possibility that the 1971 White House Conference on Aging will not accomplish its stated objectives.

Within the rather general framework of disillusionment, is the more specific concern that the problems of the most disadvantaged elderly will be further away from ultimate solution, or even recognition, if the Conference activities continue on the present course.

Underrepresentation of black Americans, Mexican-Americans, Indians, and other minority groups has been noted by many of our observers. In some cases this has amounted to no representation at all. Few elderly, black participants have been involved, and fewer still among the impoverished group.

Part of the blame for this underrepresentation was laid directly to failure to provide funds, or other assistance, to enable them to come to meetings and make their voices heard.

Formal structuring of the Conference activities and printed materials also grossly neglected those elders, whose jeopardy is increased by both poverty and minority group status.

Six, this is miscellaneous in a sense—erroneous reporting of the numbers of participants in forums have been cited. In one city, only 1,600 participants were apparently tallied but the figure of 2,500 was reported and accepted.

It has also been critically observed that officials have gathered up conference materials and recommendations so quickly that the local people never see them again.

There has been very little chance to revise and refinish. This kind of pressure is resented and its motives are suspected.

It has also been alleged that big name officials in the field of aging often show up and make preliminary statements at the meetings, and then vanish from the scene. They do not listen to the discussions, they do not seem interested in what the participants actually come up with, or actually have to say.

All of this contributes to a feeling, among participants, of being used. Incidentally, we should add, finally, that I served as chairman of the community forums in Philadelphia, Montgomery, and Delaware Counties in Pennsylvania; and, at the Philadelphia Conference, the proposed cuts in the Administration on Aging were announced, and the resentment of these cuts was widespread throughout the 100 or more persons assembled.

FOLLOWUP DOCUMENTATION TO BE AVAILABLE

This very brief sketch will be succeeded soon by a more adequate document setting forth more detail. Before concluding this very preliminary statement, I should like to point out that many of the criticisms applied to the total design and operation of the White House

Conference activities. Our special concern for the black aged has been heightened by the neglect that seems to be characterized in the program up to this point.

Moreover, the process seems not to be effective in many ways, in addition to its failure to address itself emphatically to minority group problems.

I should also point out that many competent and effective people have wrestled bravely with the problems we have described. The somewhat critical nature of this report, of this statement today, is not intended to reflect upon the many participants who have given so much of themselves and worked for the common good; yet, as many of our members noted, it is not surprising that an undertone of skepticism prevails.

The people have not been heard; even if they have spoken, they have not really been heard. Especially the invisible older persons, those who are old, black, and poor, or otherwise handicapped.

Even these doubts fail to dampen the hopes of some participants. They still want to believe that their participation and their efforts have been worthwhile; and, that their study, time and energy will help to bring about an all-out attack on the devastating problems that older Americans face.

There will be discussions tomorrow morning at the National Council on Aging, Seventh Annual Conference of the national organizations, about the special problems of the aging of minority groups; and, I think that this conference will be productive of some kind of additional information that this Committee might like to have.

Our completed critique will appear in the publication "Aging and Human Development," 1971, Volume 2, Number 3, which is currently in preparation.

Thank you.

Senator CHURCH. Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson. I think at this point I might mention that the hearing record will be left open for 2 weeks for any additional comments from witnesses, and that should be communicated to the witnesses we have had earlier, as well as to those we will have tomorrow.

Mr. Jackson, the initial announcement of the establishment of the National Caucus on Black Aged indicated you might conduct your own conference before the White House Conference on Aging.

Have you decided whether or not you will do this?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, there has been a resolution approved, authorizing such a conference. However, a committee has been appointed which is in the process of determining whether this actually, in fact, will take place—and the nature of the conference, et cetera.

So that we cannot really give you any definitive information, but I would say that the possibility of such a conference does exist.

Senator CHURCH. As you know, Mr. Jackson, this committee is preparing a study of the unique problems faced by elderly members of minority groups in the United States today, and we have been appalled by the lack of statistical information related to the problem of minority groups. This involves the blacks, it involves the Mexican-Americans, and the Indians.

And this worries us because it seems to us that the White House Conference on Aging may take place without the benefit of any specific

information directed toward the special problems faced by minority groups.

Have you any suggestions as to how that could be rectified? Perhaps it can't, but we are in need of whatever guidance we can get on this score.

Mr. JACKSON. We are aware of this tremendous gap in information, and we share your concern that information would become available, prior to the White House Conference on Aging, which might be helpful in terms of influencing the recommendations of that conference.

CENSUS DATA LACKING

I can share with you an experience I had just last week. Dr. Jackson, of Duke University, and myself spent an entire day in Washington, a part of it at the Bureau of Census—attempting to see if we could get certain kinds of information applicable to the problems and needs of the black elderly. We were told that we could get it, if we could come up with \$15,000. Apparently the agenda that the Bureau of the Census had for itself would not permit it to do this, unless there were some special funding. And, after some discussion of how we might get this money, it was finally suggested that maybe we could go back to the Administration on Aging and talk with them about transferring some funds from one Federal agency to another. Well, of course, that was not productive of the resources to do this. So at the present time we are still attempting to come up with the necessary funding to try to get the information.

Senator CHURCH. I hope you keep in touch with this committee.¹ Perhaps we can find some ways to be helpful. I hope so.

Senator Eagleton.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one question that I will put to Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON, in your prepared statement you alluded to, as one of your criticisms of the planning process for the White House Conference, the interposition of political screening. Messrs. Cruikshank and Hutton testified last week on that same general subject matter.

POLITICAL SCREENING CRIPPLING WHCA?

Could you spell out for the record, in somewhat more specific detail, what information you have as to the nature of the political screening process, how it manifests itself, how far-reaching it is, whether it is an isolated hit-or-miss thing that you have stumbled on occasionally, or thorough and far reaching and pervasive? Just greater elaboration, if you could, on that point.

Mr. JACKSON. I really don't know, Senator, how widespread it is. I will just say that many of our own members have reported this. Now we expect to have the critique that we are developing fully documented, but at this time I really am not in a position to give you definitive information.

Senator EAGLETON. When do you think you will have this critique?

Mr. JACKSON. It will be ready 3 months prior to the White House Conference. We expect to have it published at the publication center

¹ See app. 1, item 1, p. 163.

in the Human Development Institute of Wayne State University.

Senator EAGLETON. And by fully documented, you mean names, occasions, specific details as to the nature of this activity?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, that will not appear in the published report. I am saying it will be documented in our files.

Senator EAGLETON. And will your files be made available to this committee or could they be made available to this committee in this regard?

Mr. JACKSON. I will have to get clearance with caucus members for that.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, I will ask at this time, for the record, if you will ask your board of directors or other governing body with whom you must consult to give you authority to divulge to us such specific details to back up the allegation that you have made.²

Mr. JACKSON. I will be glad to.

Senator CHURCH. I think that Senator Eagleton touches upon a point that has been of concern to this committee, and I think it has been a concern to all the members regardless of their party affiliation, because we have had testimony prior to your own that some kind of political test has been involved in determining who will participate in this White House Conference on the Elderly. Now if that is so, we want to get to the basis of it. Perhaps it means that the administration has no interest in minorities, that they want this to be a White House Conference for the Republican Elderly. But we think that any kind of political means test would be quite inappropriate, quite wrong, and if there is any basis for concern on this score we want to get to the root of it.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, we will be happy—certainly I will be happy to cooperate personally, but I would have to, as I say, get clearance as far as the overall documentation is concerned.

Senator CHURCH. Fine. Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson.

Our next witnesses are Dr. Herbert Shore and the Rev. William T Eggers, who will appear together and who are representing the American Association of Homes for the Aged.

Gentlemen, in the interest of time—it is 11:30 now—if it is convenient for you to summarize any prepared statement that you have so we will have more time for questions that would be helpful, with the understanding, of course, that the full statement will appear in the record and will thus be available to other members of the committee and be published as a part of the hearing.

STATEMENT OF DR. HERBERT SHORE, PAST PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF HOMES FOR THE AGED

Dr. SHORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to summarize most of it. It is a brief statement. However, since some of the things I allude to in my presentation were in the nature of questions to Mr. Jackson and to Mr. Chaskes perhaps I will stay with that part of the text.

I am Dr. Herbert Shore, the executive director of the Dallas, Texas Home and Hospital for Jewish Aged, a nonprofit, denominationally sponsored, long-term care facility.

² As of press time, Mr. Jackson had not received clearance to release the information.

I have been past president of the American Association of Homes for the Aging, and past president of the National Association of Jewish Homes for the Aged, serving now as its executive vice president.

As adjunct professor of sociology, I serve as a member of the faculty and director of field instruction at the Center for Studies on Aging, North Texas State University, Denton, Tex.—one of the programs supported by title V, AoA, and have been practitioner-in-residence and lecturer in the residential institutes of the Institute of Gerontology, University of Michigan, also sponsored by title V, AoA.

I have served as a member of the Technical Review Committee for title IV—Research and Demonstration Grants—for 2 years. I am a member of the Technical Review Committee for title III—Grants of the Governor's Committee on Aging—in Texas.

I have had a direct contact with each of the functional titles of the Administration on Aging at the local, State, and national level.

I am honored at this opportunity to appear before you; and consider it a privilege to share my views on the questions to which you are addressing your inquiry today.

AGING PROGRAMS APPEAR CONTRADICTORY

If one were asked to describe the present situation as it pertains to the aging program, I believe it would be characterized as contradictory. There are many illustrations of this, but there are a few I would like to discuss.

The first relates to the expressed purposes and lofty ideals of the White House Conference planned for later this year. We are told that the goal of the White House Conference is to evolve a national policy on aging. This implies that there is no present policy; that one may be identified and followed in the future. The facts, however, belie this goal. There is, in fact, a policy being pursued by the Government—the disastrous reductions in funds proposed in the budget; the dismantling of the Administration on Aging and its programs, and the fragmentation of aging efforts by absorption in SRS and the regional offices. The simple truth is that the present policy toward aging, and the hope that the Older Americans Act held out, is one of destruction and dismemberment. There is a national policy toward aging and aging programs, a policy that is in direct contradiction to congressional intent and congressional authorization.

There is a policy that not only has not moved forward with new money, new support, new vigor and hope, but has created a state of confusion and of reduction.

The structure of the White House Conference and the series of serious delays, of lack of direction and guidelines, the financing of the Conference with funds designed for other purposes rather than employing new financing—all these things together raise questions as to the real role and function of the Conference. The plan, perhaps as originally conceived, sounded good, but there is increasing evidence that the Conference has been programed in such an esoteric and sophisticated way as to obviate against real recommendations emerging. The intellectual "issues" to be discussed may well be one of the most remote exercises designed to avoid dealing with true needs and immediate remedial legislative redress.

Mr. Jackson commented at some length on this point, and some questions that Senator Eagleton asked about—I reinforce it by saying, aging is a process and phenomenon that is nonpartisan. Large numbers of experts and knowledgeable leaders have not been able to participate—because they have not checked out at the ward level. The formula being proffered that would limit professional delegates from each State to one-fourth of the representatives is another indication of control of the possible input; and, perhaps, fear of the potential outcome.

The year that older people spoke to the Nation had a pleasant promise. But has anybody been listening? The best way we can demonstrate our good faith would be to strengthen the Federal activities and programs, strengthen the Administration on Aging, and listen to the wishes of Congress.

If the budget cuts are not restored, or even increased, it will really be a ludicrous circumstance when the White House Conference is held; to say that we care about our senior citizens and prove it by destroying ever tangible evidence of our support—this is a cruel hoax, a Kafka-like contradiction.

Another example of the blatant contradiction and inconsistency relates to title V of the AoA, which provides for education and training.

Public Law 90-248 of the Social Security Act and amendments passed by the Congress requires that States using title XIX (Medicaid) payments in nursing homes must have a method for assuring that the administrators of such homes are licensed. The congressional intent of licensing is to insure better care, higher standards, a better life for the elderly. Administrators must provide evidence that they can meet the tests of character, suitability, experience, education, and training. The need for trained administrators has been well established through the significant hearing of this Senate committee.

The network of training programs, particularly on the graduate level, developed through the title V, AoA funds, held greatest promise for producing the kind of leadership—trained qualified professional personnel that could meet the demands of the licensing laws. That could turn out a cadre of professionals who could train others—who could influence the quality of care for the present and coming generations of aged.

TRAINING STANDS IN JEOPARDY

I believe an excellent start has been made. The programs are underway and are just beginning to have the payoff expected of them. Yet, every one stands in jeopardy, in a state of suspension, confusion, and increasing disillusionment. We must support all training programs.

How can we, in good faith and in good conscience, on the one hand support the need for qualified trained administrators; and, then act in such a contradictory fashion by emaciating the very source that can produce qualified personnel.

In "Aging," the journal of the Administration on Aging, HEW, April 1969, there is reported a nongovernmental survey that indicates that up to a million trained persons will be needed in this field within 10 years.

The training programs so carefully planned and developed under Dr. Clark Tibbitts' guidance have been most creative, innovative,

imaginative, and productive. Thus, more than 11 different occupational areas were reached, some for the very first time, in a variety of approaches that ranged from degree programs to undergraduate education, short courses, and development of training materials.

I have had the privilege of being related to the excellent program for training administrators of multipurpose, long-term care facilities and programs in aging at North Texas State University, directed by a distinguished sociologist and gerontologist, Dr. Hiram J. Friedsam, since its inception. From my direct involvement I have seen the ready response on the part of our students and the field to assume positions of direct service and leadership.

You may be interested in knowing that in our very first class of graduates they are now doing the following :

One of them directs a large Methodist complex in Galveston;

One of them directs a residential home in Atlanta;

One of them directs a home for aged in New Jersey;

A fourth is consultant and director of training for a national chain of nursing homes;

Another is director of a group of homes in Fort Worth for some of the minority underprivileged groups;

Another is a staff director of programs on aging for a community planning council;

Another is research director for a home in Dallas;

Another is administrator of a Catholic home in St. Louis;

Another is director of a home serving the inner-city aged in Brooklyn;

Another is teaching gerontology in a junior college in the Virgin Islands;

And another is planning director for a State agency in Mississippi.

These are individuals who have already made significant contributions. One authored a manual on developing volunteer programs that has had a wide distribution.

We have a greater demand for the placement of our student interns and for our graduates than we can now produce. Our program has already won widespread recognition. We have developed some useful and innovative training materials and methodologies.

Yet, the suggested budget cut threatens the future of all these needed programs. For the very first time we can train people to serve the aged; but, we do not know how to plan or proceed with future candidates for the program.

PRESENT COURSE WILL DESTROY TITLE III

The proposed cutbacks will virtually destroy the most significant program of direct services to the aged, through the title III program. At a time when we need more information and services for the aged, the reduction and redirection will eliminate meaningful and tangible services.

In my own State, we have had a variety of services created in rural as well as urban centers. The suggestion that title III funds be used—and this is the point related to the question directed to Mr. Chaskes—the suggestion that title III funds be used for “areawide projects”

is another example of the contradiction in present policy. From information available to me, title III grants can only be used for comprehensive areawide projects related to services in the model cities; yet, I am told that HUD plans to phase out the services to model cities in the next 9 months (another Catch 22?).

We see a great potential for title III, projects, but they need to be enlarged and expanded. We have developed excellent methods of evaluating these projects and they are among the best services developed in our State.

Of course, the Foster Grandparent program that I am familiar with at Denton has been one of the most successful in the Nation. Yet, there is a suggested reduction in funds for this program, and another snipping away from AoA.

The research and demonstration grants of title IV led to identifying many important areas of national concern and priority, nutrition and transportation, to cite two. Yet, title IV has been completely subsumed. The aged who could be helped by these studies deserve better than the present policy of cut, plunder, and destroy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On behalf of the American Association of Homes for the Aging, that I represent, may I summarize our position on the issues being explored today:

1. Restore, support, and upgrade the organization, structure, position and function of the Administration on Aging, as legislated by the Congress in the Older Americans Act.

2. Insure a realistic budget for the AoA to include not less than:

- For State planning and services—\$25 million;

- For research and development—\$5 million.

- For education and training—\$5 million;

- Restore the cuts for the Foster Grandparent programs;

- Fund the \$5 million for RSVP and keep it in the Administration on Aging;

- Prevent the lumping together of Administration on Aging funds with SRS funds—so these can be properly identified.

3. Open up the White House Conference to really deal with substantive issues, with new approaches to developing programs; discard the complicated and complex, "mishmash" now proposed; come to grips with the problems of the aged poor (income), with the minority groups, with health insurance, and nutrition.

4. Extend and fund the OAA when it expires in 1972 with priorities in direct services and training; establish the appropriate commission or task force to define national goals and priorities to improve the quality of life for the aging.

5. Face up to the present planned dismemberment and dismantling of the AoA and restore it to its place of leadership in aging.

TRAINING FUNDING MUST BE EXPANDED

In the final analysis two points stand out as most important and significant.

First, that the proposed cuts in training in all SRS programs should not only be restored, but expanded; aging training programs should

not have to compete with vocational rehabilitation and community services. These are all necessary. The issue is not which is to be cut, but rather the cuts at all.

The second point is an extension of the first. There is only one agency with a specific mission to concern itself with aging. The crucial issue is the role and future of the Administration on Aging. If this agency is restored to its original function as the Congress intended in the Older Americans Act—if the last gain of the White House Conference of 1961 is not surrendered—if the hope of the aged for the help they need and the help generated through titles II, III, IV, and V is not sacrificed—then all the rest will follow.

The aim of our efforts is to make the later years more secure, abundant and happy, rather than the mere lengthening of life. It would seem that destroying the major vehicle in our Government, the Administration on Aging—charged with responsibility to alleviate burdens of the lives of those already fraught with anxiety, already empty and bitter—is just another pathetic and ironic contradiction of our society.

Thank you.

I believe Mr. Eggers has some testimony.

Senator CHURCH. Thank you, Dr. Shore.

Reverend Eggers, do you have a statement you would like to make?

**STATEMENT OF REV. WILLIAM T. EGGERS, PAST PRESIDENT,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF HOMES FOR THE AGED**

Reverend EGGERS. I am William T. Eggers of Wauwatosa, Wis., the administrator for the Home of Aged Lutherans in Wauwatosa, a suburb of Milwaukee. I am the immediate past president of the American Association of Homes for the Aging.

My observations this morning are a supplement to the material just presented by Dr. Herbert Shore, the content of which I concur with fully.

WHCA POSITION PAPERS NOT DISTRIBUTED

To summarize some of the points made in my formal remarks: I have some statements concerning the fact that key position papers on the White House Conference material have not yet been distributed; some remarks on the funding of the Conference, which is something of a repetition of the testimony of other witnesses. The statement also contains another observation to the effect that long-term care is a vital concern of aging people.

But, so far in the Conference process, the American Association of Homes for the Aging, the membership organization of nonprofit homes in the Nation, has not had any substantial input into the Conference. We have not been involved, and it does not appear at this time that there will be any substantial input from our association into the Conference.

The second group of comments support the position that has been enunciated with respect to AoA. We believe that it should continue to be a separate agency, it should be adequately funded, and it should continue to administer the titles with which it was originally charged.

Moreover, the association strongly urges Congress to make AoA the central agency on behalf of the older people of this country, per-

forming the following functions: Gathering information necessary for all of the major policy decisions which have to be made; being, or serving as, the creative "think tank" which has the United States policy on aging constantly under review, in a creative manner, and which maintains an overview of all of the public affairs of the older people in this country. This does not mean that the association favors that all programs for the aging be under the direct supervision and control of AoA, but rather that these programs, scattered as they are through various Government agencies, be under the constant review of knowledgeable personnel serving AoA.

Dr. Shore has commented on the proposed budgetary cutbacks in the various titles dealing with aging. May I supplement his remarks in the area of cutbacks in education and training? When the question first rose as an issue in this country, the American Association of Homes for the Aging took the position that one of the least expensive ways of implementing good care in long-term care facilities was the licensing of their administrators. The association believed, and still believes, that a growing core of professionally trained administrators of these facilities will substantially help to eliminate the poor care in many facilities—which, today, still unfortunately creates newspaper headlines. It believes that men who have been provided with professional knowledge in an educational program, and who have been exposed to an ethical approach to the care of older people, will immeasurably add stature to the whole field and assist in upgrading the care.

The association, therefore, supported the licensing of administrators, and supported the various educational training programs for administrators at universities across the country.

CUTBACKS CREATE INEFFICIENCY

Cutbacks in funds for this program under title V will not only, as the projections show, almost halve the numbers of students participating in programs, but will also create inefficiency. Inefficiencies will result from the fact that it will be impossible for cutbacks to take place within the faculties of these training centers; the only possible effect will be to lower the number of students participating in the programs at the various schools. This means that, with the same overhead expenses, the programs will be beneficial to a smaller number of students because fewer stipends will be available.

The association also points out that it has been extremely difficult for these schools to create short-term training programs to upgrade the knowledge and training of administrators already serving institutions, who though they have passed the minimum licensing requirements, nevertheless need additional training. I would join with Dr. Shore, therefore, in urging that for the sake of the care of our older people in general and for the sake of the efficient use of Federal funds, his budget proposals be given serious consideration. The committee might even consider the wisdom of expanding this budgetary item beyond what he has proposed.

We thank you for the opportunity to address you on these matters so vital to the older people of our Nation.

(The prepared statement follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REV. WILLIAM T. EGGERS

I am William T. Eggers of Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, the Administrator for the Home of Aged Lutherans in Wauwatosa, a suburb of Milwaukee. I am the Immediate Past President of the American Association of Homes for the Aging.

My observations this morning are a supplement to the material just presented by Dr. Herbert Shore, the content of which I concur with fully.

To the statement which the Association has made through Dr. Shore on the White House Conference, the following statements should be added. It is difficult to understand that with the Conference only relatively few months away, key position papers have not as yet been distributed to those who would be intimately concerned with the contents of the Conference. It would seem that a Conference of this magnitude on so vital an issue should have more timely and adequate preparation than it presently has; and it would be the hope of the Association that these key papers would be released immediately.

It is further the position of the Association that the funding for the Conference has been somewhat belated and inadequate. Since the thrust has been to involve representative older people in substantial numbers, people whose incomes often do not permit the luxury of attendance at meetings like this; it would seem in the best interests of the aging of the country that more adequate funding could have been made available and even could be made available for Conference participants.

Moreover, long term care is a vital concern to aging people. So far in the Conference process, the American Association of Homes for the Aging, the membership organization of nonprofit Homes in the nation, has not had any substantial input into the Conference. We have not been involved and it does not appear at this time that there will be any substantial input from our Association into the Conference.

My second group of comments concern themselves with the Administration on Aging, its current budgetary proposals concerning it and its future. Our own Association of nonprofit Homes is fully persuaded that AoA should be a separate agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and that it should be adequately funded to carry out the functions that will be listed subsequently in this testimony. The history of AoA leads one logically to the question: When Congress speaks, who listens? The Association believes that AoA should continue to administer the titles with which it was originally charged. Moreover, the Association strongly urges Congress to make AoA the central agency on behalf of the older people of this country performing the following functions: gathering information necessary for all of the major policy decisions which have to be made, being or serving as the creative "think tank" which has the United States policy on aging constantly under review in a creative manner and which maintains an over-view of all of the public affairs of the older people in this country. This does not mean that the Association favors that all programs for the aging be under the direct supervision and control of AoA, but that rather these programs, scattered as they are through various government agencies, be under the constant review of knowledgeable personnel serving AoA. In brief, I think the Association is saying that AoA should be the voice of the aging within the federal government, and I would quote the Secretary of HEW, Elliot Richardson, concerning the "frustrating experience of those who earnestly wish to implement national purposes but are blocked by the compartmentalization of federal funding." What the Secretary has noted is most applicable to the affairs of the aging.

Dr. Shore has commented on the proposed budgetary cutbacks in the various titles dealing with aging. May I supplement his remarks in the area of cutbacks in education and training. When the question first rose as an issue in this country, the American Association of Homes for the Aging took the position that one of the least expensive ways of implementing care in long-term care facilities was the licensing of their administrators. The Association believed and still believes that a growing core of professionally trained administrators of these facilities will substantially help to eliminate the poor care in many facilities, which today still unfortunately creates newspaper headlines. It believes that men who have been provided with professional knowledge in an educational program and who have been exposed to an ethical approach to the care of older people will immeasurably add stature to the whole field.

The Association therefore supported the licensing of administrators and supported the various educational training programs for administrators at universities across the country.

Cutbacks in funds for this program under Title V will not only, as the projections show, almost halve the numbers of students participating in programs, but will also create inefficiency. Inefficiencies will result from the fact that it will be impossible for cutbacks to take place within the faculties of these training centers: the only possible effect will be to lower the number of students participating in the programs at the various schools. The situation will be that the same overhead expenses will be beneficial to a smaller number of students.

The Association also points out that it has been extremely difficult for these schools to create short-term training programs to upgrade the knowledge and training of administrators already serving institutions, who though they have passed the minimum licensing requirements, nevertheless need additional training. I would join with Dr. Shore, therefore, in urging that for the sake of the care of our older people in general and for the sake of the efficient use of federal funds, his budget proposals be given serious consideration. The Committee might even consider the wisdom of expanding this budgetary item beyond what he has proposed.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you on these matters, so vital to the older people of our nation.

Senator CHURCH. Thank you very much, Reverend Eggers.

Dr. Shore, as you know, there has been a recent transfer of the components of the training program from AoA to the SRS regional offices. What do you think the effect of that transfer is likely to be on the training programs under title V?

Dr. SHORE. Well, it is very hard to evaluate it, Senator, because the people in the regional offices tell us that they really are shuffling papers, the applications for the continuing grant proposals, etc., come through the regional office, but policy and anything that has to do with funding commitments still await word from Washington. And so there is a hiatus.

We, for example, plan to admit a new group of students. We think that we will have sufficient funds for the first year of their training. But it is really a very unfair situation to the students and to the school and to the faculty to not be in a position to know whether or not this program will be funded in the second year. And the people in the regional offices can't tell us, and the people in Washington don't tell us.

So I really don't think that it really has made any difference. It is a maneuver that, in my opinion, creates further confusion and delay.

DO CUTBACKS RESULT IN FALSE ECONOMY?

Senator CHURCH. You know—very often in the name of saving money—we make cuts that in the end prove all the more costly. There are so many examples of that, that I needn't belabor them. But it occurred to me in listening to your testimony that we could cut back on AoA training for nursing home administrators and in the end only increase the Federal expenditure for Medicare and Medicaid and that kind of thing. Would you agree with that?

Dr. SHORE. Yes, sir.

Senator CHURCH. Do you think the two are related in the overall cost to the Government of these programs?

Dr. SHORE. That is a very astute observation. Unfortunately, what will happen is that as we do not turn out qualified trained personnel, not only those who administer the programs, but who have the commitment to the professional care of people, you are going to have to increase the policing force, so that you are going to have more and more inspections and more and more agencies coming in to see whether

or not some of the other fellow programs are being met, and you are going to have to fund greater expenditures to have inspection for titles 18 and 19, and State and Federal, and so forth, which means massive confusion and massive waste of time.

All of it gets away from the real care of the older person. I think your point is very well taken.

Mr. ZELENIKA. Senator, could I add a comment to that?

Senator CHURCH. Yes. This is Mr. Zelenka, whom I neglected to introduce when you first came to the table, but I am happy to have your comments.

Mr. ZELENIKA. This committee, you know, was involved in a tremendous struggle on the Moss amendments which called for higher standards in the nursing staff and skilled nursing homes under title 19, and several studies exist that show that in those facilities the staff themselves were trained personnel. Even though the payroll cost of those particular facilities was greater than that of the facilities, for example, using the practical nurse the overall cost of operation was substantially less, and could only be attributed to the use of trained personnel.

And so any effort, say, to cut training on the rationale that we would rather cut training than services is false, because there is a direct link between trained personnel and economic and efficient operation.

Reverend EGGERS. I might add to that also. I have had the opportunity of having one of the students of the North Texas program serve as intern in my facility for a 9-month period—I think it was—and the program therefore is not only a theoretical, but a very practical program which gives the students the opportunity to gain actual practice in the facility. This is rewarding to him and rewarding to the facility at which it takes place, and certainly of great consequence to the future.

Senator CHURCH. Gentlemen, we appreciate your testimony very much this morning. Thank you for coming.

Our next witness is Mr. Thomas Walters, President of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS WALTERS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES; ACCOMPANIED BY ARTHUR L. SPARKS, DIRECTOR OF FIELD OPERATIONS

Mr. WALTERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am accompanied this morning by Mr. Arthur L. Sparks, the director of field operations of our organization. And, with your permission, I would like to file a statement and then, due to the shortness of time, give you one or two high points.

Senator CHURCH. Good. That will be appreciated. Your prepared statement will appear in the record.³

Mr. WALTERS. Thank you, sir.

We, as all other people who made a study of this type of work, certainly realize that the problems affecting our elderly and retired population cannot help but affect the entire Nation, both economically and socially. And today we are told that approximately 20 million people are in that senior citizen age group, and that there will be at least 40

³ See p. 151.

million within the next few years. And, of course, the greater number of people—this is brought about by people living longer and retiring earlier, and things of that nature—the more your problem is going to increase rather than decrease, especially as it affects the elderly citizens of this country.

We are deeply distressed by the administration's 1972 fiscal year budget requested for the Older Americans Act; especially as it affects the local projects under title III, and the successful Foster Grandparent program. It is my feeling that the only standard for success of any program involving person-to-person contact—such as Foster Grandparent, Meals on Wheels, and Senior Citizen Centers—is the manner in which these programs work at the local community level. All the research and development in the world, and any good program they can theorize, does no good whatsoever—unless it can be successfully established at the local level where the people are involved.

And we certainly hope and trust that this committee will, at least, give a strong paper recommending that the administration's proposals not be accepted by the proper committees that will handle the appropriation of this money.

In comparing the authorized funding and the budget request for the Administration on Aging, and then noting the expanding budget requests for other Federal units; I can only conclude that the administration is hiding its head in the sand—instead of facing the already existing problems of the elderly, and the effect of these problems on the Nation.

Now, last Saturday we attended a meeting, at the Mayflower Hotel, of the planning board for the President's Committee on Aging; and I think this statement that I have just made, relative to the recommendation of the reduction in funds, was one of the great fears that was in the minds of most of the people who were at this meeting. And we certainly hope that AoA will not become somewhat of a stepchild. In other words, it is our opinion that it should be increased with the prestige and power and with authority to act.

VOLUNTEERS NEED TRANSPORTATION AND LUNCH

We have long sought to have our members become active in local volunteer projects; but we often get the answer that they simply don't have the money—for transportation and lunches, which comes about with volunteer service.

Now we know this is true, because more than two-thirds of all the members and survivors, under the Federal Retirement System, receive less than the so-called poverty wage of \$3,000 a year. And many of these thousands of people would like to do the work; if they could just find some way to get expense money. They are capable, able physically, and trained in their life's work. So, we think we are losing a great opportunity to get the services of these people, who served this Government so well, just because we are somewhat penny-pinching—and not furnishing any money for transportation and lunches, and so forth.

We strongly oppose the idea of these programs for the elderly, being taken out from under the direct jurisdiction of the Administration on Aging—and swallowed up in the mass of other programs in HEW. These programs are not, and should not be treated as, wel-

fare programs. Anyone dealing with the elderly knows that they are extremely proud, and definitely shy away from anything which may bear a connotation of welfare.

The Administration on Aging should have full authority and responsibility for any and all programs which deal solely with the older American. I believe this was the original intent of Congress; and, I am personally convinced that this is the only way we can give the required amount of study and action to the well-being of the elderly. We all know, from past experience, that when various programs are sloughed off from the original position to a secondary position—it is usually just the first step toward total deletion of the program.

We certainly recommend strongly, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee do whatever they think is best to persuade the Congress to increase these moneys, rather than reduce them; especially the programs that directly touch the men and women who make up this great group of American citizens. I believe that we are all proud of their accomplishments through life, and would like to see them spend their last days as pleasantly as possible.

Mr. Sparks and I will be happy to attempt to answer any questions that you might have in mind; and, we appreciate this privilege of appearing, and congratulate you and your staff on holding these hearings.

(The prepared statement follows.)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THOMAS G. WALTERS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Thomas G. Walters, President of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees, an Association composed exclusively of persons retired from the Federal and District of Columbia Governments and their survivors. I am speaking on behalf of our some 144,000 members throughout the 50 States, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

As a member of the Executive Committee of the Planning Board for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, I am pleased with the amount and quality of background and planning work which has thus far been accomplished toward securing a well-organized and productive Conference scheduled for November 1971. Hundreds of dedicated men and women from throughout the country have already given hours of their time and the benefit of their experience toward making the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, a meeting which will be able to come forth with constructive, practicable proposals for the betterment of financial and social conditions for this country's Senior Citizens.

At this time, my fears are not that the White House Conference itself will be unsuccessful in establishing a program of priority needs for the elderly, but that the establishment of the program might become the end result of the Conference, due to inadequate action and funding needed for its realization.

We certainly all realize that problems affecting our elderly and retired population cannot help but affect the entire nation, both economically and socially, especially when we realize that there are 20 million Americans included in this group which continues to increase yearly due to longer life spans, earlier retirements, etc. We should also remember in considering the scope of these problems that when speaking of "Retirees" we are speaking of a group which used to be considered as persons over 60 or 65. Social and economic factors are now lowering the ages of "retirees" to the 50-55 year olds, bringing the number of persons in this group closer to the 40 million mark. When dealing with this large a percentage of our entire population, sufficient programs must be set up and acted upon.

I am deeply distressed by the Administration's 1972 fiscal year budget requested for the Older Americans Act, especially as it affects the local projects under title III and the successful Foster Grandparents program. It is my feeling that the only standard for success of any program involving person-to-person contact, such as Foster Grandparents, meals on wheels, and Senior

Citizen Centers, is the manner in which these programs work at the local community level. All the research and development in the world, and any good program they can theorize, does no good whatsoever, unless it can be successfully established at the local level where the people are involved. To cut back funding on the Foster Grandparents program, which has proven itself useful to both the young and old involved, and to reduce funds for community grants, in many cases causing abolishment of successfully working programs, seems to be an outright effort to backtrack steps we have already taken forward.

My major complaint with the Administration on Aging in the past has been that the majority of ideas and solutions to existing problems have been set forth and publicized on paper, but little concrete action is taken to put these ideas into practice. Now we see that they apparently want to set back the programs which have been established and advance new "paper principles."

In comparing the authorized funding and the budget request for the Administration on Aging, and then noting the expanding budget requests for other Federal units, I can only conclude that the Administration is hiding its head in the sand instead of facing the already existing problems of the elderly, and the effect of these problems on the Nation. I can then only stress the need for Congress to significantly increase the funding for the Older American Act when it acts on fiscal 1972 appropriations. Unless this funding is substantially increased, we shall lose much of what we have gained in the past and the results of the White House Conference on Aging will be totally useless.

I was pleased to note the proposed increase in funding for the retired seniors volunteer program, RSVP, as it has long been my contention that the two major problems facing the retired and elderly are inadequate finances, and loneliness. A successful RSVP program would aid both of these problems to some extent, by giving the elderly an opportunity to become involved in volunteer work and thus make contact with other persons, and at the same time reimbursing him for the personal expenses incurred by this work. We have long sought to have our NARFE members become active in local volunteer projects, but we often get the answer that they simply don't have the money for transportation and lunches which comes about with volunteer service. RSVP is dealing with this problem.

I strongly oppose the idea of these programs for the elderly—RSVP, Foster Grandparents, etc.—being taken out from under the direct jurisdiction of the Administration on Aging and swallowed up in the mass of other programs in HEW. These programs are not, and should not be treated as "Welfare" programs. Anyone dealing with the elderly knows that they are extremely proud and definitely shy away from anything which may bear a connotation of "welfare."

The Administration on Aging should have full authority and responsibility for any and all programs which deal solely with the Older American. I believe this was the original intent of Congress and I am personally convinced that this is the only way we can give the required amount of study and action to the well being of the elderly. We all know from past experience that when various programs are sloughed off from the original position to a secondary position, it is usually just the first step toward total deletion of the program.

The Older Americans Act must definitely be extended when it expires in 1972, but the Administration on Aging must at the same time be upgraded and extended, with action taken to secure its position as a major unit within the framework of the Federal Government. I do not feel the question of "where" the AoA is seated as important as "what" its authority entails.

I trust that this Committee will report a supporting position on increasing 1972 appropriations for the Administration on Aging and establishing the Administration as a separate Federal unit with exclusive authority on the problems of the Aged.

Senator CHURCH. Thank you very much for your statement.

I have one or two questions. One element of the Social Security program that has bothered me very much is the so-called retirement test. Now you are the president of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees—

Mr. WALTERS. Yes, sir.

Senator CHURCH. And these Federal employees receive their retirement income, whatever it might be—you have mentioned that it is very modest for most—but once they are entitled to their retirement,

once they have served their time in the Government they get their retirement income even if they choose to take some other position, work at something else if their health still permits them. Isn't that true?

PAST RETIREES NEED AUXILIARY COMPENSATION

Mr. WALTERS. Yes; that is true. But, up until about 10 or 15 years ago it wasn't common practice for Federal employees to take other assignments. In fact, it has been true during the years past that it was frowned on by the administration in power—taking another position. And the people that are hurting worst, financially, are the people who retired 10, 15, 20, and 25 years ago, Senator, and had no opportunity for Social Security and were too old when it came about to get any coverage; and, therefore, they are the so-called forgotten people in this great array of retirees.

Senator CHURCH. Yes; I understand that. And certainly I agree with that. Many of those people have found it necessary, have they not, in order to supplement their retirement income to work either on a part-time basis or full-time basis if their health permits?

Mr. WALTERS. That is true. That is true.

Senator CHURCH. But in the Social Security program the amount of work a person may do and still be entitled to draw his benefits is strictly limited, you know.

Mr. WALTERS. That is true.

Senator CHURCH. \$1,680, and beyond that you then begin to suffer deductions in your benefits.

Mr. WALTERS. We have strongly supported increasing that to the Bureau of Compensation; and I believe, before this Congress adjourns, they will take some action. I believe they will.

Senator CHURCH. Well, I hope so.

Mr. WALTERS. I hope so. Maybe that's a better way for me to put it.

Senator CHURCH. Mr. Walters, you say that where AoA is located is not as important as what its authority is. Yet if it functions as a subdivision, a subordinate subdivision of HEW down in the bureaucratic chart two or three levels, can it really have an influence on other departments like Labor and HUD? In other words, isn't its impact in dealing with other departments lessened if it has a subordinate position within its own department, HEW?

Mr. WALTERS. Well, of course, our great concern, Senator, is to not diminish its influence or its prestige. We would like to see it upgraded rather than downgraded. And, if it is felt from this committee, and from the Congress, that it ought to be transferred to some other agency where it would have more prestige and more power—why, we would certainly support it.

What we are interested in, is giving whoever has charge of this program some prestige and some authority and some power to act. Instead of doing a lot of talking, do some acting.

Senator CHURCH. Well, that certainly is our concern, too. And when we see the Administration on Aging cut down each year and its responsibilities delegated out to other agencies and its own scope and function reduced, it seems to us that the intent of Congress is not only being flaunted, but that some rescue operation is going to be necessary to salvage this program before it disappears completely.

Mr. WALTERS. I certainly agree with that approach, and our organization agreed with it; and, I think the staff will tell you that has been our position all along—to give it more prestige and more power and more action to do something, and to accomplish what we would like to see accomplished to help these people.

Now, I noticed in my mail this morning a letter from a lady, whose husband was a railway mail clerk; and, she said, served 36 years, and she is 91 years old—or young—and she gets \$106 a month. And the only way she is ever going to get any increase, unless Congress acts, is these little costs of living that come along—and 4 percent or 4½ percent on \$106 doesn't look like much to us; but, I am sure, it is a great help to people in that category. And that is not an isolated case. There are cases by the thousands.

Senator CHURCH. No, I know it isn't. Yet we have had a habit in the Congress when we increase benefits under Social Security, let's say—and I think it must apply also in the matter of Federal retirees—

Mr. WALTERS. I am certainly glad to hear you say that.

Senator CHURCH. We tend to do it on a percentage basis so that those that are getting the smallest amount benefit the least. And they are the most in need.

Mr. WALTERS. We are talking and advocating a bill that would give the low-income annuity people a greater percentage than those up in the higher grades. Now, that is not the most popular thing to do sometimes; but, from a butter-and-egg, and meat-and-bread standpoint, I think it is the thing to do for those people.

Senator CHURCH. Well, I think it is, too. I commend you for doing it. It is always so easy to just go along with a straight percentage increase because it leaves everybody in relatively the same position and you don't get into arguments; but when you consider that 91-year-old lady whose husband worked for 36 years for the Government, who is now getting a handsome sum of, what—

Mr. WALTERS. \$106.

Senator CHURCH. \$106 a month, 91 years of age, and no doubt this represents all that she has got to live on.

Mr. WALTERS. She didn't say so, but I rather guess that is true.

UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY RISES

Senator CHURCH. Well, we know it is true in many cases, in most cases. It is obvious that people faced with living costs today who must try to get along on such a modest sum of money are in much greater need than others that have benefit of higher retirement pay, and it seems wrong to me that that woman should get \$4 or \$5 increase while someone who is getting two or three times as much money will get two or three times as large an increase.

It may involve problems, but I commend you—face up to the problems. because these people at the lower end of the scale are the people who are in desperate need of adequate pay.

Mr. WALTERS. It is my understanding, Senator, that Senator Moss, a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, will introduce legislation in the next day or two; will introduce a bill, that will have in mind, trying to do and trying to correct some of the things

that you have just enumerated—giving greater consideration to those in the lower income brackets of the Federal annuity rolls.

Senator CHURCH. Good. I am glad to hear it. It is long overdue. I think we should take another look at Social Security, too. There is a formula in the Social Security system which determines the benefit, and as I understand its functioning, there is some larger proportion of the earnings returned in the way of benefit to those lower on the scale as compared to those upper on the scale.

Mr. WALTERS. Well, they have a floor of approximately \$70, I believe now, in Social Security; where there is absolutely no floor in the Federal retirement system.

Senator CHURCH. Yes, I think that formula in Social Security should be looked at again, too, with this idea in mind.

Mr. WALTERS. We agree with that.

Senator CHURCH. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. WALTERS. Well, thank you, sir. Thank you very kindly. I would just like to add one statement, then I will be glad to submit the summary to your staff. We are asking our people, members who had 20 years of service and who are receiving less than \$250 a month to write us—and we are getting letters by the thousands. And, we are trying to get away from the fact that some people over at the Commission, who I must say have a right to their opinion—I retired from the Civil Service Commission—but they are always saying these are short-term people getting this low income. Well, I take the position, Senator, that if you worked 20 years for the Government or somebody else, or 25 or 30 or 40, that you cannot be considered as a temporary employee.

So, we are going to have some facts and figures that cannot be disputed; and the folks are signing the letters, so there is not going to be any stuffing the ballotbox. But, I think, it is going to be revealing to all of us.

SOCIAL SECURITY ONLY SOURCE—HOW MANY?

Senator CHURCH. Good. That just reminds me—I am going to say it now in hopes the staff here will take note of it and pursue it, otherwise we both might forget. I think that it would be very helpful if this staff could track down the number of people on Social Security that are getting very low benefits who have no other source of income.

We are often told the same thing. We are told by the defenders of the system, well, people that are getting small amounts in Social Security, that that isn't the whole picture because they may have rental properties and interest and, no doubt, stocks that are paying handsome dividends, and this sort of thing, you know, and therefore you mustn't determine their present condition by looking to this Social Security benefit alone.

Well, I would like to know just how many of these people way down on the scale do have other sources of income, and I think there ought to be ways we could find that out.

Mr. WALTERS. Well, I think you are going to find, Senator, the lower you are on the totem pole, the less other income you have.

Senator CHURCH. That is logical and I think that is what we will find, but let's get the figures.

Mr. WALTERS. I know that is true of the Federal retirees—and I surmise it is true of Social Security.

Senator CHURCH. I would think so.

Well, thank you very much.

Mr. WALTERS. Thank you for your interest. Thank you very kindly.

Senator CHURCH. Our last witness this morning is Dr. Robert Butler, psychiatrist and gerontologist, from the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT BUTLER, PSYCHIATRIST AND GERONTOLOGIST, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Dr. BUTLER. Good morning.

Senator CHURCH. Good morning, Doctor. I understand you have one major message this morning, and that is responsive to an earlier query I made; "Why is aging always put on the low rung of the ladder when it comes to determining Government programs and allocating tax money?" If you have an answer to that question I would like to hear it.

Dr. BUTLER. I am going to try to offer you one.

First of all, the hour is late for us and the hour is late for the elderly, so I will be brief on both counts and say I am pleased to be here; and to say also, that those of us who have had a long history of concern with the problems of the elderly of our Nation are deeply troubled by the continuing emasculation of programs to serve them—Medicare cutbacks, the reduction of research, the phasing out of the 202 housing program, the decimation of the Administration on Aging.

We witness a most decent man, the Commissioner of Aging, and the coordinators of the coming White House Conference on Aging, given obstacles rather than support by the present administration.

Who would even believe that this is the year of the White House Conference on Aging?

I hope and believe that the fates of the Administration on Aging and the White House Conference have been reviewed during these hearings today and tomorrow; so, I will concern myself with what I do regard as a fundamental question: "Why Americans do not commit themselves to a decent old age?"

IMPLICATIONS OF "AGE-ISM"

Our national, our cultural and human sensibility is crucial. The psychological, philosophical and political bases for our Nation's inability to confront, and do something about the contemporary tragedy of old age in America, should be made known to all Americans—for aging ultimately affects all of us.

Old age can be a tragedy in America for anyone, however, powerful and rich he or she may once have been. Why survive then, many ask, since destitution, inadequate health care, substandard housing and a marginal, disparaged social status are the likely concomitants of late life? Elsewhere we could describe "How to Grow Old and Poor in an Affluent Society?"

Let me quote an attractive, well fed, dark-haired 14-year-old girl: "I don't want to live to old age; it's too terrible and scary."

And let me quote a middle-aged man: "I can't get a job. I'm only 45, and I can't get a job. No one will hire me. They say I'm too old."

Let me describe a gray-haired old woman, once upper middle class, who looked hungrily at the food presented to her at a Thanksgiving dinner the women's club had arranged. On this national day of feasting, after a year of near fasting, she was able to give thanks. She had gone hungry but had been quiet. If she felt rage, it was still mute.

Why is old age a tragedy for the majority of older Americans? What are some of the deep-seated prejudices the elderly face? Here are some instances of ageism:

The first might be called "The American Dream Gone Haywire."

Mrs. Sally G., a 76-year-old woman held tenaciously onto her home which is rat infested and dilapidated in the inner city slum area of your Nation's Capital. Once robust and attractive, she is now sallow and thin. She has to choose between food on her table, prescription drugs for her ailments, and payments of her property taxes, which have increased in recent years. She can no longer afford repairs for her beloved, but deteriorating house. She has no electricity, heat, or water.

She was referred to us by city officials who wanted to condemn her home. The accompanying notes call her senile and crazy. She and her husband had been industrious and prudent and she now owned their home free and clear—the American dream.

Her husband, however, had died 10 years ago and she was subsisting on his modest Social Security and some babysitting money, very much like the instance you were asking about, Senator—how many people have Social Security but no other resources—she had \$94 a month. The year: 1970. She continued to be self-reliant and did not ask for help, and was in no sense senile or crazy.

A second instance of prejudice: Writing in the "liberal" magazine, *The New Republic*, August 29, 1970, a scholar advocated that all persons lose their vote after retirement, or at the age of 70, or at 55 if they cross State lines. Thirty-seven years old, he is an Associate Professor of Classics at Brandeis University. Was Prof. Douglas J. Stewart providing a deadpan put-on and implying that the old are already effectively disenfranchised? Or did he believe in his own proposals?

Senator CHURCH. That was what I was going to ask, considering how poorly the elderly are doing with the vote, what happened if they didn't have a vote at all?

Dr. BUTLER. Right.

Senator CHURCH. Do you suppose he was serious?

Dr. BUTLER. I have reason to believe he was, but I wanted to give him the benefit of the doubt.

A third extraordinary instance of rank prejudice: A November 1970 report of the Rand Corp. proposed that we abandon old people, chronic invalids, and the insane in the event of a nuclear war. Entitled "The Post Attack Population"——

Senator CHURCH. What was that combination again, the old and what?

Dr. BUTLER. The chronic invalids and the mentally ill. The insane is the term they use. That is a rather old-fashioned legal term.

Senator CHURCH. This was the way that they had been lumped together?

Dr. BUTLER. Right. And I am going to quote from it:

Old people suffer the special disadvantage of being easily identified as a group . . . a community under stress would be better off without its old and feeble members. The easiest way to implement a morally repugnant but socially beneficial policy is by inaction . . . by failing to make any special provision . . .

In some ways, it seems to me, we act as though we are already living in such a postattack society when it comes to the aging, mentally ill, and the chronically ill.

A fourth very current example of our national prejudice can be seen in each of the proposals concerning national health insurance, regardless of political origin. All of them avoid the realities of aging, disability, chronic and terminal illness.

All right, now why are the elderly such displaced persons? What is the basis of ageism?

The elderly are regarded as helpless and are therefore vulnerable to neglect. They presumably cannot fight back.

This is not a culture sensitive to old people, nor to children and youth. We have lived the myth of ours being a child-centered culture and yet there is poverty, malnutrition, poor schooling, abuse and neglect of millions of American children.

I had believed that ours was really a society geared to the needs and also responsibilities of the middle aged. I now regard this as an illusion, too.

Our society serves the productive. We view our society as an organism that can, all too easily, dispense with its parts, which are subject to easy replacement. Most of our national policy decisions are economic and technological rather than moral. The Office of Management and Budget decides. There is a gross national product that is closely watched, but there is no human value index!

The extreme would be to provide identification tags for people with ratings as to productive value. Such ratings would ultimately say who should survive.

Now, what can we do? What are some of the positive steps that we might take?

PRIORITIES FOR PEOPLE

Perhaps the defeat of the SST is a modest indication of a movement away from our national preoccupation with materialism and things toward a fundamental reorganization of our priorities on behalf of people.

But let me name some specifics:

1. There must be public education, especially of the middle aged so that they overcome their own dread and associated denial of aging, disability, and death.

2. We must develop basic and applied research in the field of aging through the establishment of an Institute of Aging.

3. We must press our educational system from grade schools forward to the professional schools of medicine, nursing, social work, and so forth. They must no longer be allowed their extraordinary neglect of the realities of aging, and chronic disability.

4. Our health care system—its financial mechanisms and its structural resources—must no longer be permitted to exclude the care of the elderly, the chronically ill, and the mentally ill. This may require

such steps as: powerful pressure upon the National Institute of Mental Health; the creation of a major congressional Commission on Mental Illness of the Elderly; the encouragement of legal suits with respect to the right to treatment, and the like.

5. Required is a new militancy: on the part of organizations concerned with aging and the elderly; and, on the part of the elderly themselves.

If the White House Conference begins to look as pointless as many people already believe it will be, various organizations should withdraw from participation and not contribute to a mirage. The National Council of Senior Citizens, and the American Association of Retired Persons, as examples, should cooperate up to the very end; but, they should be ready to pull out. For once, academic organizations like the Gerontological Society, which failed us during the case of Medicare, should stand up and speak out.

Sam Rayburn used to say "If you want to get along, go along." But, where has that cynical attitude helped our Nation and our elderly?

It is possible to tailor parallel and counter White House Conferences. Already, fortunately, there may be a Black House Conference to emphasize the multiple jeopardy of the black aged.

I am making available to the committee a statement⁴ prepared February 19, 1971, to be sent to the Governors of our States regarding the representativeness of delegate selection to the White House Conference. Legal suits might be wisely taken in order to insist and insure that the intent of the congressional resolution, establishing the White House Conference, is being met.

Old people themselves should organize, fight back, and thereby regain their self-respect. They should conduct registration drives for public assistance, Medicaid, food stamps, and the like. They worked all their lives; paid their taxes; and, if they are now destitute, they should not allow their fierce pride and independence to stop them from receiving what congressional legislation has justifiably provided for them.

The elderly should demand to be on the boards of old age homes, community mental health centers, health insurance programs. They should establish Nader-like and ombudsman operations to investigate, for themselves, nursing homes and hospitals that inadequately serve them. They should use the courts on matters of job discrimination, housing, and so forth.

TWO-THIRDS OF ELDERLY VOTE

Although 10 percent of the population, they are 15 percent of the vote. In elections over two-thirds always vote. This fragile constituency will be increasingly heard from. The old people's liberation may already be underway.

Life is a fatal illness. It is a disorderly biological and social process that is, nonetheless, of one piece from birth unto death. This is reality, and, a truly just and humane society must provide for the entire brief period that a person lives on this planet.

⁴ See app. 1, item 2, p. 163.

If we cannot, as yet, develop a humane and moral social framework, then let us at least be frankly self-serving. For we all age, and we all die—however much we may endeavor to deny this truth, and however powerful we may be. We must treat our profound prejudices against the elderly and aging—for they are really prejudices against ourselves. [Applause.]

Senator CHURCH. Thank you very much for a very eloquent plea.

It has been suggested that clout ends when a person goes off the payroll. Doesn't this say a lot about the attitudes we have for non-productive people in our society, so-called nonproductive?

Dr. BUTLER. I missed the first part of your remark, Senator.

Senator CHURCH. I said I have heard it said that clout in our society ends—I have used that term several times, I can't think—

Dr. BUTLER. Clout?

Senator CHURCH. Clout—that it ends when a person goes off a payroll.

Dr. BUTLER. Or before he gets on it.

Senator CHURCH. Or before. Either way. It reflects our attitude toward the so-called nonproductive; doesn't it?

Dr. BUTLER. Yes; I think it does. And I think we see, of course, and often emphasize the very successful; and, indeed, there are many successful and productive and exciting older people who remain vitally involved. But they are fortunate when they have some power, or they have some money.

Senator CHURCH. Yes; and there aren't many lines of work any more left open to people in their advanced years, isn't that so?

Dr. BUTLER. Yes; although I think again of the expression of the great spirit of old people, when we realize that one-third of the income of older people still derives from their own earnings. I am not talking about coupon clipping, but their own work. But they do it under great pressure and under bootleg conditions—often because of the Social Security penalty. At times they have to take rather frightening jobs as night watchmen or messengers—occupations that aren't necessarily as secure and safe as one might hope.

Senator CHURCH. But in the professions there is still an opportunity for older people to continue to work; isn't there?

Dr. BUTLER. Yes.

Senator CHURCH. Is there some relationship because the professions are pretty much independent at the corporate organizational process that has come to typify our economy, characterize our society? Is the failure to provide adequate work opportunities for older people connected, in your opinion, with the way business is organized in this country?

Dr. BUTLER. Yes; I think, of course, that like so many matters that we see in a society, the original purpose had merit. For example, during the depression, when rules of tenure, seniority, and the like, were introduced, they had some meaning. However, at this time I think we need a much more flexible and open society in which we have a very different distribution of education, work and retirement. As they now stand, they are in three separate parts.

But, I think that we should not perpetuate the kind of intellectual and work obsolescence that we create through stultifying rules of tenure, binding people to the same job. We should open up; we could

keep people involved in various kinds of jobs right up to the end of life if they wish to do so. There is no need really to have this kind of exclusive productivity orientation.

Senator CHURCH. Well, I agree with that. But it seems to me that so many of our laws and programs are designed just to produce the opposite result, including Social Security.

SOCIETY BECOMING INCREASINGLY SEGREGATED?

What worries me, I suppose as much as anything, is the way our society is becoming increasingly segregated. We talk about segregation in one term, a racial term; and we overlook that the segregation is going on at every level.

I remember when I was growing up in an earlier period in a small Western town when the stores were still owned by local people, not big corporations, and people didn't typically work as transients traveling from one city to another within the framework of a large company, conditions were rather settled in this little town. And people tended to live in old-fashioned houses, and in my family—and I have been fortunate—our children were brought up always in the company of their grandparents, and this has added a great deal of meaning to their lives, and their feeling toward the family was immensely enhanced by that companionship.

And now all the people tend to live in small houses. There is no room for the older folks. They are moving from place to place, they are becoming increasingly rootless. This is the kind of society we are creating.

When we moved into a neighborhood when we came to Washington, I lived in the neighborhood for a while and finally I discovered that the reason there was so little flavor in the neighborhood was that we were all alike. We all were parents, were about the same age, either involved in politics or young executives in the banks or in the big companies. We all had children of about the same age, there weren't any older people around. There weren't any poor people, there weren't any black people. We were boring one another to death. And the youngsters living in this kind of a segregated condition weren't experiencing life, real life. And that is how this segregating process is compartmentalizing, atomizing our society.

So I think these problems are growing more severe all the time and we are falling further and further behind in coming up with solutions for them. And I wonder where it is all going to lead.

Dr. BUTLER. Your comment about segregation among age groups is even strikingly true among children. Two centuries ago, children of different ages used to be in the same classroom in school. The pressure toward peer group events, peer group decisions, and peer responses has become quite extraordinary, particularly in the last decade. So we see this age segregation—

Senator CHURCH. Age segregation, and then also economic segregation. In this neighborhood of mine, for example—I just used the personal because it is my own experience—but everybody is about the same income level. There weren't any rich people, there weren't any poor people. And then the automobile, of course, permits the segregation because it is possible to move out to a neighborhood where every-

body is just like you and then travel in your car to your work where you are completely compartmentalized, and listen to the radio in the car for artificial entertainment. No contact. No human contact.

It used to be in a small Western town all the menfolk got together down at the country store and talked about the community and its problems and the philosophies, and they knew one another.

Well, that kind of contact has all but disappeared in the big American city. And we live in buildings vertically and get in elevators and never even associate with people who live next door to us in our own apartment houses. We are becoming a country of strangers.

DR. BUTLER. I wonder if the White House Conference on Aging should not have audiences of young people, children, middle-age people, being given an opportunity to learn the problems of older people at that time; rather than being oriented in a very specialized way as it now stands. We perhaps need something quite innovative, just around this very point.

Senator CHURCH. Yes. Well, we appreciate very much your testimony, and I think that concludes the hearings for this morning. The committee will meet tomorrow. It won't be possible for me to chair the meeting tomorrow because of another obligation, but Senator Eagleton will be here to chair the meeting tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m. the following day.)

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FROM WITNESSES

ITEM 1. LETTER FROM HOBART C. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CAUCUS ON THE BLACK AGED TO SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, CHAIRMAN

NATIONAL CAUCUS ON THE BLACK AGED,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 5, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I believe you indicated at the hearings on Monday, March 29, 1971¹ that you would be interested in the efforts of the National Caucus on the Black Aged to secure certain information on the Black aged prior to the White House Conference on the Aging.

Here is what we were recently told by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce. For \$3,000, the Population Section could apparently supply us with a report concerning basic demographic characteristics of black by age groupings within the 50 largest cities in the United States. That type of data would specify income levels, housing conditions, marital statuses, et cetera, all of which would be extremely useful in developing a profile of black aged in inner cities. The report, as I understand it, would be prepared by that Population Division.

For approximately \$10,000 to \$12,000, the Population Division could provide statistical data from the 1960 and 1970 CPS giving very detailed information useful for comparative purposes to elicit trends over the decade, but these data would not be analyzed. Hence, reports would have to be prepared from the data. If the data could be run and reports obtained, I think that the analytical tasks could be done elsewhere. The important thing, as you know, is to get funds to get these data so that researchers might utilize them in helping to develop information for policy recommendations for those affecting policies concerning black aged.

Any help that might be available will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

HOBART C. JACKSON, *Chairman.*

ITEM 2. STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT N. BUTLER,² TO THE GOVERNORS OF THE STATES, REGARDING SELECTION OF DELEGATES TO THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

The authority to choose delegates to the White House Conference on Aging offers all governors a unique opportunity for direct influence on governmental policy toward the elderly. In your selection we urge you to be guided by three principles:

First, because every American citizen has a vital interest in a rational federal policy, participants at the Conference should include representatives of *all* socio-economic, racial and age groups.

Second, because of their particular understanding of the problems faced by the elderly, recommendations of delegates by groups like the National Council of Senior Citizens, American Association of Retired Persons and National Council on the Aging should be solicited and honored.

Third, because of their special needs, certain categories of the elderly, including widows, the poor, blacks and other minorities, should be especially well represented at the Conference. Recommendations of delegates by citizens' organizations such as the League of Women Voters, the National Welfare Rights Organization and Common Cause among others, should be sought and honored.

¹ See Senator Church's remarks, p. 139.

² See p. 159.

Appendix 2

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FROM ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELIZABETH K. LINCOLN, CHAIRMAN, NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF STATE EXECUTIVES ON AGING, DIRECTOR, SERVICES FOR AGING, NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE COUNCIL ON AGING

The New England Association of State Executives on Aging and the New Hampshire State Council on Aging wholeheartedly and completely support the statement of the National Association of State Units on Aging concerning the cutback in the funds requested for the Administration on Aging in the President's Budget Message for Fiscal Year 1972.

The New England Association of State Executives on Aging is extremely concerned that President Nixon's Budget Request Message for Fiscal Year 1972 severely slashes Federal funds for the Administration on Aging's programs for older Americans and will have a direct adverse effect on programs and communities in the New England states.

For Fiscal Year 1971, the total Administration on Aging budget was \$33,650,000. The Fiscal Year 1972 budget request is \$25,000,000. That part of the Administration on Aging programs that benefitted our states the most was the Title III programs which provided direct allotments to states for grants to local communities and state regions. The Fiscal Year 1971 appropriations was \$9,000,000. The Fiscal Year 1972 request is for \$5,350,000. The effect on The New England states is a 40.5 percent cut back of \$320,361, as follows:

	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972 request
Connecticut.....	\$145,992	\$86,732
Massachusetts.....	218,546	129,836
Maine.....	112,370	66,758
New Hampshire.....	104,406	62,027
Rhode Island.....	108,830	64,655
Vermont.....	99,098	58,873
Total.....	789,242	468,881

Many fine programs providing services for older Americans were initiated in our states with the Title III Federal funds. If Congress does not restore these projected cuts, some of these programs will have to be dropped and the others severely reduced. Older Americans, unlike many other disadvantaged groups within our society, still maintain a tenuous faith in the institutions and mechanisms of our democratic process. They ask little and have given much to enrich our way of life. These program cuts are an insult to their faith and their contributions.

The proposed cutback in funds for community programs and Foster Grandparents programs will force reductions in community projects for activities and services that directly involve and reach the older people themselves. These are the most visible and tangible programs provided by the state agencies on aging, and in the eyes of the general public form the chief reasons for the existence of the state agency operation. The comprehensive planning, evaluation and research activities are not highly visible or publicized and are little understood. The new area-wide projects, despite administration statements to the contrary, do not seem to be an adequate substitute for the Title III community services projects that now provide successful direct programs or services benefiting large numbers of older people.

The NEA-SEA is seriously concerned over what seems to be the Department of HEW policy to reduce the operations of the Administration on Aging, and the identity of its programs, by a cutback in funding and a reorganization plan that places it under the Social and Rehabilitation Service within the Department of HEW.

The total number of older individuals in the New England states is increasing each year, and producing a need for more community services projects. Yet our state agencies on aging are now faced with reductions in funds which will seriously hamper our program operations and result in hardship for the older citizens in our states. The senior citizens in the New England states are disturbed and dissatisfied over this apparent lack of interest in their problems and needs, on the part of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the way the programs for the elderly are being submerged.

In each New England state the state agency on aging is planning conferences where older people, representatives of senior citizens' organizations and of agencies giving services to the elderly will meet in state activities for the White House Conference on Aging, and to develop a state policy on aging. The New England Governor's Conference has passed the following resolution requesting the New England Association of State Executives on Aging to present the Governor's Conference with recommendations for a New England Regional program and policy for the White House Conference on Aging.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the President of the United States has called a White House Conference on Aging to be held in November, 1971, and has asked the states to prepare comprehensive reports on the problems facing our older citizens and recommendations for a national policy to solve those problems; and

Whereas, the problems facing our older citizens are critical and require the best efforts our states can direct toward their solution; and

Whereas, the six New England States working together to define and highlight the problems being confronted by our older citizens can make a more constructive contribution to the White House Conference; now therefore be it

Resolved That the New England Governors 1) support the purposes and goals of the White House Conference, 2) pledge their combined efforts to comply fully with the Conference goals and 3) direct all state agencies charged with the White House Conference planning responsibility to cooperate with the New England Association of State Executives on Aging for the purposes of developing a report on the common problems and concerns of the older citizens of all the New England States.

Be it further resolved That the New England Governors request the New England Association of State Executives on Aging to present the Governors' Conference with their recommendations for the New England Regional program and policy for the White House Conference on Aging by September 1971.

Governor FRANK LICHT,
Governor WALTER R. PETERSON,
Governor FRANCIS W. SARGENT,
Governor KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor DEANE C. DAVIS,
Governor JOHN DEMPSEY.

We feel it would be an exercise in futility for us to attempt to develop any state or New England regional policy on aging with such inadequate funding for our state agencies existing programs as will be provided in Fiscal Year 1972.

The history of the Title III Federal appropriations is a tragic example of the Federal government's shortsightedness and breaking faith with state governments. The Title III appropriation for state allotments for grants for services to older persons was \$14,500,000 in Fiscal Year 1969, \$9,000,000 in Fiscal Year 1970, \$9,000,000 for Fiscal Year 1971, and now a projected \$5,350,000 for Fiscal Year 1972.

The tragic and inhumane aspect of these actions is that the elderly are the only group of people which has an increasing number joining the poverty ranks. Studies recently completed or now in progress evidence that approximately half the elderly in Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire live in poverty and that 35% to 40% in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut live in poverty. Older persons represent that group which can least afford cuts in government programs that are beneficial to them.

Another bizarre and incomprehensible aspect of the Federal Administration Fiscal Year 1972 budget is the proposal that the Federal funds for the excellent Foster Grandparents Program be cut from \$10,500,000 in Fiscal Year 1971 to \$7,500,000 in Fiscal Year 1972. This program made it possible for older persons to provide tender loving care to retarded and disturbed children. The ultimate worth of this program is beyond doubt and has been highlighted in local and national publications, newspapers, radio, and television.

One out of ten Americans are 65 or over (20,000,000+), two out of ten Americans are between the ages of 45 and 64 (42,000,000+); this represents a total of over 62,000,000 persons and the two groups having the highest percentage for voting and participating in state and national elections. They are the people who will be directly and indirectly affected by the proposed budget cuts.

We believe positive action should be initiated immediately not only to restore the projected budget cuts, but also to make more Federal funds available than was appropriated for Fiscal Year 1971. Each of us has written directly to all members of the congressional delegation from our state.

