

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 3—WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 30, 1971



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

(1)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

60-215

WASHINGTON : 1971

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, *Chairman*

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

	Page
Opening statement by Senator Thomas F. Eagleton, presiding-----	167
Statement of Senator Fred R. Harris-----	167

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Lally, John M., associate director, Cardinal Ritter Institute, St. Louis, Mo.	168
Meyer, Garson, chairman, President's Task Force on the Aging (1970); and chairman, Advisory Committee, New York State Office for the Aging----	177
Nash, Bernard, executive director, National Retired Teachers Association/ American Association of Retired Teachers-----	188
Roundtable discussion of AoA-----	204
Garson Meyer	
Dr. Blue Carstenson	
William Fitch	
Bernard Nash	

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1.—Additional material submitted by Senator Fred R. Harris:	
Statement of Mr. Jess Teague, director, Community Action Program, Ada, Okla.-----	209
Letters concerning the Evergreen Retirement Center, Wagoner, Okla.	210
Statement of Mr. Dale Kirk, director, Sequoyah Foster Grandparent program, Sallisaw, Okla.-----	212
Supplementary comments, first annual evaluation of the Sequoyah Foster Grandparent program in Oklahoma-----	216
Appendix 2.—Some unique programs financed by title III in New York State, submitted by Garson Meyer-----	220
1971 White House Conference on Aging, regional and community conference dates-----	223

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

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 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 10:10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 4232, New Senate Office Building, the Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, chairman of the Subcommittee on Aging, presiding.

Present: Senators Eagleton, Pell, and Percy.

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.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON, PRESIDING

Senator EAGLETON. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

This is the third day of a series of joint hearings being held by the Special Committee on Aging, chaired by Senator Church of Idaho, and the Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, chaired by myself, inquiring into matters relating to aging. Senator Church, who conducted the first 2 days of hearings, of necessity, has to participate in some matters before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning; and, thus he asked that I chair this third day of this series, which is by no means the final day of public hearings of this particular series.

Also, let me say, at the outset, for all witnesses that their prepared statements in full will be made a part of the record and they are, therefore, at liberty to digest their prepared statements, if they are so inclined; or, if they wish to read them in their entirety they are free to do so; they have either choice available to them.

I have a statement from Senator Fred R. Harris, of Oklahoma, who could not be with us today, which he wished submitted for the record. With no objection, it will be included at this point.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS

I appreciate the opportunity of presenting this statement to these joint hearings. While in my State of Oklahoma during the past few months, I have had occasion to talk to a number of elderly Oklahomans about matters of great con-

cern to them. I have also heard from many people who are in charge of programs for our senior citizens. On January 13, I held a full day of hearings in Ada, Oklahoma, dealing with the problems of the elderly and the solutions to some of those problems.

One thing which was stressed both in these hearings, and in correspondence which I have received from Oklahomans, is the importance of the Title III local community programs to the people involved in these activities.

I would like, at this time, to express my concern before this Committee of the severe cuts in the budget which the Administration has submitted for FY 1972 insofar as it affects programs for older Americans.

The Budget Analysis submitted reflects an overall decrease in programs for the aging from \$33 million in FY 1971 (estimate) to \$26.5 million in FY 1972. Even more concern to me than the overall cut in authorized programs are the programs which have been singled out for reduction.

The community programs under Title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 have been cut by \$3.65 million for FY 1972. The Title III community programs are programs awarded by grants from the State on a "seed money" concept with Federal-local fundings at a 75/25 ratio the first year; 60/40 the second year, and 50/50 thereafter. I have been advised that in Oklahoma 52 multipurpose activity centers have been funded with Title III money. There are 16 projects which are no longer receiving Title III funds, and of these, 15 are continuing to operate on local funding. To my thinking, this is an ideal method of stimulating local development by initial Federal funding. However, not all local communities are able to maintain the programs once Federal funding has been withdrawn. In this respect, I would like to suggest that consideration be given to providing additional funding in small rural areas where the prospect for additional local funding are slim.

In this connection, I would at this point like to add to my statement the testimony of Mr. Jess Teague, Director of the Community Action Program at Ada, Oklahoma, which he presented at the hearings which I held there on January 13.*

Senator EAGLETON. Our first witness is from my home city of St. Louis, Mr. John M. Lally of the Cardinal Ritter Institute, a very worthwhile and fine organization functioning in the St. Louis area dealing in matters relating to health and aging.

Mr. Lally, we welcome you and you may proceed.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN M. LALLY, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR,
CARDINAL RITTER INSTITUTE, ST. LOUIS, MO.**

Mr. LALLY. Thank you, Senator.

At the outset I want to thank you for this opportunity to offer testimony in this hearing.

I have come here to speak in support of the Older Americans Act and in support of the Administration on Aging. I come here to urge the Congress to extend the Older Americans Act; and, not only to restore the proposed funding cutbacks for the Administration on Aging, but to increase its appropriation.

My remarks are based on firsthand experience with almost 900 older people whose lives have been directly and materially improved through programs made possible by the Older Americans Act and the Administration on Aging.

I am the associate director of the Cardinal Ritter Institute. This is an agency operated under the auspices of the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of St. Louis. The purpose of the Cardinal Ritter Institute is to provide social services and health services to the aged, regardless of race or creed.

Among the programs we operate are two which are funded by the Administration on Aging with grants made possible by the Older Americans Act.

*See appendix 1, p. 209.

I have seen what these programs have meant in the lives of older people; and, I can imagine—though I would rather not—what the discontinuance of these programs would mean to these people.

The programs to which I refer are a Senior Center program funded by a title III grant through the Missouri Office of Aging, and a Foster Grandparent program funded directly from the Administration on Aging.

We operate our Senior Center in the Blumeyer Housing Project. This is a low-income housing project in the inner city of St. Louis. Our center is located in two high-rise buildings which house approximately 700 older people. The average age of these people is 72. Their incomes range from \$900 to \$2,000 annually. The neighborhood in which this housing project is located is a high crime rate area. Personal danger on the streets of this neighborhood is a reality, and a source of concern for these older people. Assault to older persons on the streets of this neighborhood have occurred with regularity. To provide a safe means for shopping, a bus with an armed guard was provided by a local grocery store. So concerned are the older people that their buildings are kept locked, and many seldom venture out unless they are part of a group activity sponsored by our center.

I mention these things not to dramatize, but to emphasize that the people served by our center are hindered not only by advanced age and inadequate income but also by the dangerous environment in which they live. Consequently, for many, the center provides their only source of social and recreational activity. Without this program, which has been made possible by funds from the Administration on Aging, the quality of their lives would be significantly lessened. Without the outlets that our program provides, many would be virtual prisoners in this public housing project.

ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES OF INSTITUTE

The Cardinal Ritter Institute Senior Center provides activities of an educational, recreational, and cultural nature. This includes adult education classes in a variety of subjects such as basic education, Negro history, millinery, interior decorating, and arts and crafts.

The recreational activities consist of a varied "menu" of parties, picnics, movies, hobby clubs, excursions, dances, table games such as bingo and pokeno, and many others.

Lectures, musical programs, literary activities, and plays round out the cultural program.

Our center also provides the professional services of a nurse and social worker, as well as opportunity for the older people to engage in community service through volunteer programs.

This life-enhancing program has demonstrated a successful answer to the needs of these 700 older people. It is an extremely meaningful ingredient in their lives.

The future of this program is now in jeopardy. It is in imminent danger of being discontinued within the next 30 days—because the Missouri Office of Aging does not have funds to continue to help finance it, and sufficient local funding is not available.

There is a glimmer of hope in the possibility that the Model City Agency in St. Louis might purchase the center services for the next

year; and, we are indebted to you, Senator Eagleton, for your assistance in making this a possibility. However, at this time it is still only a possibility; and, our experience in seeking funds from the Model City Agency over the past 2 years does not engender unqualified optimism. Moreover, should our program be given a reprieve through Model City funding, a year from now it will again face the same problem—it will face collapse for lack of continuing funding.

Through local resources we have provided, and will continue to provide 65 percent of the cost of our center program; but, we lack that 35 percent cash necessary to “glue” the whole program together. Without the 35 percent cash the entire program will be jeopardized. It might well be a repetition of the old story “for want of a nail the kingdom was lost.” This cash funding, we feel, should be made available on a continuing basis from the Administration on Aging. The Older Americans Act should be amended to make this possible. There is an urgent need, especially during this time of economic recession, for continued Federal matching for programs which have proven their worth and which have no other means of continuing. We are hearing a lot about revenue sharing these days. This would be a direct form of revenue sharing.

SUCCESSFUL CENTER PROGRAM FACES EXTINCTION

Our center program, which faces extinction, has been successful. So much so that the St. Louis Housing Authority asked us 2 years ago to expand it to other housing projects in St. Louis. We expended every effort to find funding for such an expansion but without success. Our State Office of Aging did not have the funds for this expansion, because the Administration on Aging did not have the funds to pass on to our State.

In the light of our present situation and past experience, the current level of funding for the Administration on Aging seems to be inadequate. A cutback is simply unthinkable and would be disastrous. I reiterate, therefore, our request, our plea, that the level of funding for the Administration on Aging be not only restored but increased.

Our Foster Grandparent program has been in operation for almost 5 years. During that time, 160 poor elderly people have served as foster grandparents and have given human nurture to 320 institutionalized children.

I know you are familiar with the foster grandparent concept, and it is quite unnecessary for me to describe our program. I merely want to emphasize how very much this program has meant, and continues to mean, to the elderly who participate in it. Perhaps the best way I can do this is to relay to you the thoughts and sentiments of some of these foster grandparents in their own words.

A 73-year-old foster grandparent said:

A whole new life of usefulness has been opened up to me; and, last, but not least there is the financial help that enables us to live with dignity and self-respect. My hope is that I be granted the health and strength to keep on being useful.

A 77-year-old foster grandmother said:

I have been widowed for 28 years and have worked with children all of my life; but, I have never done any work as rewarding as what I have done at the St. Louis State School and Hospital. The children are lovable, and the achievements they are making with the help of their foster grandparents are remark-

able. You would have to see them before and after to really believe their progress. God bless the program, and may it live forever.

Another 73-year-old foster grandmother said:

Being a grandparent to the boys at Methodist Children's Home of Missouri has been a blessed experience in my life; and, I look forward each day when I arrive to hear that welcome greeting of "Hi grandma."

Finally, a younger foster grandmother, aged 66, had this to say:

My own children are all married now and have their own interests. It is so comforting to feel needed again. I thank God many times for my job. The salary from the Foster Grandparent program is so helpful, since my only other source of income is my Social Security. It does not only give me financial assistance but helps me to be a little independent—which I feel all older people need.

Some of these old people have to travel by bus for 2 hours to get to work. Nevertheless, during the 5 years that our program has been in operation they have seldom missed work—except for reasons of illness. During a bus strike, one foster grandfather walked to and from his work every day—a distance of 12 miles. This kind of dedication points up the importance of this meaningful role in their lives.

And, what about the children who have benefited? I could list child after child whose life has been brightened and improved by his foster grandparent. I will mention but two striking incidents.

At our State School and Hospital in St. Louis there is a young boy who, apparently because of lack of human stimulation, had never spoken. After several months of attention, love, and care from his foster grandfather this child began to talk. A little girl had never walked. Again after months of attention, help, and encouragement from her foster grandmother, she began to walk. The dumb speak and the lame walk? No; I claim no miracles for this program; but, merely, human response of children to human love.

We have 58 of our 80 foster grandparents at the State School and Hospital in St. Louis. Dr. Duffy, the superintendent of that institution, in an interview with the St. Louis Post Dispatch which was published on March 31, 1970, referred to the Foster Grandparent program "as the most significantly effective program on the grounds."

We have been advised to ready ourselves for a cutback of this program because of the proposed funding cutbacks in the Administration on Aging. Again, I urge the Congress to restore the proposed cutbacks and to go even further by increasing the appropriation.

PROGRAMS PROVIDE OPPORTUNITY FOR ELDERLY

The programs that I have discussed are too good to lose. In this world—which has so much violence, hate, and selfishness—is it too much to ask that we preserve something so good? Is it too much to expect that programs—which provide opportunity for happiness, dignity, and fulfillment for older citizens—be continued? I think not! I certainly hope not.

The Older Americans Act is a good act. I hope it is extended. It has made possible a happier and fuller life for many older Americans. Our programs, and others like them across the country, cannot continue without the financial assistance from the Administration on Aging. If the programs do not receive the needed funds they will become but a memory for those old people who have known them; and, an unfulfilled hope for those who will never have an opportunity to know them.

Our older people deserve more than an unfilled hope. They deserve more than a memory.

Senator EAGLETON, that concludes my statement. Again, I thank you and this committee for giving me the opportunity to present our views.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you very much, Mr. Lally, for an excellent presentation.

Now, dealing first with the program that you are operating at the Blumeyer project in St. Louis, the one that is threatened with financial obliteration in the next 30 days, is that threat—and it is a real one—premised on the fact that the appropriation for fiscal year 1971 for title III community programs of \$9 million was not sufficient; or, is the threat an anticipatory one based on the diminished budget request for fiscal year 1972?

Mr. LALLY. This is a current threat, Senator. We were told by the Missouri Office of Aging that the law now provides for them to continue funding programs, under the title III, for our 4th year. We were also advised that they would be happy to consider doing that; except, for the fact, that they do not now have the money to do so. The reason they do not is because they did not receive the money from the Administration on Aging.

Senator EAGLETON. Based on the information you have, is the full \$9 million that was appropriated under title III for community programs, of which this Blumeyer program is one, going to be spent in this fiscal year?

Mr. LALLY. As I understand it, it will be.

Senator EAGLETON. And, thus, your program in Blumeyer is threatened with cancellation because there are more demands and needs for the money than the \$9 million will fulfill. I take it that would be the case.

Mr. LALLY. Yes, that is correct.

Senator EAGLETON. And, thus, if your program is deemed to be worthwhile, and I personally think it is worthwhile, there is a need for more than \$9 million to even fulfill this year's obligation.

Mr. LALLY. That is my conviction.

\$3.65 MILLION CUTBACK FOR COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Senator EAGLETON. And yet the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1972, knowing that there are unmet demands and needs for money that even \$9 million will not fulfill, is \$5,350,000—not an increase to \$10 million, or \$11 million, or \$12 million, but a substantial reduction of not quite 50 percent but pretty close thereto. Therefore, insofar as the administration's analysis of community programs is concerned, of which the one you are operating at Blumeyer is an illustration, they apparently do not see the need for such programs.

Mr. LALLY. Apparently they do not.

Senator EAGLETON. Is that your inference?

Mr. LALLY. We think they are wrong in this, Senator. We think there is a need. We think there is a need, not only to restore the fund that they propose to cut back; but, to increase it, if the need is going to be met.

Senator EAGLETON. The Blumeyer area is a mix of both low-rise townhouse units wherein people of all ages reside, and a complex of three or four high rises, is that correct?

Mr. LALLY. That is correct. There are four high-rise buildings.

Senator EAGLETON. How many floors?

Mr. LALLY. Fifteen floors.

Senator EAGLETON. Of the four high rises, are some of those earmarked for the elderly?

Mr. LALLY. Two of them are.

Senator EAGLETON. Two are for the elderly.

In round figures, how many people are housed in the two elderly high rises?

Mr. LALLY. Seven hundred.

Senator EAGLETON. Seven hundred. And those are primarily the individuals that you service, as of now, with your Cardinal Ritter program at Blumeyer?

Mr. LALLY. Primarily. Primarily it is these 700.

Senator EAGLETON. Ethnically what is the mix in the two high rises designated for the elderly?

Mr. LALLY. Ninety-two percent black, 8 percent white.

Senator EAGLETON. Not holding you to the penny or the precise dollar, what would be the median income of the people in those two high rises?

Mr. LALLY. I would say \$150 a month.

Senator EAGLETON. And as I understand it, out of that \$150 a month, 25 percent goes to pay for rent.

Mr. LALLY. Correct.

Senator EAGLETON. And then the remainder for other living needs—food, clothing, et cetera?

Mr. LALLY. Yes.

Senator EAGLETON. Thus on \$150 a month, with roughly \$40 going for rent, leaving \$110 for food and clothing, insofar as living is concerned, the services which you render, which you describe in your statement, comprise—more or less—the totality of social life for these individuals.

Mr. LALLY. For many of these people, this is their total social life.

Senator EAGLETON. And this is a result not only of the economics of the situation, because with \$150 you don't have a lot to spend for recreational and social endeavors, but also of the nature of the neighborhood—safety on the streets, ease of access to Forest Park, et cetera. How would an elderly person get to Forest Park if that individual wanted to go to the zoo, to the opera or to sit out in the park? Is it conveniently located, insofar as public transportation is concerned?

Mr. LALLY. I would not say it was convenient. There are many places more inconvenient; but, for an older person, it is certainly not convenient. We receive, for example, free tickets to the St. Louis Municipal Opera, every summer, which is located in Forest Park. Many times we cannot dispose of these tickets to the people in our center—for the reason that they have no way to get there. The bus fare in St. Louis would cost them a dollar to go and come. A dollar is too much, even though they can get free admission—and also there is the inconvenience, and reluctance to being out on the street at night. We have to provide a bus to take them, in order to get them there.

Senator EAGLETON. Have you been successful, on occasion, in getting somebody to donate a bus to accommodate them?

Mr. LALLY. Occasionally, Senator, but not very often.

Senator EAGLETON. But no regular structured program?

Mr. LALLY. No.

PREFERABLE METHOD OF FUNDING BLUMEYER PROJECT?

Senator EAGLETON. Now, again talking about the Blumeyer program and then I will talk about Foster Grandparent in a minute, would it make more sense for the services that you are now providing at Blumeyer to come from the Housing Authority; or, do you believe that funding through the Older Americans Act, when such funding is available, is a preferable method?

Mr. LALLY. I think funding through the Administration on Aging would be a preferable method for this reason. The Housing Authority's primary interest is housing; whereas, the primary interest of the Administration on Aging—as designated by the Older Americans Act—is improving the quality of life of these people. I am afraid that, as so often happens when two purposes are joined together, one usually becomes subservient to the other. I think this might happen if the responsibility were lodged with the Housing Authority.

Senator EAGLETON. Were you ever asked to consider undertaking a program similar to the one you are now operating at Blumeyer in the Pruitt-Igoe area?

Mr. LALLY. We were asked to duplicate what we are doing at Blumeyer in all of the other housing projects more than 2 years ago, and Pruitt-Igoe was included.

Senator EAGLETON. Would you have been willing to undertake it had the money been available?

Mr. LALLY. We certainly would have. In fact, we submitted proposals to do so to the Model City Agency. We submitted proposals but nowhere could we get funds to do so.

Senator EAGLETON. Now getting back again to Blumeyer, what we are talking about really in terms of green dollars is about \$25,000.

Mr. LALLY. That is correct.

Senator EAGLETON. That is, if this program fails in the next 30 days, it is for want of \$25,000.

Mr. LALLY. That is correct.

Senator EAGLETON. Because there are contributed both space and services totalling 65 percent of the cost.

Mr. LALLY. That is correct, Senator.

Senator EAGLETON. What do you buy with that \$25,000, roughly?

Mr. LALLY. We pay the salaries of three full-time staff people. We also pay for office supplies. We pay for the rental of buses, and so on, to take these people out. The payroll amounts to approximately \$20,000 for three full-time people.

Senator EAGLETON. Three full-time people for \$20,000? Tell me what these full-time people do, and what you pay them.

Mr. LALLY. We have a program director, who holds a master's degree in social work, who is paid \$9,500 a year.

Senator EAGLETON. With a master's degree in social work?

Mr. LALLY. Yes.

Senator EAGLETON. How long has he been there?

Mr. LALLY. He has been on this program for 3 years. He started with it.

Senator EAGLETON. You say \$9,500?

Mr. LALLY. Ninety-five hundred dollars. He has been making that only for the past year.

Senator EAGLETON. How about the other two full-time people?

Mr. LALLY. The other two are people with bachelor's degrees. They are activity supervisors and their job is to look after the day-to-day activities—see that the wherewithall for these activities is there—to supervise them and make sure they are positive, constructive experiences for the people. One of these people receives \$415 per month, the other one receives \$597 per month.

Senator EAGLETON. And those are both full-time jobs?

Mr. LALLY. Both full-time jobs.

Senator EAGLETON. Total payroll, then, roughly in the neighborhood of \$20,000?

Mr. LALLY. That is correct.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, speaking for myself, I don't think anyone could accuse this program of being overly saturated with bureaucracy, or top heavy with high-priced personnel. Quite the contrary, you have people that are rendering services, three in number, who, based on the current cost of living scales that I know exist in St. Louis, in my judgment are grossly underpaid. I am not trying to start a rebellion in your ranks.

Mr. LALLY. We agree with you, Senator.

Senator EAGLETON. But your director, with a master's degree in social work, has been with you 3 years and is making \$9,500 a year. I guess over at the Pentagon, they probably have some car drivers making more than that.

Mr. LALLY. I might say, just in passing, concerning this particular program director—I mentioned the crime in the street in that area—he was also robbed at gun point one evening and lost his wallet and watch; and, he was not reimbursed for that, either.

FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM AND PROPOSED VOLUNTEER AGENCY

Senator EAGLETON. Now, with respect to foster grandparents, the administration has proposed merging the Foster Grandparent program into what they call a volunteer agency. How would you view the transfer, structurally, of the Foster Grandparent program to a more broadly gaged so-called volunteer agency? Do you believe this would eventually be the end of the Foster Grandparent program or would it flourish? How do you view that prospect?

Mr. LALLY. It appears to me it would only be the beginning of the end. That is the beginning of the death knell for this program. It is cutting back.

Senator EAGLETON. Why do you say that? You know, we live in a world of semantics and images. One of the key words of our time now is "coordinate" along with "consolidate" and "combine." Those three C's are good words; everybody wants to use them. So we are going to coordinate, consolidate, and combine lots of things into one program. Why do you feel foster grandparents might do down the drain in such a 3-C operation?

Mr. LALLY. First of all, I think it would lose its identity in this larger situation. Second, if I read the intent of the present administration in cutting it back—not replacing foster grandparents whom we lose through attrition—I have no evidence of this; but, it just sounds

to me as if this is the beginning of more cutting back. All their rhetoric about improving the income in other areas, and so forth; and, that this program is no longer needed as an income and maintenance program, sounds to me like the first steps of many more to come.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, I thoroughly agree with you. I will answer my own question in another way. When you coordinate, consolidate and combine, of course, there is then less identifiability for any particular program. It is easier to lose it in a big C, and it is much more difficult to trace how a program is operating at the funding level, when it gets lost in the collage.

In view of the administration's recommended cuts in the whole series of programs relating to the aging—the community programs under title III, the Foster Grandparent program—and their reluctance to give the aging program high-level status within the Department of HEW, I agree with you that the Foster Grandparent and many other aging programs, when merged into one overall volunteer agency, would sort of fade into benign oblivion. To use Moynihan's words, it would be an example of benign neglect.

Mr. LALLY. Also, I think, Senator, the motion afoot to remove funds from that to the RSVP program is again an indication that, when they move the Foster Grandparent program into this overall volunteer superstructure, and continue with that philosophy; it would become a volunteer program and would no longer be what it is today.

Senator EAGLETON. Just dealing with St. Louis, the area that you live in and know of by experience, with adequate funding how many foster grandparents could you put to work in your estimate?

Mr. LALLY. We have an expressed need—now this is not going out looking for people—these are for the institutions that we have dealt with who have asked for more, who have said they could use more. We could use 125 foster grandparents. We have been requested to provide 125; we now have 80.

Senator EAGLETON. That is without recruiting and running ads in the paper, or any kind of a solicitation process?

Mr. LALLY. Yes, sir.

Senator EAGLETON. You could go very easily from 80 to 125?

Mr. LALLY. Very easily.

Senator EAGLETON. And by some kind of in-depth recruiting, if that were your design, you could double that figure?

Mr. LALLY. Easily.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you very much, Mr. Lally. You have been most helpful to this committee.

I don't know what the travel schedule of the various witnesses may be, but they are free and at liberty to remain; and, perhaps, as we go through other witnesses there might conceivably be some kind of a dialogue. The witnesses are not obliged to stay if they have other appointments and other places to which they must go.

Our second witness is Mr. Garson Meyer, chairman of the President's Task Force on the Aging, and chairman of the Advisory Committee, New York State Office for the Aging.

Mr. Meyer, we welcome you. You may read your prepared statement in full or distill it for us if you so desire.

STATEMENT OF GARSON MEYER, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON THE AGING (1970); AND CHAIRMAN, ADVISORY COMMITTEE, NEW YORK STATE OFFICE FOR THE AGING

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I will probably do a little of each. I will read, in full, the first portion of my prepared statement and then summarizing the highlights of the second portion.*

I am Garson Meyer. I am here today representing no particular organization. I make that statement because I was listed as representing the President's Task Force on the Aging and I am not actually representing that Task Force.

Senator EAGLETON. You were the chairman of it.

Mr. MEYER. Yes, sir.

Senator EAGLETON. And the Task Force report speaks for itself.

Mr. MEYER. Yes, sir.

Senator EAGLETON. You signed it.

Mr. MEYER. I did.

Senator EAGLETON. And when we get into questions—

Mr. MEYER. I am not denying that, I am merely stating I am not representing the Task Force today.

Senator EAGLETON. I understand. If there is any part of your Task Force report that you wish to recant, please bring it to our attention.

Mr. MEYER. I am fully supporting the entire report. I would like to see the entire report implemented. I hope you have read it, Mr. Chairman.

I am here in the interest of 20 million older Americans whose needs and wants will be jeopardized by cutbacks in budgets and by the downgrading of the Administration on Aging.

I welcome this opportunity to appear before you to discuss the effects of recent reorganizations within HEW on the Administration on Aging.

LOW PRIORITY FOR ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

During the hearings which you are now conducting, others have testified that the Bureau of the Budget's unrealistic allocations for the Administration on Aging will seriously jeopardize the welfare of 20 million older Americans. I, therefore, will not burden you with repetitive documentation. I do emphasize, however, that the cutback from the congressional authorizations is just another indicator of the low priority given to the needs of the elderly. I also must emphasize that this low priority is not something which is of recent origin but really goes back to the 1960's.

In 1962, immediately following the 1961 White House Conference on Aging, there was a strong assurance that an identifiable, independent office of the aging would be established as a strong focal point for the needs of older persons. Instead, the Office of Aging was made a subsidiary of the Welfare Administration. In 1965, Congress enacted the Older Americans Act, with only a single dissenting vote. It was generally accepted that it was the intent of Congress, after much debate, that an Administration on Aging would be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, responsible directly

*See appendix 2, p. 220.

to the Secretary of HEW. As I prepare this statement, I do not have the benefit of records, so I cannot quote the exact language of the House Report on the establishment of the Administration on Aging, but I do remember well that the Report did contain the intent that the Administration on Aging would have status in HEW equal to the Social Security Administration and equal to the Welfare Administration.

Yet, from the very time that AoA was placed in the Department of HEW, its status has been gradually reduced and its responsibilities fragmented. In August 1967, without any discussions with members of the Advisory Committee—and I was a member of that Advisory Committee—AoA was submerged under the Social and Rehabilitation Services. This, in my opinion, is in violation of the original intent of the Congress when it established AoA.

And now, AoA is being further fragmented by the movement of the Research and Development Grant programs to the Social and Rehabilitation Services and the Training Grants to the Social and Rehabilitation Regional Offices; and by the contemplated transfer of the Foster Grandparent program and RSVP program to the newly organized Action for Volunteers.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, one can rationalize on very firm ground, that these transfers of programs are justified in the interests of improved organizational structure, better administration and an improved management. These transfers will also add additional arms of our Government which have important programs concerning the elderly. In our Government structure where we are organized under functional lines, these transfers in themselves are not bad. Yet, nonetheless, they do reduce the one agency that Congress visualized in the Older Americans Act as a focal point for services to the elderly.

PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE: RECOMMENDATIONS

The President's Task Force on the Aging made a recommendation which would, in its opinion, reestablish in our Government a strong unit relating to the elderly such as Congress sought to establish in 1965. Permit me to quote directly from that report. You see, Mr. Chairman, I am not neglecting the Task Force. I am quoting the Task Force report:

If the Nation is to achieve the goals set forth in the Older Americans Act, the Task Force believes that the present efforts of the Federal Government on behalf of the elderly should be organized more effectively. The success of some of the new programs it recommends can be accomplished through restructuring such efforts.

A large number of units of the Federal Government are engaged in a range of complex efforts which directly or indirectly affect the elderly in a variety of ways. While all of these efforts are pertinent, their lack of coordination constitutes a major problem and leaves largely unexplored the possibility of interlocking programs.

This lack of coordination at the Federal level causes concern. No agency has authority to determine priorities, to settle conflicts, to eliminate duplications, to identify and assign responsibility, to search for gaps within and between agencies, to initiate concerted action to keep Federal agencies constantly aware of how their programs affect the elderly. The Task Force is also concerned about the ways in which these problems become magnified at the State and local levels through Federal agency policy and grant-in-aid programs.

The Task Force recognizes that in enacting the Older Americans Act, Congress intended the Administration on Aging to serve as the Federal focal point

on aging. The experience of the Administration on Aging during the last four years, however, makes it abundantly clear that inter-departmental coordination cannot be carried out by a unit of Government which is subordinate to the units it is intending to coordinate. Nor does the experience of the President's Council on Aging suggest that such coordination can be accomplished effectively through a committee.

We, therefore, recommend that the President establish an Office on Aging within the Executive Office of the President. We recommend that the President seek statutory authority for this office through an Amendment to the Older Americans Act, but that until such authority is obtained, the President create the office by issuing an Executive Order.

We recommend that the responsibilities of this office include:

1. The development of national policy on aging;
2. The overseeing of planning and evaluation of all Federal activities relating to the aging;
3. The coordination of such activities;
4. The recommendation of priorities to the President;
5. The encouragement of Federal agencies to undertake research and manpower preparation.

We recommend that in addition, the office advise the President on concerns of the aging and alert other Government officials to the potential impact of their decisions on the interests of older persons. In our judgment, these responsibilities warrant Cabinet level status for this office.

In recommending an Amendment to the Older Americans Act to provide for transfer of the Federal focal point on aging from the Administration on Aging to a White House level office on aging, the Task Force intends that responsibility for operation of the several grant programs authorized by the Older Americans Act remain within the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

That is the end of the quote.

It is pertinent to note that the Task Force ranked all 24 recommendations in the order of their importance. The establishment of the Executive Office on Aging was ranked first above the other 23 recommendations.

I repeat my belief that the adoption of this recommendation will establish within our Government a strong unit relating to the elderly.

So much for the recommendation on the Administration on Aging.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I move to the White House Conference, on which I was asked to comment.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE—PLANNING OFF SCHEDULE?

As a member of the Planning Board of the White House Conference on Aging, on the Executive Committee, and as Vice Chairman of the Committee on Programs and Procedures I would like to address some remarks relating to the planning for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. I detect that there is some feeling that the planning for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging is behind schedule and I will also comment on that situation.

As a member of both the 1961 and the 1971 planning body I will make some comparisons on the planning of both conferences. In order to make such comparisons, it is necessary to review the objectives in 1961 and those of 1971. One of the principal differences in the objectives, it seems to me, is in the focus. In 1961 it was necessary to make the public as aware as possible of the needs of the growing elderly population and to strive toward Federal and State programs and legislation on behalf of the elderly. Today the focus needs to broaden to the Federal, State, community and voluntary organization pro-

grams and concerns and the adoption of a national policy on aging which will recognize that the elderly are really a national resource.

Now I am skipping some of the details comparing the 1961 to the 1971 Conference and turning to page 13, of my prepared statement.

The 1971 Conference involves a much greater number of people, especially older people from all across the Nation, than did the 1961 Conference. This requires a well-organized conference which moves from the community, or grassroots, to the State level to the Federal level. It also requires a structure that involves large numbers of national organizations whose members can be mobilized to support adopted policies in the total conference process and not just at the single national conference as happened in 1961.

May I interpose here, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that the very structure or plan for the White House Conference of 1971 carries with it the components for implementation of the programs beyond 1971. This was not the case in the 1961 Conference.

We do have such a plan and structure for the 1971 Conference. For example, I know of no other such Conference which has had multiple-year involvement. This involvement started over a year ahead of the actual Conference with community forums and will be projected into an implementation process following the annual Conference in order to make sure that the Conference is not just another meeting.

COMMUNITY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCES

I know of no other effort comparable to that in 1970 when the plan went to the grassroots for participation by the people with whom the Conference was concerned. The holding of over 6,500 local meetings, involving hundreds of thousands of older persons, is in itself an accomplishment to say nothing of doing it while planning a major White House Conference. This was done in 1970 and made the Nation aware of the elderly population and their needs as nothing else could have done.

At this time there are hundreds of Community White House Conferences being held in the States under the plan developed by the White House Conference staff. In my own State of New York, there are 21 regional and community conferences being held right on schedule—over 110 task forces involving 1,500 persons are all diligently at work right at this very moment. These meetings, in contrast to the forums of last fall, involve providers of service, various specialists, and young people along with large numbers of older persons. These meetings have had technical assistance from the Conference staff through training materials; in some cases actual training, technical guides, workbooks based on the Conference background papers—about which I shall speak later—and training films.

Community conferences in 1961 were the exception rather than the usual as they are in 1971. In most States recommendations will go from Community White House Conferences to State conferences after being collated by State task forces. I understand that all 50 States will be holding State conferences.

This will provide an important community-State link. It will also add to the statewide planning, coordination and evaluation, mandate

given the States in the 1969 amendments to the Older Americans Act, an important consideration in the plan.

I should like also to comment on the status of background papers for the Conference. Early drafts of these papers were reviewed with care by the appropriate technical committees since it was essential that these be technically correct in every respect. Based upon such a critique the authors have now put these papers in final form for printing and the printing schedule gives assurance that the papers will be ready for State conference task forces and for the national organization task forces, both of which are scheduled to meet in May. I believe that the resulting papers will reflect the fact that these technical committees are made up of a mix of older persons, specialists, experts, and providers of service such as are to be expected in the Conference itself and will also reflect a concern for ethnic and minority representatives which the Planning Board has expressed.

Since the meetings of task forces composed of representatives of national organizations have been scheduled for May—these are the meetings that were postponed from the meeting in February as I recall—there will be no delay in the overall conference plan. I think this is important.

WHCA PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS SCHEDULE

The Planning Board Committee on Program and Procedures reviewed this schedule during the past week. The timing of these meetings now coincides with the State White House Conferences. The recommendations coming from the national organizations and States will be collated in July for the consideration of the delegates at the national conference, which is precisely the timing originally planned. The committee also satisfied itself that the background papers will be available for the organization task force meetings, as promised last month.

You will also be pleased to know, I believe, that the Committee on Program and Procedures, of which I happen to be a member and vice chairman, made several recommendations adopted by the Planning Board, which I believe will assure a truly open conference. The Board gave the Executive Committee the power to select the chairmen and vice chairmen of the 14 subject matter sections at the Conference. It also gave the delegates the opportunity to elect the subsection chairmen assigned to each of the 14 subject matter sections.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the majority and minority leaders of this committee during the last session, Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., and Senator Winston Prouty, for taking the initiative in having added the \$650,000 to the Conference appropriation to cover delegate expenses. Being certain of having this amount for this purpose has made it possible for the Planning Board to draw up criteria for delegate nomination from the States.

The Conference program is on target. Community conferences are now being held. State conferences are ready to go in May. Organization task forces are also scheduled to meet in May. Regional hearings on areas of special interest are nearly completed. Earlier forum results have been tabulated for the States which have also been sent

their data books. Thousands of people are taking part at the grass-roots in what will be an historic event for our older Americans.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, you will be pleased with the progress now being made in the plans for the Conference and also to know that many States are including in their plans a component for implementation of the recommendations beyond 1971.

Thank you very much. I am grateful to you for the opportunity to make this presentation.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Meyer.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, may I put in the record the list of the regional meetings that are being held in the State of New York at the moment?

Senator EAGLETON. Yes. That list of regional meetings in New York will be made part of the record and placed at the conclusion of your prepared statement.*

First let me inquire about the administrative structure of the aging program starting with, as a premise, the first and, I would suspect, the most fundamental recommendation made by the President's Task Force on Aging in April of 1970, Recommendation No. 1, Establishment of an Executive Office on Aging, which was quoted from extensively in your statement.

You were the chairman of that task force. What word have you received from the White House with respect to the implementation of that basic recommendation of your task force?

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose I will receive any direct report from the White House. This is now White House material and should be translated, if it is acceptable, in recommendations not to me but rather to the Congress.

Senator EAGLETON. Yes, of course.

Let me get at it another way. Do you know of any individual on the White House staff—Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Ziegler—that deals in whole, or in part, with problems relating to aging?

REPORT REFERRED TO DOMESTIC COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MEYER. I don't suppose there is anyone in the White House that deals in whole, but there are certainly a number of people that are dealing in part, with the program. This very report to which you are referring has been referred to a Subcommittee on Aging of the Domestic Council, who are deeply concerned with programs relating to the elderly. You undoubtedly know that the President of the United States is chairman of the Domestic Council.

Senator EAGLETON. Who is on the Domestic Council?

Mr. MEYER. I do not know all the people on the Domestic Council but it is chaired by the President. I believe that Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Cole, and Mr. Garment are some of the members of the Domestic Council.

Senator EAGLETON. Your report was published in April of 1970.

Mr. MEYER. Yes, sir.

Senator EAGLETON. And transmitted to the White House for the President's attention and the attention of the staff.

*See appendix 2, p. 223.

Has any member of the President's staff, anybody from the White House, called you on the telephone, written you a letter, or had any contact with you since April of 1970?

Mr. MEYER. Yes, sir.

Senator EAGLETON. Was there more than one contact?

Mr. MEYER. There were many contacts. The correspondence included a thank you note.

Senator EAGLETON. You did get a thank you note?

Mr. MEYER. Yes; sir.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, that is more than President Johnson said when he got the Kerner Commission Report, so you are one up on that one.

The contacts that you have had from the White House, have you had any discussions with the staff members about Recommendation No. 1, that is, the establishment of an Executive Office on the Aging.

Mr. MEYER. Only in a very general way, and I am sympathetic with their point of view but I don't accept it.

Senator EAGLETON. That is what I want to know, what is their point of view?

Mr. MEYER. Their point of view is that every group in the United States would like to have a Cabinet-level office. You will find that desire exists not only in governmental administration, you also find that in industry. I was in industry for 45 years, in one of the executive positions where everybody wanted to be responsible to the top executive, and this is practically impossible.

A structure has to be developed where a group does have identity and contact and a pattern where they can make their needs known to the President directly or through the proper channels. But their feeling at the moment, and I am only expressing an impression that I gather, is that they are considering this very seriously but they do have in back of their minds the very knowledge that there are great many groups that would like to have a special Cabinet-level department responsible for the Indians, for the Blacks, for the Mexican-Americans and so on all the way down the line.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, let's forego for the moment the creation of a Cabinet post for aging. Let's get to the area of what the President can do by Executive order. There are lots of things he can do without coming to Congress.

Mr. MEYER. That is right.

Senator EAGLETON. He can take us to war, he can do lots of things.

Mr. MEYER. He can take us out of it, and he will.

Senator EAGLETON. I wish he would.

EXECUTIVE ORDER COULD CREATE CABINET-LEVEL POST

By Executive order, for instance, he can have a special representative or special consultant on aging if he so desires, just as he has Mrs. Knauer, his advisor on consumer affairs who is attached to the White House staff, or Mr. Rumsfeld. He upgraded Mr. Rumsfeld to a Cabinet-level post when he was head of the OEO. So if there were the desire, if there were the inclination, he could have a special assistant of whatever type he wished, could he not?

Mr. MEYER. Yes, he could.

Senator EAGLETON. Even if we did not go the Cabinet-level route, it is conceivable we could go that far if there were the desire.

Mr. MEYER. I don't think that is really the answer, Mr. Chairman, and I beg to not fully agree with you. If you are going to coordinate—and you don't like that word but that is the only way that I know of expressing it.

Senator EAGLETON. I like it but it can be overused.

Mr. MEYER. Correct.

Senator EAGLETON. Like aspirin tablets can be overused.

Mr. MEYER. The desire to coordinate the various Cabinet-level programs it seems to me requires one of equal status for that coordination. As I pointed out in my direct testimony, trying to have a person at a lower level to coordinate action on the Cabinet level is a very difficult thing to do.

Senator EAGLETON. The track record of inter-agency councils and inter-agency coordinating groups, and this goes far beyond the field of aging, has not been a very fruitful one.

Mr. MEYER. That is correct.

Senator EAGLETON. They do meet occasionally, dutifully, and stare at each other and say, "Here we are coordinating today," and then adjourn; and, then 3 months later they meet and re-coordinate, but it has not been very fruitful or productive.

Mr. MEYER. This in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is one of the difficulties of the President's Committee on Aging. It is an inter-departmental committee and generally the heads of the departments are a little too busy to come to the inter-departmental committee meetings and they send someone else.

Senator EAGLETON. Sometimes a summer intern.

Mr. MEYER. That is right.

Senator EAGLETON. Isn't the problem much broader, Mr. Meyer, than one of bureaucratic structure, even though status is important in all walks of life and especially important in government? Is not the problem broader than the organizational chart with arrows pointing to whom you report and all that? Isn't it really a more fundamental question of a lack of commitment; that is, a failure by this administration, and I dare say some of the preceding administrations that were Democratic, to assign a sufficiently high priority to the needs of the aged? Does it not go, really, to the sense of commitment, sense of concern, sense of need?

"A COMMITMENT IS NECESSARY"

Mr. MEYER. First let me say that any structure, Mr. Chairman, that does not carry with it a commitment and a policy is futile. If you are going to have any kind of an organizational chart and put it on the full wall in back of you, it means nothing unless there is a commitment by the people who are involved in that particular organizational chart or organizational structure. So a commitment is necessary. As I pointed out again in my direct testimony, as far back as I can recall in my own interests in this field, and it goes back to many other political

parties other than the one now in power, that we have had that same low priority; it started back with the first office on the aging and it has carried through ever since.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, I fully agree with that. That is, we could by law, if the President would sign it, create a Cabinet post, Secretary for Aging, Secretary for Senior Citizens, what have you. But the mere creation of the Cabinet post itself would not be the solution, isn't that correct?

Mr. MEYER. That is correct. It is my contention that unless you do have a commitment, structure means very little.

May I read, and I hope you will forgive me if I don't identify the source, but this is a report of one of the State Ways and Means Committee on a reduction in the appropriation requested by one of their offices on the aging.

Senator EAGLETON. I don't care to get the source of the statement, but this is a State legislature?

Mr. MEYER. This is a State legislature and this is an official report by the Ways and Means Committee of a State legislature.

Senator EAGLETON. All right.

Mr. MEYER. "Such items as consultant and printing expenses should not be regarded as priorities for the State fiscal year—State X should reconsider its commitment to establish regional and statewide committees in preparation for the 1971 White House Conference on the Aging."

They have cut out the entire appropriation for that particular request to set up regional committees for the White House Conference on the Aging. But this is not only a State or a national situation, Mr. Chairman; you will find it in local communities. The previous witness this morning indicated that he is finding it difficult to get the local support for programs.

Senator EAGLETON. That is not quite accurate, Mr. Meyer. That is the money that goes to the State.

Mr. MEYER. When that dries up there are no local funds.

Senator EAGLETON. There is no local fund to replace it or substitute for it.

Mr. MEYER. We are facing the same situation in my own local community where the Department on Aging is going out of business because the Federal funds have dried up. They are having difficulty in finding local funds. Now I have every belief that we have a pretty good community and I think we will get the funds, but in the meantime there is a year's lag trying to reorganize something that was a good organization previously.

Senator EAGLETON. Now, your Task Force report recommended that the President request the full amount of the authorization for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. No such request, by the way, was made by the President last year, but the Congress took that initiative and added \$650 thousand to the \$1.2 million already authorized for the Conference. Now my question is, What are your recommendations for the use of this \$650,000?

\$650,000 FOR WHCA DELEGATE EXPENSES

Mr. MEYER. I am pretty sure that I am correct, but I may be wrong, that this \$650,000 being used by the States to pay for the transportation of the elderly delegates to the White House Conference who otherwise could not get to the White House Conference if they didn't have the means of transportation. In other words, the very basic plan of the White House Conference calls for a large number of elderly poor to be represented on the delegation but it is futile to name these people for delegates from a distant State and then not have any funds to bring them to the Conference. So these funds, I am pretty sure, generally will be used for that particular purpose.

Senator EAGLETON. Transportation and housing for delegates who need financial assistance.

Mr. MEYER. That is right.

Senator EAGLETON. Would this be a fair summary of the remainder of your testimony? As I heard and read through what you were reading, the remainder of your statement paints a very rosy picture as to how satisfactorily and neatly and timely the planning and development efforts of the 1971 White House Conference are proceeding.

Mr. MEYER. Well, if I painted a simple, rosy picture—

Senator EAGLETON. I didn't say simple, I said rosy.

Mr. MEYER. My brush was a little out of line. It is not simple, nor is it rosy. It is a very difficult program. As I pointed out, I think I did say that the White House Conference staff is being faced with a tremendous program and tremendous problem of trying to organize many of the State conferences, many of the regional conferences and at the same time carry on a program for the national conference. So it is a difficult thing.

I do want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that even though there were some early delays, and I think in any organizational setup of this tremendous magnitude—and it is a tremendous magnitude—you will find some early delays. You have no patterns to follow. People who were involved in the 1961 Conference who are presently involved didn't have the same problem then because they didn't have these preliminary conferences, they didn't have the national organizations organized as such. The national organizations came into operation and made their points of view felt right at the Conference. There were no previous task forces involved in that particular program. All of this makes it a very difficult thing and there were delays. It was necessary that the national organizations' meetings, planned originally for February, had to be postponed because they refused to meet unless the background papers were available to them, and the background papers were not ready for them. So there were delays.

EFFECT OF DELAYED MEETINGS ON TIMETABLE

Now, at the moment, I say they are on schedule. May I take just a few moments to indicate why I say this and why this early delay of a month or two for the meetings of the national organizations does not affect the ultimate timetable beyond April, May or June.

The two major sources of input for the 1971 Conference will be the State regional meetings and the State meetings. Most of these will be

held in May, some will be held in June. These were scheduled to meet at this particular time. This is going to be one source of input, the local forums of last year making their needs known to the regional groups and the regional groups making their needs known to the State meetings which will be held in May.

The other major source of input will be the task forces of the national organizations, and they were to have met originally in February. They are now going to meet in May. Now the results of the national organizations task force meetings and the State meetings have to be collated and synthesized into not a working paper but really into a statement of the needs as indicated by the national organizations and by the States, and these will be the papers that will be actually used in November.

These will be ready in July or August of this year still giving us, the White House Conference group, several months previous to the November meeting to study and digest the papers that are going to be presented to them. So even though the picture is not a rosy one and is not an undifficult one, if that is a word, nevertheless having surmounted and overcome the previous delays they are on schedule today, sir.

Senator EAGLETON. Counsel, Mr. Oriol.

Mr. ORIOL. Mr. Myer, weren't the task forces supposed to have the technical papers in hand at their first meeting; and, isn't that the reason why they did not proceed?

Mr. MEYER. Yes.

Mr. ORIOL. Then the community meetings that you said are now going on, weren't they supposed to have the technical papers in hand?

Mr. MEYER. No, they were supposed to have the workbooks and they do have those workbooks today.

Mr. ORIOL. The technical papers, as I understand the manual, were to be on hand before the community papers; in fact, much of the deliberations were to be based on them. Now are you saying that the summary of the technical papers is in hand even though the technical papers have not been published yet?

Mr. MEYER. No, the technical papers have been written. The technical papers have not been printed, but there is no reason why a summary cannot be made of a technical paper.

Mr. ORIOL. But these technical papers are still revised, aren't they, and the summary has been published?

Mr. MEYER. Not as I am aware of. They are not being revised at the moment. I think the technical papers will be revised after they come back from the States. In other words, the States may find certain recommendations which can be improved upon or should be negated.

Mr. ORIOL. The technical papers don't make recommendations, they are merely an objective study of available information on technical subjects.

Mr. MEYER. That is right.

Mr. ORIOL. And they are not meant to argue a point or a view but to provide information necessary for all of these——

TECHNICAL PAPERS NOW PUBLISHED

Mr. MEYER. These technical papers are now completed. I may be wrong, but it is my impression that these technical papers are now completed and the summaries have been made and the summaries have

been printed. I see that Blue Carstenson does have the workbooks here which are the summaries and also the copy of one of the background papers that has been printed. The others have not yet been printed.

Mr. ORIOL. But the technical papers were originally due in December, weren't they?

Mr. MEYER. This I don't know.

Mr. ORIOL. Well, we could clarify that.

Mr. MEYER. I read from the March 26-27 meeting which was just held this last weekend of the Planning Board Committee on issues and policies. "Policies, proposals or recommendations from States and national organizations will be collected and synthesized for the use of delegates to the national conference. The tasks will be performed by the White House Conference on Aging staff working under the guidance of a technical committee. A separate collation and synthesis will be done for each subsequent area and each of the issues within the area. The collating and synthesizing will be done during June and July and presented to the technical committee during the week of August 9. Following the technical committee's review, and this is the time that the technical committee reviews"——

Mr. ORIOL. That is a re-review.

Mr. MEYER. That is correct. The staff will prepare the summaries for the booklets and titles from the States and the national organizations for the use of delegates at the national conference.

So again the original schedule——

Mr. ORIOL. What is the date of that, if I may ask?

Mr. MEYER. The date is March 26 and 27.

Mr. ORIOL. Of this year?

Mr. MEYER. This was the last weekend meeting we had. It has not been distributed as yet, I don't suppose, because it was just the meeting of the issues and policies and this is merely a draft of their proposals.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you very much, Mr. Meyer. We appreciate your presentation. You have been most helpful to us.

Mr. MEYER. Thank you.

Senator EAGLETON. Our next witness is Mr. Bernard Nash, executive director of the National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons.

Mr. Nash.

STATEMENT OF BERNARD NASH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION/AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS

Mr. NASH. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Senator Percy.

I am here representing more than 2.6 million members of the two associations, several of whom are here in the room with us today. We first want to express our deep appreciation for the leadership that is being shown by this committee in highlighting the needs and bringing attention to the emerging crisis that we think is of a priority nature in this Nation.

I have a prepared statement which I will highlight and then submit for inclusion in the hearing record,* and also would like to do a little editorializing if I may.

Senator EAGLETON. Fine.

*See p. 193.

Mr. NASH. The crisis that I am talking about is not only the crisis of the present but a crisis of the future. There needs to be a strong arm within Government to deal with both. The crisis of the present is evident. The crisis of the future is not readily as evident or in the minds of the people who make the decisions regarding the future on aging.

I am talking about the increasing number of older persons in our society. In 1900 there were 3.3 million; today there are 20 million. In just 70 years of our Nation's history we have increased that rapidly.

Professor Philip Houser of the staff of the University of Chicago, an international population expert, has predicted that in 41 more years there will be 55 million people in this age group. Medical advances are extending and improving the life and health of man.

A technological crisis results from man being increasingly cast in the roll of a consumer rather than as a producer in our society. So we are seeing earlier and earlier retirement. The role of the older person in our society creates a social problem; it creates an economic problem if they have extended years—and those years must be lived on fixed income.

So these are issues that must be studied. These are issues that need to have alternative plans tested. Unless we have committees such as yours, and unless we have an agency to implement plans and to collate the findings and to then move ahead with long-range implementation, we are going to be working with band-aid approaches that create even greater crises than we have today.

The crisis picture also emerges from a series of recent actions and inactions, if you will, on the part of our society and particularly our administration. We have a reduction in the funding that is proposed. But also we have a philosophical point that you mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, a point of commitment beginning with former HEW Secretary Finch's statement, about a year and a half ago, comparing the expenditures of our Government between children's programs and aging programs. Making aging look as though it were receiving a far better share than, what in reality, was fact—because there was a mixing of trust fund moneys—that is, moneys that people had put into accounts for their future, for their retirement, and general revenue funds.

Now those figures lead to a deviousness which we can ill afford in our society. Certainly the older person applauds anything for children; but, when it comes as a proposal that tends to pit one against the other then we feel that there is an error in our priority determinations.

The inactions, of course, have been alluded to—inactions with regard to our present status in the White House Conference planning; our inability to fill the intended goal that Congress expressed in title I of the Older Americans Act, and its passage in 1965.

INADEQUATE FUNDING WILL FORCE CRISIS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, budgets serve two important functions. They express and fix priorities. Second, they are a tool of research management. The President's proposals for 1972 call for 28 percent of the authorized funding of \$105 million—which

Congress established previously. That wholly inadequate priority determination will force our country to face the crises that I mentioned earlier.

Our 2.6 million members certainly applaud any efforts toward national economy; on fixed incomes with problems of taxes and so forth, we certainly could not be against this. But we cannot understand why those least able to absorb reductions are the ones that are called upon to do so. The Administration proposes only \$29.5 million for programs under the Older Americans Act. Title III community service projects—providing Meals on Wheels, homemaker services, transportation for the infirm, recreational programs, adult education activities, and so forth—are cut by some \$3.65 million. Another \$3 million is slashed from the popular and successful Foster Grandparent program.

In the total national budget picture, these are minor amounts indeed; but when taken from an already meager base they portend a crippling effect upon programs the Congress envisioned as urgently needed—when it overwhelmingly approved the Older Americans Act.

As a previous witness has testified, the HEW reorganization in 1967 was one of the first blows that crippled the ability of the Administration on Aging to achieve the intended goal. The indifference and unconcern came into sharper focus with that particular move. Having been the Deputy Commissioner on Aging during that era, I am acutely sensitive to what this did to our ability to move ahead with the title I objectives that had been given to us.

From its inception AoA was unable—through lack of manpower, money and Executive Branch support—to fulfill the vision and goals the Congress had for it. Congress intended for AoA to become a powerful, creative, central voice within government to insure that older citizens, who have contributed so much to our society, might continue to participate fully in its benefits—in dignity and independence.

Now, this was not a program designed for government to give more and more funds to people; it was intended to assist communities and agencies and organizations—private and public—to better serve the older members of society. That goal has not been achieved; and, instead of seeing renewed efforts to achieve it, we see a dismantling of the AoA structure.

SEPARATE PRESIDENT'S ASSISTANT ON AGING NEEDED

The Commissioner on Aging is wearing three hats: as the Commissioner, as the White House Conference on Aging Director, and as the President's Assistant on Aging. No one man, no matter how capable and committed, can properly fill these roles. A separate Presidential Assistant in the White House could insure the needed coordination, at a far greater degree of success than what we have been able to achieve in the past. For the head of an agency, four to five levels down in HEW, seeking to perform in this capacity is immediately suspect—his voice weakened by his multiple identity.

This, perhaps, explains why AoA has never achieved the status within the Executive Branch which the Congress intended. It has never been a forceful element to administer effective programs. Manpower

has always been inadequate. Today it has 54 employees on board, including clerical personnel.

Congress authorized 135 which, I would say, is inadequate—knowing the problems and the issues with which they must deal. Its budget, of course, has never really been adequate. Starting weakly in 1965, it has become even weaker in recent years.

The administration proposes a \$3 million reduction in the tested and proven Foster Grandparent program. I don't need to spend time on that. Research has been done by the University of Utah Medical School, the University of Oklahoma, North Texas State School of Sociology and Economics, and other organizations clearly demonstrating the value of this particular program. Cost benefit studies show that the program actually saves the taxpayer money.

At Western Carolina State School in North Carolina the director of the program—a psychiatrist by the name of Dr. J. Iverson Riddle—ordered his staff to maintain records for a period of 1 year on the costs and the benefits of the program. Mr. Chairman, at the end of 1 year they had clearly demonstrated that this project—costing \$69,000 of funds—had saved the institution in tangible measureable dollars, \$121,000, almost double what it cost.

Now, why are we cutting back these programs if they are clearly so successful? To be effective we should expand such programs; and not take money away from them to experiment with other ideas—which may also be very productive, but have different objectives. We are not saying that the Retired Senior Volunteer program would not be worthwhile, but we are saying that a program which has already proven its worth should be expanded—not cut back. That is why the taxpayers are willing to expend funds on demonstrations, to determine which alternatives are best.

Some AoA spokesmen attempt to identify the shift of these programs to the new volunteer agency as an “alliance of the generations.” That may be a noble goal; but, from AoA's point of view, I think it should be secondary to relieving the poverty of means—and the poverty of meaning—in the lives of older Americans, which the Foster Grandparent program has certainly done, along with certain of the title III programs.

Probably nothing so sharply identifies the impossibility of one man filling the three roles now given the Commissioner of AoA than the present state of affairs surrounding the White House Conference on Aging. This has also been testified to, so I will not go into detail on that.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS STILL WAITING

The Conference date is less than 9 months away and national organizations, such as ours, are still waiting for the technical papers. One of the principal inputs to the Conference is our response to those papers.

I don't know whether you are aware of this, Mr. Chairman, but the Boards of Directors of our two associations made a grant of \$1,000 to each State agency on aging—no strings attached—to help them begin conducting local community forums. Many State executives have informed us that it was those grants that got the program moving; that, had it not been for those grants, they would not have been able to in-

volve older persons in the development of the needs—statements and the priority—statements which they feel important to the potential impact of the White House Conference.

The Congress continued to manifest greater sensitivity to the problems of older Americans than the administration—earmarking funds in this year's budget to defray transportation costs for older persons. As you pointed out earlier, this was not requested, Congress had to make the decision to earmark it. Of deep concern to us is that no funds have been requested and no plans discussed relative to the post-Conference year. This has been called the "Action Year" in the Conference publicity, yet we've had no discussion as to its form and relationship to the Conference recommendations.

Senator EAGLETON. What is going to be the action year?

Mr. NASH. The year following the Conference.

Senator EAGLETON. Calendar or fiscal?

Mr. NASH. I would imagine fiscal year, sir, because there is a 7-month delay between the Conference and the time any actual statement needs to be made by the Secretary of HEW to Congress—regarding findings or recommendations of the Conference. Yet no funds for this activity have been requested. Our associations have called for a public issuance of progress reports—on the implementation of Conference recommendations—hoping that such a plan would impose pressure for meaningful action. As to what happened to the Task Force report, we also feel that the same question might, in subsequent years, be asked, "Whatever happened to the White House Conference?"

Over 700 recommendations were submitted in the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. Our associations have been reviewing these recommendations. We have had a staff of five people going through them and boiling them down into specifics. We have something like 143 actual recommendations out of those 700, many of which were duplicative or were tangents of a given recommendation.

PLAN NOW FOR YEARS FOLLOWING CONFERENCE

Yet when you measure what action has been taken in the years since 1961 on those recommendations, you see the need now to plan for the years following the 1971 Conference.

From what I have said, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the members of our associations are alarmed about the very issues which grip the interest of this Committee.

We deplore the budget reductions in AoA programs reflected in the administration's 1972 requests;

We view the proposed reorganizations within HEW as a further weakening of AoA, and in clear violation of congressional goals for that agency; and

We are alarmed at the inadequate planning, progress and funding for the White House Conference on Aging.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, Mr. Chairman, here are some of the recommendations which we believe to be essential if the original goals are to be met:

1. The Older Americans Act should be extended and enacted into permanent law when it expires in 1972.

2. The Administration on Aging should be restored to its intended position of strength within the Executive Branch as an independent agency within HEW, on a parallel standing with the Social Security Administration, the Public Health Service, the Social and Rehabilitation Service, and so forth, with its administrator reporting directly to the Secretary. Only from this position of strength can it effectively address the immediate crisis and deal with the long-range issues of concern to older Americans.

3. Funding for tested and proven programs, such as the Foster Grandparent program, should be restored with new funds appropriated for program expansions, research and evaluation.

4. A separate individual should be named to fill the position of Special Assistant to the President on Aging.

5. Congress should charge the White House Conference on Aging Advisory Committee to immediately develop program plans and a budget to carry out effective post-Conference year activities.

6. All Government programs involving older Americans should come under final jurisdiction or review of AoA, giving that agency the coordinating responsibility it was originally intended to have.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege of sharing our views with you.

(The statement follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BERNARD E. NASH

I am Bernard E. Nash, Executive Director of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons. On behalf of the more than 2½ million members of our Associations, may I first express, Mr. Chairman and members of these Committees, our appreciation for the leadership you are exercising in support of older Americans in scheduling these hearings to highlight what we believe to be a growing crisis in priority determination by this Administration.

That crisis picture emerges from a series of recent actions—and inactions—which reveal an alarming insensitivity to the needs and aspirations of our nation's 20 million older citizens.

The actions are recent reductions in Administration funding for programs serving the elderly through the Administration on Aging and reorganizations within Health, Education and Welfare which will diminish the effectiveness of proven programs. The inactions are related to the November White House Conference on Aging and the failure of AoA to fulfill the goals for which it was created by the Congress. After presenting our views on these issues, I will conclude my remarks with some recommendations, as you requested, on what action we believe the Congress should take in extending or amending the Older Americans Act.

Budgets—for individuals, businesses and nations—serve two important functions. They fix priorities. And they help in resource management. The Administration's budget proposals for fiscal 1972 programs under the Older Americans Act—calling for only some 28 per cent of the \$105 million in authorized funding and a \$3.65 million reduction in community service projects—establishes, we must conclude, the Administration's sense of priorities for older Americans. And from that wholly inadequate priority determination will inevitably flow not effective resource management, but a squandering of both financial and human resources which our country can ill afford.

The Administration's total program on aging seems to be based on a defensive budgetary approach. The 2½ million members of our two Associations applaud efforts toward national economies. But we cannot understand why those least able to absorb reductions are hit most severely. The Administration proposes only \$29.5 million for programs under the Older Americans Act. Title III community Service projects—providing meals on wheels, homemaker services, transportation for the infirm, recreational programs and adult education activities—are cut by some \$3.65 million. Another \$3 million is slashed from the popular

and successful Foster Grandparent Program. Two million more is trimmed from the research and training programs.

In the total national budget picture, these are minor amounts, indeed, but when taken from an already meager base, they portend a crippling effect upon programs the Congress envisioned as urgently needed when it overwhelmingly approved the Older Americans Act.

When these budget cuts are considered along with the reorganization actions which downgrade the Administration on Aging, the picture of indifference and unconcern comes into sharper focus.

From its inception, AoA was unable—through lack of manpower, money and Executive Branch support—to fulfill the vision and goals the Congress had for it. Congress intended, the record shows, for AoA to become a powerful, creative, central voice within government to insure that older citizens who have contributed so much to our society might continue to participate fully in its benefits in dignity and independence.

That goal has not been achieved. And instead of seeing renewed efforts to achieve it, we see a dismantling of the AoA structure—a siphoning away of funds, programs and functions. And what remains is a facade—a symbol of concern with the impressive title “Administration on Aging,” but with very little to administer. The Administrator, a highly dedicated and committed man, is asked to fill three roles—each conceived as separate and distinct assignments and each needed to insure the successful achievement of AoA goals. He is the Commissioner on Aging, the White House Presidential Assistant on Aging and Director of the White House Conference on Aging. No one man—no matter how capable and committed—can properly fill those roles. A separate presidential assistant in the White House could insure coordination of all government programs serving the elderly. When the head of AoA fills both roles, he is immediately suspect, his voice weakened by his dual identity.

This, perhaps, helps explain why AoA has never achieved the status within the Executive Branch which the Congress intended. It has never been the forceful element necessary to develop and administer effective programs. Manpower has always been inadequate. Today it has only 54 employees on board, including clerical personnel. Congress originally authorized 135 persons. And its budget, of course, has never been adequate. Starting weakly in 1965, it has become even weaker in recent years. And now the proposed removal from AoA of such programs as Foster Grandparents and RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteer Program), the shift of Title IV and Title V research and training programs to the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the budget reductions sap its strength even further.

The Administration proposes a \$3 million reduction in the tested and proven Foster Grandparent Program and earmarks an increase of \$4.5 million for the yet-to-be tested RSVP program. Program experimentation is essential. But experimentation should not be an end unto itself. It should be done to prove theories. Once proven, should we not expect theories to be translated into vigorous programs? In past hearings, your committee has heard at length testimony about the value of the Foster Grandparent Program, both to the older people whom it employs and to the younger people whom they serve. Cost benefit studies have demonstrated that this program actually saves the taxpayers money by delivering services more effectively.

Some AoA spokesmen attempt to identify the shift of these programs to the new Volunteer Agency as a means of strengthening both—a step toward forging an “alliance of the generations.” That may be a noble goal. But from AoA’s point of view, I should think it to be secondary to relieving the poverty of means and meaning in the lives of older Americans for whom these programs were conceived.

Probably nothing so sharply identifies the impossibility of one man filling the three roles now given the Commissioner of AoA than the present state of affairs surrounding the White House Conference on Aging. Called by the President to develop a “new national strategy on Aging,” this Conference should provide a significant breakthrough in focusing adequate priority attention for older Americans and in developing an action agenda to meet not only their immediate needs, but also to develop the long-range strategies needed to deal with the changing age profile in our society. Unless this is done, we doom ourselves to dealing with continuing crises.

But what has happened? With the Conference date less than nine months away, planning is far behind schedule, Technical Committees and Task Forces were named late, meetings have been cancelled and background papers await their low-priority production schedule in the Government Printing Office.

Some state executives have told us that had our Associations not provided financial assistance for their pre-Conference Year activities in 1970, they would have been unable to involve hundreds of interested older people—a major goal for that phase of Conference planning. (The Congress, continuing to manifest a far greater sensitivity to the problems of older Americans than the Administration, had to earmark funds in this year's budget to help defray transportation costs for older people to attend the Conference itself.)

Even though the Conference is planned as a 3-year program with the post-Conference year being most important, no funds have been specifically requested by the Administration for Conference follow-up activities. Our Associations have called for public issuance of Progress Reports on implementation of Conference recommendations—hoping that such a plan would impose pressures for meaningful action.

From what I have said, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the members of our Associations are alarmed about the very issues which grip the interest of this Committee.

We deplore the budget reductions in AoA programs reflected in the Administration's 1972 requests;

We view the proposed reorganizations within HEW as a further weakening of AoA and in clear violation of Congressional goals for that agency; and

We are alarmed at the inadequate planning, progress and funding for the White House Conference on Aging.

But the picture is not all bleak. The Older Americans Act which gave birth to AoA ignited among all who work in the aging field a spark of hope that finally this nation was recognizing its older citizens and embarking on a creative effort to share with them the full benefits and opportunities of our society. To draw attention to the unfulfilled promises is not to say that no progress has been made. A step has been made, albeit a feeble one. Its feeble quality results from no weakness in the concept of the Older Americans Act, but rather from a lack of commitment to the concept by those charged with its implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Here are some of the recommendations which we believe to be essential if the original goals are to be met:

1. The Older Americans Act should be extended and enacted into permanent law when it expires in 1972.

2. The Administration on Aging should be restored to its intended position of strength within the Executive Branch as an independent agency within HEW, on a parallel standing with the Social Security Administration, the Public Health Service, the Social and Rehabilitation Service, etc., with its administrator reporting directly to the Secretary. Only from this position of strength can it effectively address the immediate crisis and deal with the long-range issues of concern to older Americans.

3. Funding for tested and proven programs, such as the Foster Grandparent Program, should be restored with *new* funds appropriated for program expansions, research and evaluation.

4. A separate individual should be named to fill the position of Special Assistant to the President on Aging.

5. Congress should charge the White House Conference on Aging Advisory Committee to immediately develop program plans and a budget to carry out effective post-Conference year activities.

6. All government programs involving older Americans should come under final jurisdiction or review of AoA, giving that agency the coordinating responsibility it was originally intended to have.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege of sharing our views with you. I will be happy to respond to any questions you or members of the Committee might want to pose.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Nash.

I want to address to you one philosophical question that troubles me in this whole area and it relates really to the question that I asked Mr. Meyer concerning the commitment. I have a bookcase in my office that is filled with reports and studies and conference committee recommendations that are gathering dust.

Now we are going ahead with a White House Conference on Aging, it is going to cost a couple of million dollars, and I don't begrudge that, but I wonder, if we are just going to have another performance that will lead to very little?

A great deal of the disenchantment of our age generates from the fact that we make lots of promises. Indeed we declare lots of wars. We declare wars on nutrition, we declare wars on hunger, we declare wars on housing, we declare wars on aging, we declare wars on inferior education, we declare wars on pollution control. We have declared war on practically everything except North Vietnam.

But we never wage these wars. We declare them, we give them lots of rhetoric, lots of conversation, lots of speech making, and we get people's hopes up high that something is going to be done. We are going to declare war on health care—that is being declared now. We are going to get lots of people excited that we are going to give A to Z, cradle to the grave, health care, and we know full well that we cannot even come close to delivering on those promises because we don't have the medical manpower to deliver them.

FOLLOWING WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE—WHAT?

I am not going to digress into that field, but the point I am making is that because of the Conference we will have in November of this year, the senior citizens of America will say: "Maybe there is going to be a better, brighter day. The White House is going to be listening to us, the Congress is going to be listening to us."

I wonder, are we really listening very hard? Even if we listen, isn't that maybe about all we are going to do? And won't this big report that will come out, probably lots of volumes with appendices and supplements and charts and graphs and statistics, be just another collection for me to add to the bookshelf that I have in my office? I have the Kerner Report; I have all kinds of reports. If you want any of them, you are welcome to them. I think it is a very dangerous thing. I think it is a very dangerous exercise in political hypocrisy to arouse these great hopes, anticipations, expectations and then to dash them on the rocks of forgetfulness and inattention. It is better, really not to promise at all, better really not to verbalize at all than to do it and then do nothing thereafter.

So I ramble, and I am sorry. Senator Percy didn't come here to hear a speech from me. I apologize.

Senator PERCY. I always listen.

Senator EAGLETON. Don't you think there is a real risk in this business that we are going through in this year of 1971?

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir. This is the reason our Association is making the grant. We felt that we had a responsibility for moving out and trying to prevent this very thing from happening. This is the reason why our budget authorized hiring new individuals to study what happened since the last White House Conference, trying to develop an action planning. There is a very real danger in this, Senator. We have expressed what we believe are the basic priorities, some of which have been mentioned this morning.

DEVELOPING BASIC PRIORITIES

We feel that the first priority in the field of aging is in fact the development of a social philosophy in this Nation regarding our older members.

We feel that the second one is the creation of a better image of the older person.

The third is the creation of more options for the older person to live a life style they desire.

The fourth is development of means for creating a society awareness of the very things you have expressed here today

So we feel that while it is fine to be talking about needs and to conduct studies and forums all over the country that we have a laundry list at the present time of these, we know what people need. We don't need another conference of that nature. We need to attack some of the fundamental priorities.

Senator EAGLETON. All right.

One final question, Mr. Nash, and then I will yield.

More than once, during these hearings to date, it has been suggested that undue attention has been paid to political considerations, that, indeed, there has been a political screening process in the selection of members of technical review committees and task forces. We have heard testimony on that from a number of witnesses to date. Do you have any specific examples of such practices?

Mr. NASH. Sir, I would be testifying only in terms of rumor, feeling, and so forth of this.

Senator EAGLETON. Congress delights in receiving that kind of testimony. [Laughter.]

SUSPICIOUS OF DELAYS IN APPOINTMENTS

Mr. NASH. We are concerned in the delay for the appointment of persons. I left the Administration on Aging about 15 months ago, therefore I was active in the preparation of the original joint resolution which Congress passed—calling for the White House Conference—and in the early days of trying to determine what direction we would go with this. To now be on the other side of the table and to observe what has happened—knowing of the nights and weekends we put into that early planning—and wondering why we are no further ahead than now; we are suspect of roadblocks that have been thrown in the way.

Senator EAGLETON. Senator Percy.

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

As a personal note, I think I would like to simply observe that I don't imagine that either the majority or the minority members of the committee this morning would, by age level, put us in a position of exactly walking in the shoes of the older Americans; but, I don't think we have to be at that age level.

As the honorary chairman of all the retired employees of Bell & Howell Company—a position I still retain—for some 20 years, I have gone back every year with those people, walked with them through life as they have gone into their retirement years. We set up, some 20 years ago, a retirement counseling program beginning at age 55; so that as Bell & Howell employees approached the retirement age of 65,

they would have had years of experience in thinking through the problems of adjusting to retired life—and it has become a real pioneer program.

I would like to, with some deep feeling, say how pleased I am to be on this committee and to join with my honored colleague from the sister State of Missouri, in what he has said this morning about the lack of money for the funding of programs. I can say we have done the best we can, by defeating the SST the other day to help the administration get more money for programs that will help people here on earth. [Applause.]

I would like to commend Mr. Nash for his statement. I found one phrase, "that poverty of means and meaning in the lives of older Americans," that is about the most powerful nine or 10 words I have seen in this field. There is a poverty of means, but also of meaning. I think this is the thing that we must recognize. We gravitated to a society where we don't, in our churches, take this responsibility any longer; where young people don't assume that there is a responsibility for the elderly, as there was in this country years ago, as there has been in the world ever since the beginning of mankind. Somehow we seem to have shifted all the burden to the State.

I don't think the State can ever be a substitute. Somehow, Mr. Nash, I hope through the work of your Association, the work of these hearings and other hearings, we are going to try to talk to the American people—and talk about their responsibility to their own families. As I visited the homes for the elderly in Chicago, on an unannounced tour a week ago Sunday—I just stopped in after church, at a convenient time for people to come—and in not a single nursing home that I was in did they have a single visitor visiting the elderly. They are neglected, they are left alone.

In the hearings by this committee that we are holding in Chicago, on nursing homes, we are going to reveal a scandal that exists in the nursing homes for the elderly; not only negligence; but, exploitation of the elderly by those who were seeking a fast buck, and a profit at their expense, and our expense at the Federal Government level—because we provide many of the funds.

I think, also, Mr. Nash, your statement that you have provided financial assistance for the State pre-Conference Year activities in 1970 is to be commended; and, I think both the chairman and I deeply appreciate what you have done in that field—to make these hearings and this Conference much more meaningful.

EXTEND—THEN PHASE OUT—EARNINGS LIMITATION

I would like to ask specifically, because it is such a good opportunity and you represent a great many people, how you feel about certain specific things. I introduced, and the Senate last year overwhelmingly passed, an increase in earnings limitation from \$1,680 to \$2,400. I would like to next introduce a phasing out, over a period of 7 years, of any earnings limitation. Do you have a personal position on this?

MR. NASH. Sir, it is 100 percent in support of what you are expressing. Our Legislative Counsel has voted for this. They recognize the points that you have placed in the phasing concept and support this.

We feel that to deny people who are retiring with good health and with much experience, ability and desire to work, to jeopardize their position by saying that you cannot work and receive the money that you yourself have placed into this bank is completely inconceivable.

Senator PERCY. I appreciate that. I think we would like help over in the House—that is where we failed. We will pass this amendment in the Senate again. I think it is the kind of thing that, again, it just seems wrong to have a disincentive to work—particularly when the extra income is so urgently needed.

Mr. NASH. And it may not cost money in the long run, sir. It may appear to but when people begin to earn income and pay taxes and keep the economy moving with their earnings, I question the manner in which anyone would say that it costs money.

Senator PERCY. I also would like your judgment on another provision that I put in—where we have 100 percent of Social Security for women. I have never seen any woman that can live any cheaper than a man; in fact, there might be evidence to say that it is to the contrary. Why should women have 82½ percent and the man gets 100 percent? Do you support this principle?

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir; we certainly do support it.

Senator PERCY. In your statement you indicated the Administration on Aging should be restored to its intended position of strength. I interpret that to mean that at one point it did have the intended position of strength. If so, when was that?

Mr. NASH. No, sir. No, sir. The word “intended” was quite intentional. Having been the first Deputy Commissioner, from the inception of the Older Americans Act and the Administration on Aging, I was responsible for developing the State programs—the handbook and guidelines, models and so forth—to carry out the title I intent through the title III program. It became evident that with the manpower in the budget we had, even in the beginning, to make an extremely difficult decision.

We had two basic charges, one to begin to implement the grants programs at a 3, at a 4, and at a 5. We also had the second charge of coordination of being a focal point in Government for the older American. With the manpower and the resources we had, we had to make that difficult decision to focus on the grant program and to ride with whatever we could accomplish in the coordinating role. That simply became a side issue with us, not because we intended it but because we had nothing to do it with.

FUTURE FOR OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Senator PERCY. In your prepared statement you state, “The Older Americans Act should be extended and enacted into permanent law when it expires in 1972.”

I would certainly agree that, always, it appears to be better to have something permanent in the law rather than come up with something new; but, as a practical politician—if I can call myself that now—I just wonder whether or not, in view of the fact that no administration in your judgment has brought this up to the level that it should be; whether or not, by requiring that it be re-extended periodically,

whether, that does not then focus new priority and new attention, and give us a chance to again bring it up to the level that it should be? Because once it is in permanent law, how do we get a crack at it?

Now I ask you a practical question, whether or not you would want to comment on your recommendation now?

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir.

Certainly the effect of hearings of this nature in the throes of a dying organization in an attempt, like the Phoenix, to bring it out of the dust and ashes, you can achieve some degree of visibility. I ask, why is this necessary?

If we do make a commitment, if we do recognize that from the present moment we have a growth rate of some 17 million persons in only 70 years of our Nation's 300-year history and then we listen to Dr. Houser and we find that we will have a 35 million increase in only 40 years in this age group, I do not think our energy should be expended on trying to prove and reprove the need for this, it should be for getting on with the job. Therefore, I would feel that we need a public agency. We should make that commitment philosophically now and we ought to spend our time giving it the support it needs and not trying to reaffirm the fact that somebody is failing.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Chairman, if I could have another couple of minutes.

Senator EAGLETON. Certainly.

Senator PERCY. I would like to ask you, again, one specific question.

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BILLS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Senator PERCY. I wish I had had a chance to talk with you, and your Association, before I drew the bills up. I will be introducing, tomorrow, a series of seven bills for the senior citizens; and, because they will not be introduced until tomorrow, I would very much appreciate the press observing a p.m. release tomorrow—because there may be some last minute modifications before I present them on the floor.

I would like to go through each of them, briefly, to just get some reaction from you—or have you think about them—and give me a considered reaction from the Association, or any other groups that are represented here that do represent the aging.

First would be a bill to create—this is not a new idea, it is just to try to implement something that has been talked about—an Assistant Secretary of Housing for the Elderly within the Office of HUD to administer, plan and coordinate housing programs for the elderly.

Do you have a position on that? Would you support it?

Mr. NASH. We would support it.

Senator PERCY. The second bill; to improve conditions in long-term care facilities, would develop more comprehensive and stricter Federal controls for these facilities and provide for inspection, training and enforcement moneys.

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir.

Senator PERCY. My feeling is that this is such a national problem—and there is so much abuse at the local level, as we have revealed in the Chicago investigations, by the media, and the Better Government Association, and its Operation Watchdog, I started years ago—that I

think we have to have some national standards. I come to this reluctantly, but I come to it as a matter of firm conviction. Would you concur?

Mr. NASH. Yes, and we would ask for subsidization of the State agencies charged with this responsibility. When I was the director of the State program for aging in Minnesota we had three inspectors for all hospitals, nursing homes and other group care facilities. When I left 5 years later we still had three inspectors and we had 24 some additional beds that had been built in the meantime.

Senator PERCY. I think, if it is important for us to have national standards and Federal inspection of meat packing houses, certainly it is important in the care of the elderly—to have adequate standards protected by Federal law. Make it a Federal offense to break those standards—which, I think, is now a national problem.

Mr. NASH. We would also ask that that be considered not only in your bill, Senator, but also that in any national health plan that is composed that these protections will be built in.

Senator PERCY. The next bill grew out of my proposals years ago—to provide half fares for the elderly, in the use of public transit, in Chicago in nonrush hours. I have been pleased with the success of that program which adds revenue; which does not detract a bit. These nonrush hour cars are half empty. With reduced fares, the cars can be better utilized by people.

REDUCED FARES

I now would like to extend this proposal much farther because I think the ability to travel, to move about—particularly if you lost a driver's license for instance—is terribly important. It is terribly important to be with your children, and to get there on a basis that is less costly. One of the bills that I am putting in tomorrow will provide requiring half fare opportunities on mass transit facilities, trains and buses crossing State lines, and airlines during nonrush hours or on a seat availability basis. Make it a Federal offense to deny automobile insurance on the basis of just age—if the person has a driver's license.

Why should the insurance company be permitted, or allowed, to deny insurance because of age when, in their own judgment, they are not the ones who set the standards; it is the drivers' tests that have to be met and passed. Yet sometimes, the insurance is refused because of age which makes it literally impossible for a person to drive, even if he has a driver's license.

How would you feel about those bills? I am almost asking you, in your opinion, how do you feel about motherhood?

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir; and I feel pretty good about it.

Let me expand upon that. We feel we have long supported this. Our Legislative Counsel has repeatedly recommended this sort of action. We have submitted letters to the FAA to get airline reductions which we understand we have in this program but we would like to see it half fares with reservations and not on a standby basis because if you are asking the older person to sit in a crowded airport repeatedly, we thing this is rather unfair.

We have our own contract with an insurance company which provides automobile insurance to the older person which is noncancelable to age 80, and the evidence we receive from people making application for this and the stories that we have on this would certainly bring about wonderful evidence in expanding that program.

Senator PERCY. I would be most anxious to have it. I appreciate this very much.

Mr. NASH. Fine. Mr. Brickfield accompanied me here, our Legislative Counsel, and I am sure he will be calling you to assist in any way he can.

Let me add one additional point on the transportation because we are not really talking transportation, we are talking mobility. We are talking about the whole issues of retiring from an active life simply because of mobility, and we know the impact of this on health, we know it on mental health, we know it on the ability to contribute to one's society. Therefore, it is a critical issue that requires more than than just asking for half fares. It requires really serious consideration in terms of subsidies to transportation systems, public or private—perhaps the development of a system not unlike the school bus system, perhaps the development of feeder lines into the major bus lines from areas where older persons are living, perhaps a subsidization in rural areas of the State where there is no public transportation. So it is useless to ask for or receive half fares. This is a much broader issue than simply half fares and public transportation.

\$2.5 BILLION UNUSED IN HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Senator PERCY. You are getting into my legislation from last week. I put in a bill, last week, to abolish the Highway Trust Fund. Here you have a \$2.5 billion unused surplus in that fund, and mass transit is starving. There is no question that we have to get into helping with operating expenses. Senator Williams and I have been working together on legislation which overwhelmingly passed the Senate last year, and which failed, again, in the House. So we need your help (in the other body on the other side of the Capitol) with our honored colleagues over there.

Mr. NASH. Thank you, sir. I am sure our 21½ million members will support that as well.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Chairman, from what few years we have been here, we know that it is very difficult sometimes to get appropriations—you can get the authorization, but the funding is another thing. Also there are other ways to accomplish things. You can skin a cat several different ways; and, if you can find a way to provide the financial benefit without the appropriation year by year, you are subject then to ups and downs in the economy, and everything else. It is better to build it in the law as a structure.

So the next bill is to provide 100-percent deductibility of medical expenses for senior citizens. The bill would also exempt, from paying Social Security taxes, persons over 65 who are receiving Social Security and who are also working.

What sense does it make to keep on paying Social Security taxes if you should be a recipient of Social Security—which you have earned for the previous 30 or 40 years? What would be your reaction to that?

Mr. NASH. We are 100 percent in support of that again, Senator. We would add that if this particular concept would not be supported that there is an additional way of handling this. If a person does go on working, they should be able to increase the amount of Social Security that they would receive when they do finally retire.

Senator PERCY. The other side of the coin?

Mr. NASH. Yes.

Senator PERCY. We would not care how it is done if we just increase the income which we think they have earned.

Mr. NASH. Correct.

Senator PERCY. Fine.

Getting near the end, a bill to include drugs under Medicare which would eliminate partial payment by the consumer.

Mr. NASH. Absolutely. We are 100 percent in support of that.

Senator PERCY. A bill to provide employment opportunities for the elderly by setting up a wide range of counseling, training, supporting and research activities in the Department of Labor. This bill would also authorize the Secretary of Labor to encourage the employment of senior citizens in federally funded projects, and to partially subsidize community service projects employing low-income people over 55.

Mr. NASH. Yes, sir. We are in support of that. Evidence of this is the fact that we have created, about a year and a half ago, an organization called Mature Temps which is seeking temporary employment for older persons. There is clear evidence through the response to this of the need for your bill, and again we would like to supply you with some of that information.

PROVIDE FOR MULTIPURPOSE COMMUNITY CENTERS

Senator PERCY. Lastly, a bill to provide for construction, staffing and maintenance of programs within multipurpose community centers for senior citizens. Such centers could serve as the focal point for delivery of community services to the elderly, including nutrition, transportation and informational services.

Mr. NASH. There is need for multipurpose facilities which would cut down the problems of transportation and would make possible more this thing we have all been talking about, better coordination of the services that are already existing in our communities.

Senator PERCY. Well, I am very encouraged by your response; and, whatever additional information you can provide in these fields I will certainly be eager to have.

Mr. NASH. May I say we are encouraged by your interest and your producing of these bills, so we hope and pray you will continue to be a long-term member of this committee.

Senator PERCY. Well, I don't introduce an awful lot of legislation, but with home ownership, after a 2-year battle it is now law. We intend to follow through and see that these are not just bills that are introduced, but bills that are passed and implemented.

SENIOR CITIZENS MUST FEEL NEEDED AND WANTED

I agree with your comments on the Foster Grandparent program, and it comes back to our opening comments of the need. I think this is the greatest lack that we feel today; that senior citizens feel neglected, feel they are out of the main stream, they are not needed or wanted. Yet when we have the administration proposing day care centers now with operating funds; who better could provide the talent to go in and help man thousands of day care centers that are going to be required all over the United States? Who better can provide many of the services that we need and want, if we have training and skill provided to senior citizens?

Look at our hospitals. You pay \$100 a day, and if you ring the bell at night—between maybe 12 midnight and 6 in the morning, you are lucky if you get anyone to come in. They simply don't have the help, even in hospitals where you are paying a very, very high rate, much less adequate assistance and help in nursing homes for the elderly. There are many who are physically qualified, right up through their 80's, to provide service and care; and, none of them would be more compassionate than some of the people I saw serving the elderly in these nursing homes that I have been visiting.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield at this point. I have one question for Mr. Garson Meyer but I have been much too long and I am sorry to have taken so much time.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Pell.

Senator PELL. No questions.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF AoA

Senator EAGLETON. The Chair at this time is going to announce that we will not be able to complete these hearings this morning. We are seeking a room for tomorrow morning to hear from Dr. Carstenson and Mr. Fitch.

While we have a few more minutes I will ask a general question of the entire panel, since they are all here. We will just go down the line starting with Mr. Meyer and moving geographically, but not politically, to the right. [Laughter.]

There are two schools of thought, to perhaps over-simplify it, about the role of AoA. One school of thought would have it that AoA should be a separate and distinct high-echelon agency reporting directly to either some Cabinet staff or to the Secretary of HEW and should be an on-going and an expanding governmental agency that would operate expanded programs.

On the other hand, there is another school of thought that says AoA should be, as OEO was originally conceived to be, an agency for innovation, creation, demonstration, to try a multitude of different approaches, dispose of the ones that don't show themselves to be very productive or utilitarian, and transfer those that do seem to be workable after a reasonable period of time to an on-going operating basis in some other department; that is, it really should be a testing agency, discarding the nonutilitarian programs but transferring the ones that have proven to be useful to other agencies. Now I admit I have over-simplified that a bit. We will go down

the line and ask each of the gentlemen, here with us this morning, how he views the role of AoA.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, when we deal in human values we have to compromise quite frequently. I think there is a compromise arrangement to answer your question. One is to have an advocate similar to the Task Force's recommendation directly in the Executive Branch of the Government and then in HEW have the Administration on Aging with the responsibility to carry out the service program, the grant-in-aid programs or the directly supported programs in AoA. I think you need both of them. You need one whose full responsibility lay in the overall advocacy of the total programs without actually operating the program and then in HEW probably have an operating program.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you.

Now the next responder will be Dr. Blue Carstenson of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. CARSTENSON. Yes. I think that you need a bill for some coalition, and I would like to build a coalition between Aging and the Office of Management and Budget which has the money. So I think I agree that there does need to be something in HEW, something that can give support to State agencies on aging and have a definite program related to these State agencies. But I would like to see this shifted from welfare either to an independent agency which I don't think the bureaucracy is going to buy regardless of the Congress' proposals to this effect but to transfer over to Social Security. At least you will have a coalition there of friends and you can survive and have some interest in aging rather than in welfare where it does not have any friends to speak of.

On the upper level I think an independent commission, and you drag the Office of Management and Budget in as a member as well as someone representing the AoA in HEW. Some way we have to get at that. The Office of Management and Budget simply does not have any commitment to the people at this time.

Senator EAGLETON. Next Mr. William Fitch, Executive Director of the National Council on the Aging.

Mr. FITCH. I feel very strongly that an Administration on Aging should be an independent agency. I think it must have sufficient funding, it must have an independence for operating. I don't object to what Mr. Meyer has suggested, that we have an advocate working in the White House, but I think the congressional intent was diluted when they put it under the Social Rehabilitation Service.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT FOR AoA

So I think if we go back to what the congressional intent was, to give the Administration on Aging funding and adequate staffing, that we might get on with the job and not have to have anything special to do it. I think we can retract legislation, but make certain there are funds and staff. I think it should be staffed by people who are committed to the kinds of things we talked about for 10 years.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you.

Finally, the same question to Mr. Nash who has previously testified representing the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons.

Mr. NASH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that there is a need for an independent agency within HEW for two or more reasons. The first is that it creates a special staff with the expertise that is essential to good planning and long range planning development within an area that is becoming more and more specialized.

Second, if the President's proposed reorganization plan will take some 105 agencies or so and put it into some five units, we will see the need for advocates in an independent agency that can assure the older American that their voice is being expressed. At the same time we do need a White House assistant for both the coordinating role and for dealing with the Office of Management and Budgeting because we feel that, at the present time, the budgets for the field of aging are being established on the basis of a given amount of dollars in which a program must fit rather than on the basis of need or any concept, any philosophy with respect to what the Nation needs in this area. We need a person with sufficient knowledge and authority to assure that the proper budget approach is adhered to.

Senator EAGLETON. I might say, to all the gentlemen, that we have invited Mr. Shultz of OMB to testify at future hearings of these two committees.

Now before adjourning I will yield to Senator Percy who wishes to direct a question to Mr. Meyer.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Meyer, we have heard a good deal about what the Executive Branch of Government has not done in this administration and previous administrations. I think we can be sympathetic with the administrations to a degree, as they have pressing problems and pressing requirements on all sides and we have had deficit financing for a long time. I am sure that there is not any implication on our part that there is a lack of compassion and understanding. I know certainly Dr. Shultz, whom I have known for years, and John Martin, whom I have known for many years—and I would be most interested in hearing from them on the 27th—will benefit from the testimony today.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTING WHCA RECOMMENDATIONS

I would like to turn the spotlight back to us. What is the congressional responsibility for implementation of the recommendations of the White House Conference? Where do you think we fit in? What can we do? It is easy for us to say what they can do downtown. What do you think we ought to be doing about the recommendations that come out?

Mr. MEYER. Senator Percy, in answering that question I hope that the Chairman will not think me presumptuous if I refer to a statement that he made this morning about having his bookcases filled with conference reports. In all sincerity he was questioning the effectiveness of conferences of this sort and what happens to their recommendations after they are made, other than only filling his library bookcase.

In my direct statement which I did not read, Mr. Chairman, I stated that perhaps the failure to implement some of the objectives

of the 1961 Conference lay in part to our great eagerness, which eagerness resulted in the adoption of over 600 recommendations. I think this overwhelmed everybody and we didn't know where to start; yet several good things did come out of the 1961 White House Conference such as Medicare which, with all its shortcomings, is still doing a great deal of good. The 1961 Conference also stimulated the establishment of the Administration on Aging with the support of statewide programs and local community programs.

LIMIT WHCA TO FIVE MANAGEABLE RECOMMENDATIONS

We are saying today, Senator, at Conference Planning Board meetings, that this Conference must limit itself to manageable, achievable, adoptable recommendations few in number. We are looking actually to probably no more than four or five manageable recommendations. I submit that the implementation of these recommendations should become the responsibility of the Congress as well as the administration and also of the people back home. It is not enough to say that the administration should do something about it, and I agree with you the administration should, but the Congress also has a serious responsibility to put into operation those programs which they agree should be put into operation and not sit back and say, "Well, we will close the books, the Conference is over; it is in our libraries and let's forget about it."

I think the Congress has a very serious responsibility and certainly an equal responsibility as the administration has in putting the recommendations into operation. It is my firm hope, gentlemen, that the administration will put pressure on you and that you put pressure on the administration and between them we will get some helpful results from the Conference.

You mention that we are spending several million dollars for this Conference. This is a small amount when compared to the manpower that is going into this White House Conference planning and implementation largely on a volunteer basis. We certainly don't want to see all of this effort go for naught because of lack of interest on the part either of the administration or of the Congress.

Thank you.

Senator EAGLETON. Senator Pell.

Senator PELL. I would like to contribute for a moment. We can introduce programs, we can pass bills for certain criteria but unless the administration carries out these criteria and requests the money from the Appropriations Committee and Bureau of Budget Programs, programs don't happen concerned exclusively with older people. I know some years ago getting into the OEO legislation provisions for what I call pavillion places where older people could be warm in the winter and cool in the summer and play games and checkers in centers around the country; the legislation was put in the authorizing but never a darn thing really happened with regard to implementing it.

So I think the point that Senator Percy made earlier is very valid, we have to go through all these hurdles. We have the responsibility appropriated but then I think the older people have to exert their force so that the authorized programs—frankly many of the good programs which are not being implemented on the books.

Mr. MEYER. I am glad you mentioned the role of the older person. I think it is a three-way effort which includes the administration, the Congress, and the electorate—particularly the older persons. Where the administration is not effectively carrying out the request of the Congress, I think the Congress can go back to their constituency just as the constituency has to go to their Congressmen. I think if we are going to follow the democratic processes in this country, and I hope we do for many, many years, that you will have a play between the Congress and the people and between both of these and the administration.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Meyer.

Thank you, Senator Percy and Senator Pell.

Thanks to the entire group.

This will conclude this morning's hearing. Tomorrow morning, Wednesday morning, at 10:15 this committee will reconvene in room 6226, on the 6th floor of this building, to hear from Dr. Carstenson and Mr. Fitch.

(Whereupon, at 12:36 p.m., the joint committees recessed, to reconvene at 10:15 a.m., Wednesday, March 31, 1971.)

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS

STATEMENT OF MR. JESS TEAGUE, DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, ADA, OKLA.

Senator Harris and ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored to have a part in this. I'm going to reduce my remarks to facts outside of my opening remarks.

I had my first experience with the senior citizens as a group when we organized the Activities Center here in Ada and employed Mrs. Price to operate that center. Many of you here today took part in that. I found that was one of the greatest things we had done in this county for the elderly people. Some of them are activated to useful and happy lives who had already given up. Some of them, by having a chance to come to the center, could communicate with other people, their friends. Many of these people cannot go out like they used to go and so it provided a place for them to get together. But here is a great weakness in the law that permitted us to do that. We began in the first year with a matching of 80-20. The next year it was to 60-40. The next year to 50-50. The next year it was zero. So we operate three years and if you're not in a town large enough with money to carry the center on it dies because the town just can't finance it. The little towns like Stonewall and Allen and places like that have no earthly way that they can carry the activities center on after the government draws out of it. There should be some way that the funds could be put in if nothing more than paying the rent and the utilities so that those people could go ahead and continue with the center because every one of them enjoys it. I visit these centers all over the ten counties that comprise the Indian Nation. I hope there will be a real look taken at that and I think every community, at least every county, ought to have one or two centers in their towns for the people to meet and to visit with one another and carry on these activities that they like to do.

I feel that this stresses the importance of Title III community programs in our smaller cities, and the need to increase, not cut, these vital programs.

At this point, I would like to include in my statement the comments which Mr. John Hoppis, Director of the Special Unit on Aging of the Oklahoma Department of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services, made concerning the Title III community program funds from the Older Americans Act at the January 13 hearings in Ada:

Mr. HOPPIS. The only specific recommendations for this area of need cited by older persons was the need for programs explaining fraud to older persons, and a general desire for continuing education.

Since 1965, following the passage of the Older Americans Act of 1965, Oklahoma has made extensive efforts to work with local organizations in communities in developing programs for older persons in the communities. It is recognized loneliness is one of the greatest problems older people have, and our efforts have been in the area of helping to alleviate that loneliness. With the use of Title III funds from the Older Americans Act of 1965 and with local resources, we have developed 49 programs in Oklahoma which are considered multipurpose activity centers for senior citizens. It is felt that this type program is alleviating the great need, loneliness, in that it gives people a home away from home during the daytime where they can meet new friends and renew acquaintances with old friends. We feel certain this is meeting a great need of older people, since 15 centers that are not now being funded from Title III funds continue to be operated with local re-

sources only. Ada is a prize example of this type program's being recognized as a need by local government, which is now funding the program. It is also recognized that there is a need for more funds for these type programs, and our dream is to develop these programs in every community throughout the State of Oklahoma.

It is our belief that a lot of the needs areas discussed above are being met in these centers at the community level.

Again, may I express to you our appreciation for inviting us to participate in this meeting.

The cuts for FY 1972 in funds for Title III community projects will equal \$60,000 in my State of Oklahoma, or 48% of the monies available last year. Mr. L. E. Rader, Director of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services, has informed me that this decrease will make it impossible to initiate any new programs, since most of the money available for FY 1972 is already allocated to continuation of existing projects.

A shift in funds by the Administration from community programs to area wide projects is reflected in the budget. I have received correspondence from Mr. Rader on this change in emphasis. He feels, and I agree with his evaluation, that the funds expended at the local level will go farther to provide the necessary programs for our elderly people. I do not oppose the area-wide programs; however, I do object to their expansion at the expense of the Title III community programs which have been very successful in Oklahoma.

I am likewise concerned at the \$3 million cut in the budget for the Foster Grandparents Programs for FY 1972. This program has been very successful in Oklahoma, and I would like to include at the end of my remarks a statement made by Mr. Dale Kirk, Director of the Sequoyah Foster Grandparents Program, and comments made by several of the Foster Grandparents at the hearings which I held in Ada, Oklahoma.

The Administration Budget indicates that the shift in funds from the Foster Grandparent Program is compensated for by a budget increase for the Retired Senior Volunteer Program. This program provides for volunteer services by older persons with reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. Consideration of the Foster Grandparent program, particularly in Eastern Oklahoma, shows that the older persons have a real need for the income which they receive from this program. This income can be the difference between poverty and the ability to have a more comfortable existence. Thus, I would strongly urge that the increase in the Retired Senior Volunteer Program not be used to justify cuts in a program which provides different benefits altogether for those elderly people participating in it.

I would like to add to my testimony a letter from Mr. L. E. Rader, Director of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services, concerning the Title III funds, a letter from Mrs. R. R. Platt of Wagoner, relating to the community project in that town, and a response to her letter from John B. Martin, Commissioner on Aging.

LETTERS CONCERNING THE EVERGREEN CENTER,
WAGONER, OKLA.

WAGONER, OKLA., Jan. 21, 1971.

Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently heard you speak on TV about our retired people and the need for them to have some kind of recreation, etc.

Our little city is lucky enough to have an organization for this purpose but it will likely be closed soon, as we cannot get enough finances to keep it going. After the first 3 years, the government assistance was withdrawn last April. We have had some small help from the city and some of the Wagoner clubs. Since January 1st the city cannot give us any help and we cannot pay our director.

We have the use of a building and around 40 of us are paying \$1.00 each month to buy materials to work with in craft classes.

We have a large class making ceramics and some of the pieces we make are donated to be sold so we can buy new molds, etc. When we have a Pot Luck dinner each month, we usually have 50 or more present. All activities are open to our colored people and they work along with the rest of us in craft classes.

Our Dr. Frank Nelms has recommended some of his patients to attend the "Evergreen Center" because they need to get out and be with other people.

This has been successful but we do need financial help real soon. We pay our director \$100.00 a month. Is there any kind of a fund that we might get to help our program?

Any help or advice would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. R. PLATT,
405 Parkinson, Wagoner, Okla.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1971.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: This is in reply to your letter dated February 2, 1971, concerning the refunding of the Evergreen Retirement Center in Wagoner, Oklahoma.

Community Service Grant funds under Title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, are available to support community programs. These funds are administered by the Special Unit on Aging in Oklahoma. The original legislation embodied a "seed money" concept which envisioned a decreasing level of Federal support for a three year period after which local resources would support the program in its entirety. As you know, the 1969 Amendments to the Older Americans Act modified this concept to permit funding beyond the third year. The State Agency's decision, however, to fund fourth year projects will depend on the availability of Federal funds for programs, priorities, and commitments for second and third year projects. The Retirement Center in Wagoner, Oklahoma was funded in April, 1967. Funds for the project were terminated effective March 31, 1970.

There is no question that the Evergreen Retirement Center is meeting a real need of the senior citizens in Wagoner. We would suggest that your constituent, Mrs. Platt, discuss her concerns with respect to funds for the center with Mr. John J. Hoppis, Supervisor, Special Unit on Aging, Department of Public Welfare, Box 25352, Capitol Station, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125. Staff of that office can provide technical assistance, consultation and information of available resources in the community.

If we may be of further service to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. MARTIN,
Commissioner on Aging.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OKLAHOMA PUBLIC WELFARE COMMISSION,
DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS, SOCIAL
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 22, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: Reference is made to a telephone conversation by a member of your staff with Mr. Hoppis, Supervisor, Special Unit on Aging, regarding information on the program on aging in Oklahoma. The following information is being submitted at your request.

Oklahoma received \$147,762.00 for FY 71 for use in Title III projects for local communities. Part of these funds was morally obligated for continuation of projects already in operation but not yet financially able to fund entirely with local resources. These Title III projects included 9 new projects and 16 for continuation. Since 1966, Oklahoma has funded 52 Title III senior citizens multi-purpose activity centers, and of 16 which are no longer being funded with Title III funds of the Older Americans Act, 15 are continuing to operate with local resources. This points out the need local communities have for programs for senior citizens, as well as the interest shown by the community once the program is developed and they can see the benefits it provides to the older people of the community.

We have been informed that the tentative budget for FY 72 for Oklahoma which can be used for Title III projects approved by this state agency has been reduced to \$87,783.00, which is a reduction of approximately \$60,000.00 from

the FY 71 allotment. Most of the FY 72 allotment is morally committed for continuation projects.

It is our understanding that of the \$9,350,000 FY 72 budget for Title III, \$4,000,000 of this amount is for areawide projects with perhaps part of this for the Model Cities. We are at present funding Title III projects in each of the three Model Cities in Oklahoma.

It is our understanding that part of the tentative FY 72 budget for Title III funds will be earmarked for funding areawide projects which will be approved by the Administration on Aging in Washington, D.C. rather than by the state agency. It is our feeling that more senior citizens in the community are served at a lesser cost the way they are being funded now than through the areawide route. By funding a multi-purpose activity program the center serves as a focal point with educational programs, telephone reassurance, Friendly Visiting services, etc. evolving from the center for the community area. We feel the amount in Title III for FY 72 now being planned for use in areawide projects should be returned for use in community projects approved by our state agency.

It is hoped the above information will be of value to you, and if we can be of further help, please let us know.

Very truly yours,

L. E. RADER,
*Director of Institutions,
Social and Rehabilitative Services.*

STATEMENT OF MR. DALE KIRK, DIRECTOR, SEQUOYAH FOSTER
GRANDPARENT PROGRAM, SALLISAW, OKLA.

Thank you, Senator Harris. It is a sincere pleasure for me to participate in these proceedings today. It is good to have the opportunity to discuss the Foster Grandparent program in a forum such as this with those people who are concerned about the needs and problems of older Americans.

I firmly believe the Foster Grandparent Program is a prime example of what local, state, and federal agencies can do to meet more of those needs.

Classes are over at Seneca Indian School and Susie Sixkiller rushes to her dormitory. Her brown eyes sparkle with happy anticipation.

As she hurries along, she notices several of her friends are scurrying after her. Her eagerness grows as she reaches the campus and as she bursts into the dormitory living room, her voice sings, "Hi, Grandma!"

The Indian child and Foster Grandmother clasp the other with outstretched arms, each giving of her love and receiving as much in return.

One Grandmother has caught the essence of this personal relationship in these simple, yet eloquent words. She writes, "Being a Foster Grandparent gives me the satisfied feeling that I am giving love and understanding where it is most needed! If, in my efforts, I can some way reach out to them and make them understand that they are important, that they are loved and wanted and have a place in this world, then I will feel my efforts have not been in vain, and I will be happy and filled with gratitude in being a Foster Grandparent . . . For it is in giving love that we receive love, and in helping others, we help ourselves."

Another Grandparent has written, "At first I thought I would just be helping the children, now I know I am helping myself, too. When those smiling eyes look at me and say, 'Love me, please!' that is just more than I can express!"

Here, in one concept was discovered a program that would benefit children in Indian schools and state homes where the staff load was such that individual attention could not possibly be provided each child, and

Secondly, here was a program that would fulfill profound social, psychological, and economic needs of older persons.

And so the concept becomes a two-way exchange, with the one complementing the other. This interaction between the old and the young, we find, is a natural phenomena.

Psychologists and sociologists have long recognized that one of the primary needs of the disadvantaged child is the need to feel loved, to feel that someone really cares about him.

Educators dealing with these special children have voiced the need for a close, personal relationship that provides the child individual attention and affection from a "giving" adult.

Now, consider the situation that older persons face at retirement age. They live in a society that emphasizes youth, and at the same time implies that aging is sad and painful, that older people, simply because they reach a certain chronological age, become useless and burdensome.

Having reared their own families and sent them out into the world, they suddenly feel alone and unwanted. Their purpose in living suddenly becomes less clear. It would be a natural expectation for health problems to increase directly as a result of these psychological conflicts in aging. So one can readily see that in this age group there is also a great need to be loved, to become involved, and to be of service to mankind.

Since our society places so much value on young people, it is evident that these needs of older persons can be fulfilled to the maximum by performing a special service to youth.

Susie Sixkiller's Foster Grandmother will be with Susie for some time this evening to give her love, affection, and personal attention because Grandmother will come to the school campus to be with her and another "granddaughter" for four hours each day, five days a week, including at some units, those wonderful week-ends.

Susie's Grandma is only one of 150 regular and alternate Foster Grandparents who provides this same individual attention to two assigned children each in four Indian boarding schools, two state homes under the Department of Public Welfare, and other special education, Head Start, and Day Care Centers in eastern Oklahoma.

The four Indian schools are Sequoyah High School (Park Hill), Eufaula Dormitory, Jones Indian Academy (Hartshorne), and Seneca Indian School (Wyandotte).

Foster Grandparent units on state campuses include Whitaker State Home for Children, Pryor, and Oklahoma Children's Center, Taft.

Work settings are also located in Delaware County Head Start Centers, Adair County Special Education Classes, and Day Care Centers at Park Hill.

Much variation is provided in this multitude of work settings. Foster Grandparents in Oklahoma have worked with boys and girls from pre-school to high school ages, Indian, black and white, the neglected and dependent, delinquents in correctional institutions, those who suffer from social, economic, and cultural deprivation, physical handicaps, and mental retardation.

Their ability to work effectively in each of these widely different areas is truly astounding, but the one singular trait that each possesses is LOVE—the heart of the FGP concept. In this modern, calculating era, LOVE is still the thread that sews the pieces together.

Foster Grandparents read to the children, walk and talk with the children, listen to their imaginative stories, their problems, learn of family ties, go fishing together after school or on Saturdays, bake cookies, work together in a garden patch, learn table manners at supper, enjoy special treats, tell stories of the past concerning Indian history, play competitive games, sing Negro spirituals in song fests, observe Indian pow-wows, watch Indian ballgames, participate in school programs depicting Indian heritage or black culture, and do homework together as long as it doesn't include modern math.

For the child, later in the evening it means help with those "necessary" baths, getting clothes ready for school tomorrow, and being tucked into bed by a loving adult who has had the time to spend at least two hours with her, alone or just about however she wanted.

For this service role, Foster Grandparents receive the federal minimum wage and a transportation allowance. They must be 60 years of age or older—that is, when they begin, because as they serve as Foster Grandparents, they seem to grow younger! They must be within certain income limitations, and must enjoy working with children.

When they begin work, they have received two weeks of related training and orientation to their particular situation. Oklahoma Foster Grandparents attended a five-day training session on the campus of Northeastern State College, conducted by members of the Division of Education and Psychology.

In-Service Training is conducted regularly at the individual Foster Grandparent units and three times a year all Foster Grandparents attend a Saturday workshop (called a Refresher Course), on the Northeastern campus.

Since September, 1969, the Foster Grandparent Program has been funded and administered by the Administration on Aging, Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare. In Oklahoma, the program is sponsored by the Cookson Hills Community Action Foundation, Inc.

This project presents a prime example of the cooperation possible among a rather large group of federal, state, and local organizations.

These agency/organizations include nine (9) institutional settings, five (5) consolidated community action agencies, varied special education, Head Start, and Day Care Centers in Adair, Cherokee, Delaware, and Sequoyah counties, Bureau of Indian Affairs, State Social and Rehabilitation Service, State Department of Health, and Northeastern State College, State Economic Opportunity Office, the Oklahoma Special Unit on Aging, and the Administration on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at both the regionally and national levels.

As the project has grown in service and stature, Foster Grandparents and their supervisors, though technically guests on campus, have been assimilated in to activities functions and events of the local school campuses.

Many related advantages have occurred from this new partnership. One superintendent has commented that the Foster Grandparents have been one of the strongest public relations forces to come on school campuses. Because Foster Grandparents represent various communities all over eastern Oklahoma, people learn of the "lovely children," "busy activities," and "real sincerity" of the staff and administration of the respective home or school.

With their special talents, Foster Grandparents have enriched the lives of their children in unusual ways—a Foster Grandmother who is blind encourages an Indian girl to be an accomplished singer and win honors in competition; a Foster Grandfather who is a full-blooded Choctaw inspires his Indian boys to sing songs in the Choctaw language; a former professional musician turned Foster Grandparent instills the love of music in the hearts of Negro boys; a Foster Grandmother who is an expert craftsman in needlework passes on to her Grandchildren sewing techniques taught her by an Indian mother; and other Foster Grandparents with special hobbies and special interests motivate and inspire their Grandchildren to pursue wide avenues of interest.

Comments made by the Foster Grandparents themselves in progress and evaluation reports provide meaningful insight and understanding about the program. Let me share with you a few of those comments:

- (1) "My prayers have always been to help me that I might help others; now I feel my prayers have been answered."
- (2) "I get a thrill every time a Foster Grandchild calls me 'Grandmother' and I try to live up to his expectations."
- (3) "They are getting more loveable. They hug and kiss each Grandparent every evening. One little boy asked if we were coming back Saturday. We told him we would be back Monday. He said, 'I wish every day was Monday.'"
- (4) "Everybody needs somebody. This Foster Grandparent Program is the most wonderful thing that has happened to us and to the children."
- (5) "Being an actual Grandparent must be a very lovely and exciting experience and since I, myself, cannot hope to attain to this state in this life, I think the next best thing is to be a Foster Grandparent."
- (6) "The fellowship of the Grandparents is great. We look forward to each day of getting together."
- (7) "Of course the finances I have received have been most helpful, but money could not buy the satisfaction I have had in working with the children."
- (8) "The children's table manners have improved. They sometimes teach us now. It is a pleasure to work with them and catch their enthusiasm."
- (9) "When I awaken in the morning, I realize I have something to look forward to for that day. Not just existence, but challenge."
- (10) "Children who were shy with me to begin with now bring their problems to me—just as my own children once did."
- (11) "Each day I'm grateful that I'm an American and live in a wonderful country where an older person can find such a satisfying job."
- (12) And this last comment that simply states, "I thank God for this job!"

Dr. Major McClure, chairman of the five-member team from Northeastern that evaluated the Foster Grandparent Project, wrote in his Supplementary Comments to the overall project evaluation, and I quote, "The sociologist implication for this program on the northeastern region of Oklahoma are quite exciting. First of all, two groups—the *elderly* and the *children* in institutions and:

from underprivileged homes who have to this time been of concern to society as a whole—are implementing each other.”

Dr. McClure stated that the far-reaching effects of this program can only be surmised, “but there is every reason to believe that the social structure of northeastern Oklahoma will be significantly improved in years to come as a result of bringing these two groups together. Disadvantaged children will grow up with a better chance of becoming mature citizens. Older persons will acquire a new purpose in life.”

“The greatest benefit, however,” he concluded, “is one which can never be accurately measured, and that is in terms of the alleviation of human suffering and unhappiness.”

Truly, the Sequoyah Foster Grandparent Program has provided outstanding benefits for both the old and the young, but it has only scratched the surface. It has accomplished so much, yet has so much to accomplish. We must be able to do more.

In eastern Oklahoma, over 42,400 persons over 60 years of age reside in the eleven-county area encompassed by the Sequoyah Foster Grandparent Program. Of this number, over 60% fall within appropriate poverty guidelines. This means that more than 25,000 older persons in this geographic area are potentially eligible to become Foster Grandparents. Within those institutions that are currently operating with the program, over 1,200 disadvantaged children qualify for the personal care of a Foster Grandparent. At the present ratio of two (2) children per Grandparent, 600 FGP's are direly needed.”

Susie Sixkiller and her “Grandma” stroll along the wooded campus at Seneca Indian School. Together, they experience the wonders of nature as they chase a butterfly, or gaze at a magnificent bird soaring in graceful flight.

They love, trust, and confide in each other—both giving of themselves and receiving as much in return.

“For it is in giving love that we receive love, and in helping others, we help ourselves!”

Mr. KIRK. Senator Harris, we have taken the liberty of bringing four of our Foster Grandparents with us and we would like to have them say something.

Senator HARRIS. I'd like to hear from them, I think the Foster Grandparent program is a wonderful program. The only thing wrong with it is that there just is not more of it. I want to work to expand it everywhere I can.

Mr. KIRK. The lovely lady here in the front row is Mrs. Lillie Springs who is the senior member in age but one of the youngest in spirit. She's 87 from Muskogee. Mr. Hollaway from Adair County, over in Stilwell, Mildred Franklin and Nancy McIntosh from Eufaula down in McIntosh country.

Mrs. SPRINGS. Mr. Harris and friends. We like this Foster Grandparent Project and it has meant so much to us as a livelihood. I've heard each speaker get up and say that we don't have enough money. I was in the same shape as others. I didn't have enough money to put a fence around my yard. But when I was lucky enough to come in on the ground floor of this organization, it wasn't long until I could put that fence around. People laugh because I call it my granny fence, because I couldn't have gotten it if it hadn't been for foster grandparents. It has helped in so many ways, as Mr. Kirk has told you what it means. We are all proud of our children. You can't dislike a child when he comes in his humble way and says, “Will you give me a piece of candy?” It's just such a little thing that they're asking us to do, but it means so much to them and of all of the monies that I have received, I value most my experience with the children. I have two children at the ages of seven and eight. For three years they have never given me a sassy word because we work together, and I love children.

Senator HARRIS. Thank you very much, Mrs. Springs.

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Senator Harris, I am glad to be here to meet you folks and to say that I enjoy and recommend the Foster Grandparent program. This program has been a great help to me. I have learned more through this program than I ever knew before about the welfare of the underprivileged and handicapped children. I couldn't even begin to tell you all the things that have happened and how much improvement there's been because time won't permit.

I do have a boy in mind and it's going to be easy for you to see how this program can benefit children. We had a boy that was the oldest boy of the family and they tested him and pronounced him unlearnable. His folks sent him to the school. The teacher gave him to me. He was so mean to the other children that I had to have a special room to take Roy and to take care of him. If he started

to be unruly I'd just talk to him and explain to him what he was going to do when he got big. I'd get him reconciled and start to teach him. Now Roy is eighteen and he is a neighbor of mine and he is driving his own pickup and he's now tried for his license. He comes to my house to visit me. He has never forgotten me. Every Saturday Roy comes to my house to talk with me and he is a normal boy. He behaves himself and he is interesting to talk to. He's not a rowdy. He comes to me for me to tell him the things he asks me. I try to answer his questions. You know it is remarkable to see the results this quick—this is going on the fourth year now that I have worked in this program. Another boy I want to recommend is a full-blooded Cherokee boy. His grandmother takes care of him. We had him in the special class last year and this year he is able to go on with his classes. When I go to work he meets me at the gate and he likes for me to talk to him as we go up to the building. This is a sad thing to think about in one way. In another way when you see the results it is joyful. Senator, to understand how some children can be helped so easily. He comes to my room where I'm working now and he visits with me and when he's ready to go he always says he'll see me tomorrow.

Another thing that I want to say is that this program has been a big help to me and my own affairs. I draw social security, but I didn't have enough to support myself. I happen not to be a rich man, but I try to be a good citizen. I cut and haul wood and draw social security. One of my neighbors came to my house and said he had a job for me. He said, "I want you to be a Foster Grandparent." I said, "What is that?" He explained it to me and really I don't think he could see then like we can see now what the program would mean. The next morning I went up and they hired me and I went to work. Before I went to work, though, they sent me down to Northeastern and we took a psychology course down there that sure gave me a good start. When I started to work people didn't know much about it. I'd tell them how good it was, but they didn't believe it. Now it's quite different over in my community. We have a lot of people who see the results of these children who couldn't help themselves. Take myself, if I hadn't gotten this job I would have had to apply for old age assistance. I like to work. Every day I go to work it seems like something comes in, and we have a different thought of how we can help another child. That means something to me just to realize there is some way to help these children, children who don't have a home. I find it a great privilege to be here today to tell you what I think is good in the Foster Grandparent program. Another thing I would like to do is thank you for that money we got this year. I am so glad I can thank you face to face for what you did. We want to do more than we've ever done before.

Senator HARRIS. Thank you.

Mrs. MCINTOSH. I am an American Indian and I work as a foster grandmother at the Eufaula Boarding School for Indian girls. I am enjoying my work very much. It is unbelievable what love can do for a child who feels he isn't loved. We are real happy working with these children and it is surprising the changes that take place within a few weeks in children that felt unloved, were rowdy, didn't care about their school work. After we were with them as foster grandmothers they changed completely. They're active, in fact they just seem to be more beautiful to us. Each day as I get up I have something to look forward to—to go to this school and work with these foster grandchildren.

Senator HARRIS. Thank you, Mrs. McIntosh.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. I would like to add that I am $\frac{3}{4}$ Creek Indian and my words are few. I want to be so thankful and I want to thank you, Senator Harris, for refunding our program. It's so rewarding to see these children enjoy us and it is something for us to look forward to each day. I'm 72 years old and it's just something that keeps you active. You give them your time and your love and mostly patience. Thank you very much.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS, FIRST ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE SEQUOYAH
FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA

(By Dr. Major L. McClure)

FOREWORD

Dr. Major L. McClure, chairman of the Division of Education and Psychology, Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, served as team leader of the

group that conducted the first overall evaluation in April 1968 of the Foster Grandparent Program in Oklahoma.

Other members of the evaluating team were Dr. Howard Thompson, Dr. Ross Underwood, Dr. Lloyd Slagle, and Mr. Lee K. Quiett.

For further information relating to the evaluation, contact Mr. Dale Kirk, Director, Sequoyah Foster Grandparent Program, 121½ South Oak Street, Sallisaw, Oklahoma 74955.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS ON THE FOSTER GRANDPARENTS EVALUATION OF
APRIL 1968

The Foster Grandparent Program, as designed for the northeast Oklahoma area, is of interest to the staff members from Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, involved in the project. Of particular interest is "How effective is the program in meeting the basic needs of the participating grandparents and the children involved."

A team of staff members from the college did obtain in April 1968 subjective information concerning the implementation and functioning of the program. The information was obtained from the following sources:

1. Foster Grandparents.
2. Institutional Administrators and/or Teachers.
3. Director of Community Action Agency.
4. Children (Young People).
5. Parents and/or Guardians.

The information from the above sources was evaluated by members of the team. Each source of information must be evaluated in terms of our particular social structure, and in view of the values, both social and personal, advocated by individuals, in our society without regard to whether or not those values are realistic. The evaluation will be considered from the following points of view: (1) the psychological implications for the grandparent group as a whole, (2) the psychological implication for each individual grandparent, (3) the psychological implication for those children who are affected by the program, (4) the sociological implications of the entire program as it operates in northeastern Oklahoma.

(1) The psychological implications for the grandparent group as a whole

The growing maturity of our living that terminates in the phrase we term "old age" is a constant process that begins at inception and ceases only at death. A consequence of this fact is the necessity to realize that old age does not begin at any stated chronological period of life. Old age begins at birth, if not even at the moment the genes unite.

The maturing process is a continuing one throughout our entire life span, and it is a process of constant change. In man's quest to categorize, he has artificially broken the life span down into periods which he calls infancy, childhood, youth, adulthood, later maturity, and old age, purely for his own convenience. It is noteworthy, however, that these categories of convenience have no reality in human behavior. They are merely products of the human mind, and reflect its liking for pigeon holes.

Yet, if we look at the life attitudes and the behavior of our aged people in general, we discover how tragically true is the statement "What people believe to be true, is true for them." Our old people, cast in the role of dotard by a society steeped in traditional myth; accept their parts and wait in resigned apathy for the final curtain. In a very real sense, we are destroying our own society through our insistence that basic superstition be fundamental fact. We rapidly are becoming a progressively older people, and we have no choice but to make places for our oldsters if we want life, as we know it in the United States, to maintain itself.

Through our human tendency to push things to extremes, we have come to believe that as we age we become increasingly ineffective. Within our cultural myth lies the conviction that the older we get, the dumber we get. Actually, what happens to innate ability as we age is unimportant. What is important, is what we do with the innate ability that we may have. Exhaustive studies relating to the elderly in our society point dramatically to the fact that those who are engaged in doing something live longer, happier lives than those who resign themselves to the role which our culture seems to have defined for them. It,

therefore, becomes imperative that our society find a way to keep our increasing number of elderly active and a part of our social structure.

Upon close investigation, it becomes apparent that our elderly do have much to offer society. If experience is the great enlarger of life, then certainly the elderly in our society have much to offer those who follow. Potentially, they are one of our greatest reservoirs, and interestingly enough, these elderly people will give happily of their time and effort on any worthwhile endeavor. This does not mean that they are unique or that they possess characteristics not found in many of the rest of us, but rather it means simply that they need to feel that they are an important contributing part of society.

The Foster Grandparent Program, as it is structured, is particularly well suited to meet this, as well as other needs, in our elderly. The benefits derived from this program go far beyond the amount of money earned. Old people need desperately to feel that they are contributing to society and that they belong to a group, a group with which they can identify. If that group to which they identify has a purpose, a goal, then belonging becomes even more important. The Foster Grandparent Program has met these needs. The training program was designed to emphasize what they had to contribute to society, to emphasize that they were a group, and to emphasize the need for their particular service.

(2) *The psychological implication for each participating grandparent*

Among our elderly there is a great need to feel loved or needed by someone. Having reared their families and sent them out into the world, they suddenly feel quite alone and useless. Their purpose in living seems suddenly to have ended. They see around them a society which emphasizes youth, a society which looks upon youth as its most prized possession, the hope of the future, and which implies at the same time that aging is sad and painful, that old people are useless and burdensome. Since the relationship between psychological and physiological health is so close, it would be a natural expectation that health problems would increase as a result of the psychological conflicts of aging.

The most common form of these health problems relates to intense preoccupation with bodily functions. Lack of motivation and decreased energy often combine to produce periods of chronic fatigue usually accompanied by irritability. Fatality may express itself in neurotic depression characterized by self-centeredness, and self-disparagement.

The increased social isolation and uncertainty that mark the lives of many elderly lead to emotional instability and anxiety. When despair and depression become too great, neurotic behavior patterns develop.

To offset these problems, the elderly need to become involved. They need personal contacts and a feeling that they have a service to offer to both particular individuals and to the society. Since our society places so much value on youth, these needs can be met to a high degree by a *service to youth*.

(3) *The psychological implication for those children who are affected by the program*

Let us now compare the needs of the economically and culturally deprived (and displaced) children found in institutions and homes throughout this area with those noted in the Foster Grandparents. Psychologists and sociologists have long recognized that one of the primary needs of the child in the institution and from culturally and economically deprived backgrounds is the need to feel love, to feel that someone cares about him. Most institutions are inadequately staffed to give the individual attention which is so desperately needed by these children. Teachers of the very young and teachers of special education classes have voiced the need for a one-to-one relationship in at least part of these education programs.

One significant factor lacking in the environment of this type of youngster is lack of a sense of identity. Many of these children do not know their birth dates, and most have never had a birthday party. There is perhaps no single act which symbolizes identity of the child more clearly than the celebration of his birthday. This is a formal recognition of his acceptance as an individual.

Other problems arise out of the inability of many of these youngsters to communicate effectively with middle-class teachers and institutional workers. Reared in environments where cursing and open hostility are common, they feel thwarted in their attempts to express their true feelings, whether they be of love, hate, or insecurity, simply because the middle class does not understand or accept their language of communication.

Directly related to culture and institutional environment is the development of ego strength and impulse control. Children from this environment are more likely to have a poorly internalized super-ego. This will reflect in behavior which the middle class will often classify as anti-social. Stealing, lying, and giving in to sex impulses are more common with this type of individual as a direct result of the lack of super-ego development.

Many of the grandparents are also from the same or similar kinds of backgrounds as the children whom they serve. The grandparents, drawing from their backgrounds and experiences, have a great deal of insight into the problems of the children, and are able to effectively aid the children in their adjustments to society.

Those grandparents who serve specific groups of children, or who have been permanently assigned to one or two children, add to the identity adjustment and to the feeling of belongingness of the children. This, of course, aids in the child's development of a positive self-concept.

Here again, the influence of the elderly is of real value, because as they are able to meet some of the more direct needs of youngsters, they also alter the patterns of behavior and values of the youth whom they serve. As these children see certain behavior patterns are not as acceptable to the Foster Grandparent, they tend to modify their behavior, and eventually their values, primarily through fear of losing the love, attention, etc., which they so desperately need.

(4) The sociological implications of the entire program as it operates in northeast Oklahoma

It thus becomes apparent that the Foster Grandparents are ideally suited to meet the needs of the children described, and that in turn, these children meet basic needs in the Foster Grandparents. It was with interest that the evaluating team noted that these needs are so strong that problems relating to the "generation gap" which often makes communication with the different age groups difficult, fade to insignificance in this program. Each of the groups has shown change in general behavior as a result of the effect the other group has had upon it. Administrators note that children have fewer emotional outbursts, run away less often, cry and fuss a great deal less, are less often discipline problems, and are generally happier. On the other hand, the Foster Grandparents show a new interest in life. They eat better, dress more presentably, and show more self-assurance. They have a pride in the work they are doing and take every opportunity to talk about the children they are working with. It is also noteworthy that they have fewer personal health problems.

The sociological implications for this program on the northeastern region of Oklahoma are quite exciting. First of all, two groups—the elderly and the children in institutions and from underprivileged homes who have to this time been of concern to society as a whole—are implementing each other. The far-reaching effects of this program can only be surmised, but there is every reason to believe that the social structure of northeastern Oklahoma will be significantly improved in years to come as a result of bringing these two groups together. Deprived children will grow up with a better chance of becoming mature citizens. The elderly, because they are engaged in meaningful work, will in the long run be less of a burden to society as a whole. The greatest benefit, however, is one which can never be accurately measured, and that is in terms of the alleviation of human suffering and unhappiness.

As the number of displaced children increases in relation to the rates of divorce and broken marriages, and as the number of elderly in our society increases, the implication of the future of the program becomes critical.

No single federal program instigated in the past 50 years has so much potential for alleviating the social problems of so many individuals at so little cost to society.

Appendix 2

SOME UNIQUE PROGRAMS FINANCED BY TITLE III IN NEW YORK STATE

SUBMITTED BY GARSON MEYER

In the course of 4 years and 7 months of experience in the implementation of the title III program in New York State 33 projects have been funded. Of this number, 19 have completed 3 years of operation. Four will terminate 3 years of service to the community before the end of the first quarter of the next Federal fiscal year. Eight are in their 2d year of operation and two in their 1st year.

It would appear that our ability to continue to assist local communities in satisfaction of planning and coordination programs as well as direct service has long ago reached its crest in New York State. We do have, in Binghamton and Broome County, an example of the success that can be achieved in identifying and satisfying the needs of older persons. At the present time we have three projects operational in that area.

In Binghamton and Broome there are three projects now operational. One is sponsored by Action for Older Persons, Inc., which is in its 4th year of operation and plans to continue operating during the next year which begins April 1, with funds made available to it from the local United Fund Agency and a very small amount from New York State.

They have, during this period of time, developed a social action component which has pursued vigorously new housing, employment, and more efficient utilization of services available to the older population by existing community agencies.

Project East is sponsored by the Good Shepherd-Fairview Nursing Home. It has extended and made available counseling, nursing, and homemaking services to a population heretofore neglected in this regard.

This has been complemented by Services to Older Persons, a project sponsored by the Broome County Department of Health, which further extends home-health, health counseling, and transportation services to other areas in the city of Binghamton and, in particular, to the model neighborhood area.

In examining the record of these three projects, located in the city of Binghamton, one can observe the high degree of cooperation that exists between them, the interaction that each of them has fostered in its relations with other public and voluntary agencies, and most important the public awareness of the problems, as well as the asset that its older citizens are to the community at large. They have succeeded in achieving identification in the many other communities throughout Broome County and in the case of Action for Older Persons, fiscal support for its continuance is being provided from this quarter.

In Albany County, under the sponsorship of the Council of Community Services of the Albany Area, Inc. a project was initiated to coordinate community service agencies, identify resources, centers, and extend services to the county's older population.

The Albany project precipitated the construction of a one half million dollar senior citizens center. It directs four other communities' programs for senior citizens and is providing leadership and guidance in the development of comprehensive planning to resolve urban and rural nutritional problems faced by older persons as well as attacking a more universal problem—transportation of older persons to resources that can assist them or solve their problems.

The SERVE program on Staten Island originally was funded with moneys available under title IV of the Older Americans Act. In the summer of 1969, the Community Service Society applied to the New York State Office for the Aging for funds to conduct a SERVE in New York State.

This has been highly successful. This program supports staff and technical assistance to communities that desire establishing volunteer service programs in which older persons participate. To date 18 programs have been initiated, from Metropolitan New York up the Hudson Valley and across our State to Rochester and Buffalo.

More than 500 older persons are participating in these programs as volunteers. In addition, many other communities are utilizing the expertise of the SERVE in New York State staff in developing their own programs which will require no support in the form of dollars from the State or Federal Government. Remember the SERVE staff is supported with State and Federal funds.

In order to more thoroughly satisfy the demands for help, the project developed a series of slides and a narrative which can and has been used most frequently by a multitude of agencies in demonstrating the volunteer roles that can be performed by older persons for their peers, or in many instances, the patients in hospitals, nursing homes, and child care facilities.

The County of Nassau Office for the Aging, which will soon start its 5th year of operation, designed a number of programs that have benefited the retiree as well as those preparing to retire. Working closely with adult education programs and libraries in Nassau County, pre-retirement programs have been made available to many interested individuals. This is interesting, inasmuch as its initial thrust was directed to providing pre-retirement counseling to civil service employees of the county.

This is only one of their efforts, others have brought together county and town officials in a cooperative effort to construct public housing, change zoning when necessary and, working closely with public transportation services, change routings and time schedules to assist older persons in getting to and from large shopping areas as well as other community services during those periods of the day when service needs for the working population were minimal.

Friendly Visitors became a highly defined and expert service afforded to retirees of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union through the support of this very same title III program. It had a twofold purpose, it provided a supplemental income to 50 older persons functioning as friendly visitors and that, in turn, counteracted the isolation and loneliness of housebound retirees of the union and any other older persons in need of companionship or help. During the first year alone, 26,000 persons were visited.

Mr. G., who was recovering from a stroke, provides a fairly common illustration of the kind of work that was done by the friendly visitor. His doctor advised him that he could walk again if he had the patience. His wife, however, had many fears that he would fall and hurt himself. As a consequence, he was discouraged. A friendly visitor became involved, gained the couple's confidence, stayed with him while his wife shopped and even arranged for a neighbor to come in the morning to help Mr. G. dress.

Several weeks went by and, based upon confidence in the visitor and encouragement, Mr. G. began to take his first steps. This continued for a year, there were disappointments, but Mr. G. is now able to leave his apartment and go out-of-doors for short walks.

The New York City Office for the Aging affected a reduced fare program for all those 65 and over. Six hundred thousand older persons are currently listed as participants and it can readily be understood that if such a fare reduction were not made available to them 60 to 75 percent would, because of inadequate income, be unable to use public transportation in going to and from market, physician, clinic, shopping areas, senior citizen center or day care center.

Stanley M. Isaacs Neighborhood Center and the Senior Citizens Center of Schenectady, Inc. are two title III projects which, early in New York State's experience with title III, initiated meal programs.

The Schenectady program is for the most part an "in-housing" service inasmuch as the greatest number of meals are served to those residing in the low-income project which headquarters this meal service facility. Transportation of meals to two complexes has been satisfied by ZONTA, a women's service organization that thoroughly recognizes the value of adequate nutrition and visiting that takes place with such a program.

The Stanley M. Isaacs program completed its 3d year at the end of last September but continues to operate on the basis of the impact that it made upon the community and sympathetic resources. The 4th year of this operation has

been the result of hard work on the part of their staff, good public relations and concern of a sympathetic public.

I am sure that you would all agree that providing meals to older persons living in five-story walkups in East New York is not an easy job and often it is fraught with danger, as well.

I do not consider the experience that the New York State Office for the Aging has had as being phenomenal. All but two projects continue to perform a needed service to the community. For your information, New York State, since the inception of the title III program has met one-half of the non-Federal share of every project.

In conclusion, I would like to direct your attention to the fact that title III projects in New York State have directed themselves to satisfying the need for community planning and coordination, counseling, information and referral, training of friendly visitors, providing for volunteer opportunities for senior citizens, expediting utilization of health services, cultural, recreational, and educational activities, meals programs and incidental to friendly visiting—home-making, and companionship services for many isolated and disengaged older persons.

1971 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING, REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY CONFERENCE DATES

Region	Date	Conference	City, Area or County	Chairman
1	Feb. 25	Mini-Conference, Central Bureau of the Jewish Aged.	New York City	Arthur Garson. Mrs. Morris.
1	Apr. 22	<i>Regional Conference</i> , N.Y. Society for Ethical Culture, 2 West 64th Street, 1:00-4:00 p.m.	do	Arthur Garson. Mrs. Morris.
2	Apr. 20	<i>Regional Conference</i> , Garden City Hotel	Suffolk, Nassau	Edmund Bill. Dr. Carol Lucas.
3	Mar. 27	Mini-Conference	Rockland	S. Sosnowick.
3	Apr. 1	do	Ulster	Mrs. J. W. Cranston. Eugene Curry.
3	Apr. 28	<i>Regional Conference</i> , Holiday Inn, Newburg, 12:00-2:30 p.m.	Dutchess, Westchester	Eugene Curry. Dan Sambol.
4	Apr. 26	<i>Regional Conference</i>	Broome	Paul Gouldin. Rev. S. Hayes.
4	Apr. 2	Mini-Conference, Cornell University, 10:00-3:30 p.m.	Tompkins	M. Freeborn.
5	Apr. 14	<i>Regional Conference</i>	Albany, Schoharie	James Warren.
5	May 11	Mini-Conference	Columbia	Miss Reuter.
6	Apr. 23	<i>Regional Conference</i>	Clinton, St. Lawrence, Washington.	William Clermont. William Fournier.
7	Mar. 25	Mini-Conference	Onondaga, Syracuse	Mrs. Rhea Eckel. Miss Aiko Kono.
7	Apr. ?	<i>Regional Conference</i>	Cazenovia College	Mrs. Eckel. Miss Dietz.
8	Apr. 8	<i>Regional Conference</i> , Alfred University, 10:00-3:00 p.m.	Allegany, Steuben	Arnold Jerome. Rev. R. McCune.
9	Apr. 28	<i>Regional Conference</i>	Genesee, Yates, Monroe	Hon. M. Folsom. Mrs. I. Dawson. Eli Rudin.
10	Jan. 27	Mini-Conference	Niagara	Dr. Eckhart. William Warren.
10	Feb. 18	do	Erie	Dr. Eckhart. William Warren.
10	Mar. 20	<i>Regional Conference</i>	Erie, Niagara, Wyoming	Dr. Eckhart. William Warren.
10	Apr. 2	Mini-Conference	Wyoming	Lois Bowling.

NOTE: These dates are subject to change.

March 17, 1971