

# 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 4—WASHINGTON, D.C.

---

MARCH 31, 1971



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1971

60-215

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

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

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia  
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island  
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts  
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin  
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri  
ALAN CRANSTON, California  
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa  
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York  
WINSTON PROUTY, Vermont  
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado  
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania  
BOB PACKWOOD, Oregon  
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio  
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland

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. KENNEDY, Massachusetts  
Mr. RANDOLPH, West Virginia  
Mr. WILLIAMS, New Jersey  
Mr. HUGHES, Iowa  
Mr. STEVENSON, Illinois

Mr. BEALL, Maryland  
Mr. PROUTY, Vermont  
Mr. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania  
Mr. TAFT, Ohio  
Mr. PACKWOOD, Oregon

JAMES J. MURPHY, *Counsel*

MICHAEL S. GORDON, *Minority Counsel*

---

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey  
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada  
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia  
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine  
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah  
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts  
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota  
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana  
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri

WINSTON PROUTY, Vermont  
HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii  
JACK MILLER, Iowa  
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming  
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona  
EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida  
WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio  
EDWARD W. BROOKE, Massachusetts  
CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois

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

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

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

# CONTENTS

## CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Fitch, Mr. William, executive director, National Council on the Aging.....	225
Carstenson, Dr. Blue, director, Senior Member Division, National Farmers Union.....	231
Morris, C. E., executive director, Planned Action for Community Elderly, Des Moines, Iowa.....	239

## APPENDIXES

Appendix 1—Material submitted by William C. Fitch:	
Item 1. A resolution.....	251
Item 2. New imperatives for older Americans.....	252
Appendix 2—Letters and statements from individuals and organizations:	
Item 1. Bechill, William D., chairman, Social Policy Sequence School of Social Work and Community Planning, University of Maryland at Baltimore, letter from.....	254
Item 2. Best, Peggy M., project director, Host Meals for the Elderly, Senior Citizens Association, Los Angeles, Calif., letter from.....	255
Item 3. Biemiller, Andrew J., director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C., letter from.....	256
Item 4. Bunzel, Joseph H., professor of Sociology, State University of Sociology, State University College at Buffalo, letter from.....	257
Item 5. Carey, Jean Wallace, staff associate for Aging, Community Service Society of New York, New York, N. Y., letter from.....	260
Item 6. Cohen, Dean Wilbur J., cochairman, Institute of Gerontology, The University of Michigan and Wayne State University, Ann Arbor, Mich., letter from.....	261
Item 7. Eisdorfer, Carl, professor of psychiatry, director, Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, N. C., letter from.....	262
Item 8. Friedsam, H. J., director, Center for Studies in Aging, North Texas State University, letter from.....	263
Item 9. Harger, Eone, Annandale, N. J., letter from.....	264
Item 10. Hossack, Margaret A., Senior Citizen program coordinator, secretary, Mayor's Senior Citizen Council, Detroit, Mich., letter from.....	269
Item 11. Lampe, Walter C., president, Walter C. Lampe and Associates, San Francisco, Calif., letter from.....	269
Item 12. Long, O. J., Executive Committee of the Colonial Club of Sun Prairie, Wis., letter from.....	270
Item 13. McNevin, Tony E., director, Program in Gerontology, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I., letters from.....	271
Item 14. National Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Earl Marvin, national president, New York, N. Y., statement of the.....	273
Item 15. Purcell, Hon. Graham A., a Representative in Congress from the 13th District of the State of Texas, letter from.....	274
Item 16. Robison, Frank M., acting director, Columbia Club, Seattle, Wash., letter from.....	275
Item 17. Schultz, James H., associate professor of welfare economics, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., letter from.....	279
Item 18. Schweinhaut, Margaret C., chairman, Department of Employment and Social Services, Commission on Aging, Baltimore, Md., letter from.....	280

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

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1971

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING  
AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The joint committees met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 6226, New Senate Office Building, the Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Aging, presiding.

Present: Senators Eagleton, Hughes, and Schweiker.

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

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

Senator EAGLETON. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

The joint committee hearings relating to aging are once again in session to hear the two witnesses that, unfortunately, because of time, we could not hear yesterday.

I understand Mr. Fitch has been kind enough to take himself away from a conference. I apologize to you, Mr. Fitch, for having to wait until this morning. You proceed, because we know you are anxious to get back to your meeting.

## STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM FITCH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

Mr. FITCH. I appreciate it very much, and it is obvious you think the hearings here are very important, so being here is more important than being in the other meeting.

My name is William C. Fitch. I am the executive director of the National Council on the Aging.

I very much appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee to share some of the views of our organization, and the reactions of those who participate in the many meetings, seminars and conferences sponsored and conducted by our council.

It was my understanding that my presentation should be relatively brief, to allow more time for questioning. With this in mind, I have attempted to highlight our "Evaluation of the Administration on Aging and the Conduct of the White House Conference on Aging."

Rather than duplicate many of the points emphasized by previous witnesses, I shall refer to those issues which we also strongly endorse.

## SUBMERGENCE OF AOA IN SRS

There can be no reasonable or justifiable excuse for denigrating the Administration on Aging by burying it within the maze of other programs administered under the Social and Rehabilitation Service. This dislocation is clearly a violation of the intent of Congress. This was best expressed by the late Congressman John E. Fogarty, who said in the opening address of the 1961 White House Conference on Aging that:

It should be evident to those closely associated with the field of aging and the ways of government that unless an organization has an adequate budget, sufficient staff and independence to operate, it becomes a token gesture in the field and cannot measure up to the needs for which it was established.

No statement could more clearly describe what has happened to the Administration on Aging.

To some extent, every individual and agency in the field of aging is partly responsible for what has taken place. We should have protested more vigorously at the time the organizational change was announced. That is why we are now determined to do everything possible to correct the situation.

The cutbacks in the funding for the Older Americans Act document the low priority attached to programs for the commitment by the administration for older persons. One has only to review the list of projects under title III of the Older Americans Act to understand the hardships and tragedies that have resulted from these reductions.

As a member of the original 15-member Older Americans Advisory Committee created by the legislation, I cannot recall a single major issue in which our advice was sought during the first 3-year term, or any significant action taken as a result of our deliberations. This committee was dormant for more than a year; and, since it was reactivated, we have not met as an advisory group—except as part of the large planning board for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging.

## PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON AGING ACTIVE AND WELL?

The President's Council on Aging, existing for the most part on paper, has recently reported that it is active and doing well. This information has been received with a sense of disbelief by the practitioners in the field of aging who, for years, have been asking about the relationship of the Council to the Administration on Aging, and were unable to get a satisfactory answer—and concluding it was no longer in operation. The question then becomes even more relevant. What does it do? By what authority, and how does it function in relation to the Administration on Aging?

I do not want to belabor the obvious by reviewing the gradual decline of the effectiveness and prestige of the Administration on Aging. Inadequate funding has resulted not only in project cutbacks, reductions in staff, and the elimination or transfer of essential programs, but has considerably changed the original concept—that the Administration on Aging would provide leadership, and a national focus on the needs and problems of older persons.

One of the indirect results of these failures is the effect they have also had on State agencies—that have looked to the Administration as a model, or example, to be followed at the State level.

All of that I have reported has a bearing on the planning for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging.

#### DISSATISFACTION ERUPTS INTO MAJOR RESOLUTIONS

At a meeting this past weekend with more than 200 directors of senior centers, the dissatisfaction with the planning to date erupted several times and resulted in several major resolutions. As a matter of fact, I was just handed—last evening, when I returned from our hearing here—a list of the resolutions; and, with your permission, I would like to include them in the record.

Senator EAGLETON. They will be made a part of the record and included in the appendix.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. FIRCH. Thank you.

Essentially, the resolutions will cover :

- (1) The failure to involve the elderly, especially the elderly poor;
- (2) Doubts about the process of filling out questionnaires that repeated only what the administration already knew—and your committee had documented in your report of the Economics of Aging; and
- (3) The rejection of minority groups in the planning and concern about fair representation among the delegates, at the White House Conference.

Resolutions on these and other areas will also be submitted to the White House Conference staff, for whatever purpose they may serve.

These resolutions reflect the grassroots feelings of those who work with older persons across the Nation.

As a member of the planning board for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, I do not feel that the group has played a very important role in the planning for the Conference. The first meeting was held after practically all of the phases of the preliminary work had been completed on the local forums, and the questionnaires had been distributed. The second meeting of the board, held last Saturday, again had to rubber stamp much of the planning that had already been carried out by the staff.

Several major decisions were made at this meeting that were not included in the agenda. From the outset, there has been growing indignation among the minority groups that they were not being included in the pre-Conference planning, on boards or task forces. Further, there is little reassurance that they will be fairly represented at the Conference. It was the consensus of the meeting that the appointment of minority elderly be encouraged, as well as representatives of the elderly poor. This is but a first step, and the Conference directors must develop ways to insure a proper representation among the State delegates—on all of the task forces and in key Conference roles.

<sup>1</sup> See appendix, p. 251.

You heard from Mr. Hobart Jackson, chairman of the National Caucus on the Black Aged, during your hearings on Monday and know the extent to which the minority groups have been overlooked or rejected.

At the session, "A Call to Action for Minority Group Aging," held yesterday—as part of the 7th Annual Conference of the National Council on the Aging—Mr. Jackson and Alex Zermeno highlighted the plight of the elderly blacks and Spanish Americans; and encouraged the audience to accept its responsibility to insure—not only proper representation of their disadvantaged members among the State delegates, but among the organizational representatives to be named for the Conference. I can assure you that, unless there is a greater involvement in more responsible and visible roles for minority groups, the 1971 White House Conference on Aging will be a forum for widespread confrontation. This was mentioned yesterday, somewhat facetiously, as now being called a "Geriatric Lib Movement."

The new emphasis on youth participation in the Conference is commendable. However, the great concern expressed for meaningful Conference roles for 112 youth delegates between the ages of 17 and 24 is being given far more emphasis than on ways and means to involve the older person—and the elderly poor in the Washington forum.

#### MORATORIUM ON AGING PROGRAMS CREATED BY WHCA

Overriding any of my dissatisfaction in the planning for the White House Conference on Aging is the moratorium that seems to have been declared on any action now. All of the effort to date has been focused toward a national policy on aging with great stress on numbers—of questionnaires completed, older Americans White House forums held, community conferences planned, State White House conferences scheduled—all leading to policy recommendations. In the meantime, basic programs affecting the elderly are being phased out for lack of funds. It is cruel to expect the elderly to wait until 1972 for action. There is an urgent need to do the "do-able" things now and work toward policy implementation.

Much of what I have said will be incorporated in the resolutions and recommendations of our Conference of National Organizations, which will adjourn following today's luncheon—with Senator Percy as our speaker.

The theme of our meeting has been "An Action Role for Non-governmental Organizations in the White House Conference and in Social Policy Implementation."

With your permission, I would ask that the statement of Goals of Action for the Elderly<sup>2</sup> being developed at a plenary session now in progress, be incorporated as a part of this testimony. Copies will also be sent to the director of the WHCOA. These goals will represent the best thinking of almost 500 persons representing about 25 national organizations, 42 States, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

Senator EAGLETON. You may supply to the committee at a later date, Mr. Fitch, any other resolutions, statements, or other material that may be developed in your conference after your testimony today.

Mr. FITCH. Thank you.

<sup>2</sup> See appendix, p. 252.

As has been emphasized, repeated throughout your hearings, we are not interested in adding to the volume of unused materials and reports resulting from conferences and meetings.

The National Council on the Aging has endorsed a program to spotlight the potentials of older persons and adding quality to the later years. We look forward to carrying out our fair share of the responsibility for the success of the White House Conference on Aging—but we challenge the Administration on Aging and the White House Conference staff, to create a climate in which the participants and organizations can make a constructive contribution toward a national policy on aging.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Fitch, not only for your excellent statement, but for your indulgence in coming back for your presentation.

#### CONTRASTING WITNESSES PAINT DIFFERENT PICTURES

My impression of your testimony, when I contrast it with that of Mr. Garson Meyer, who was a witness at yesterday's hearings, is that the sum and substance of his statement and of yours paint two entirely different pictures as to the planning, structuring and operation of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. I said yesterday in summarizing his testimony that he painted a rather rosy picture. Perhaps he later qualified that a little bit. I won't try to apply a word to yours, but it is something less than rosy, as I hear your testimony, insofar as the environment, the advice that has either been sought or not sought.

You were present yesterday when I gave my little speech on conferences, White House conferences and the like. I have two lingering doubts about this Conference. One is as to how it is proceeding, what the scope of it will be, who is going to participate in it, et cetera. Those are somewhat technical matters, but important.

But I am also troubled that it may result in the big letdown again. As you say in your testimony, you don't want to burden us with more resolutions that are just going to be made a part of another record. Is the White House Conference going to be yet another record, a broken record, really, to use the word "record" as a double entendre?

I am really troubled. When the Conference takes place and it is over and all the resolutions have been adopted, and the delegates have gone back to their respective States, if you and organizations like yours don't push, if we don't push, if the White House doesn't push, it will all be for naught. It will all be just a grandiose exercise in showmanship and nothing else.

Mr. FITCH. I think it is our concern. I can recall the hearings that were held, when they were trying to decide whether or not there should be a 1971 White House Conference. It came through loud and clear then—that this should not be another exercise in rhetoric. We do not need another report. Many of the people said they would not be in favor of the 1971 White House Conference if it were not action-oriented. I think something happened along the way, that we have lost the emphasis on action, or at least until 1972 or thereafter.



I have some great doubts that the questionnaire proved anything. The fact that 1½ million people may have completed it is not that impressive. I am not quite sure that they know what to do with the information.

We also know that many of the people who completed these forms do not represent those who are on the back roads, those who live in the coldwater flats, those who are out in the rural areas. These questionnaires represent people who had access, and could get to the places where these meetings were being held.

#### QUESTIONNAIRES REPRESENTATIVE . . . TO WHAT PURPOSE?

I would have some grave doubts in my own mind how representative they were. As I indicated in my testimony, I think it is cruel at this point to ask these people what their needs and their problems are. Six hundred recommendations came out of the Conference in 1961. The needs haven't changed, except, perhaps, to get worse. The report on the Economics of Aging and the material that has been developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity show the plight of these older persons who are in the poverty categories. To go out and ask them, again, what their needs and problems are is cruel, and serves little purpose.

Senator EAGLETON. Well, I couldn't agree more.

I take it you seriously question, as I do, the scientific authenticity of this questionnaire and whether we should have had the questionnaire in the first place. Assuming there had to be yet another questionnaire, there is still some doubt as to the authenticity of the questionnaire, itself, in terms of what it sought and from whom it was sought.

Mr. FITCH. There is a very interesting factor I was not even aware of until our meeting yesterday, when a representative from the Mexican-American community spoke about the questionnaire that went out printed in Spanish—and the kinds of answers that came back. Depending on how you interpret them, you may have two different sets of information. Not only that, there were one or two questions that weren't included in the Spanish version. His comment, very facetiously, was "perhaps they didn't know how to say it in Spanish."

But, nevertheless, the information is being interpreted, and I would agree, there is serious question of the scientific authenticity in the questionnaire itself.

#### WHAT OF POSSIBLE POLITICAL SCREENING PROCESSES?

Senator EAGLETON. Finally, Mr. Fitch, let me ask you this; previous witnesses at earlier hearings have indicated to us that there is a political screening process as to who will participate in this 1971 Conference. Do you have any information in that area that you could impart to us?

Mr. FITCH. I know this is a widespread opinion that is being held by many people. I have no reason to doubt it, but I really have no personal knowledge of it.

In planning for the 1961 White House Conference there was some political pressure but not to the point that has been suggested in con-

nection with this Conference. There was a sincere desire on the parts of Senator McNamara and John Fogarty to keep it a bipartisan meeting. At no time was a political clearance required for any individual or organization that had a needed expertise.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. Fitch.

We appreciate your presentation very much.

Mr. FITCH. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity, and any time we can help, you can count on us.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Dr. Blue Carstenson, representing the National Farmers Union.

**STATEMENT OF DR. BLUE A. CARSTENSON, DIRECTOR, SENIOR MEMBER DIVISION, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION**

Mr. CARSTENSON. Thank you, Senator.

One of the reasons that my testimony is in informal shape is that many changes have been taking place in the last few days. Your hearings are already a success, in that you have made an impact on the operations of the White House Conference. They are moving much more rapidly. They adopted some changes to increase meaningful participation in the White House Conference on Aging. I hope that the actions yesterday, by the National Council on Aging meeting concerning minority participation in the Conference, will move the Conference staff to do a better job on minority involvement.

**OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ALREADY USEFUL**

Your oversight hearings are already proving to be very successful and very useful. It has caused me to have to revise my testimony about four times in the last 5 days.

For 20 years the Federal Government has struggled to organize itself concerning older people. There have been periods of progress and advances in particular areas, but there have been rarely periods of more than a few months when people seem to be generally pleased with the Federal organization and progress. Most of the time people have been dissatisfied with the way the Federal Government has been tackling the problems on aging. It hasn't been because of a lack of champions in the Congress on both sides of the aisle. We have had some good people who have been head of Federal programs on aging. Tibbits, Kent, Fitch, Beechill and Martin, all have had experience and stature in the field of aging. The lack of progress indicates it isn't just the man in charge; it is something much more.

I worked for this committee in 1960 on the study of reorganization of the Federal Government programs. There have been all sorts of proposals put forth—Division on Aging, Administration on Aging, Bureau on Aging, Office on Aging, Commissions on Aging—all different kinds of proposals. There have been proposals for assistant secretaries on aging in Health, Education, and Welfare, and an assistant director of OEO for older people programs.

## OLDER PEOPLE DISLIKE AoA IN WELFARE SYSTEM

It seems that the bureaucracy has been effective in subverting AoA into the welfare system, which is disliked by older people. It has been successful in killing off the Assistant Director of OEO for Older People, the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Labor for Older People. It has even made the title of "Assistant to the President" really fairly meaningless. Even though the Congress made it very clear they want AoA created as a separate administration in HEW, the bureaucracy continues to win.

The Administration on Aging simply doesn't have the "clout" it takes to do the job. Downgrading of aging has happened under all administrations, whether under the Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson or the Nixon administrations. The bureaucracy wins.

The Administration on Aging has had very little impact on programs of other Federal agencies. I know this from firsthand cases which I can cite. It has made little impact on the policies of the Office of Education, HUD, Public Health, Office of Consumer Affairs, Department of Agriculture, Volunteer Agency, Labor Department, and the Civil Service Commission. It has literally failed in the job of interagency effort, set forth by Congress.

Bernie Nash yesterday made the statement that this function became a low priority matter because of the lack of staffing. I feel that it was something even more important. AoA just didn't have the position and "clout" to do the job.

I share Bill Fitch's concern about this President's Council on Aging. I think it is a waste of the taxpayers' money. I would hope some means could be found to abolish it.

## IMPACT ON THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

The biggest failure has been the failure of the Congress, AoA, the senior citizen groups, and the professionals in having any real impact on the Office of Management and Budget. Nixon has given it additional powers, but OMB has always had power. The Bureau of the Budget always had powers to give program emphasis, deny funds, to deny budget allocations, to set priorities. Some way we, who are concerned about aging, need to make an impact on the Office of Management and Budget.

OMB staff members are age segregated. They are isolated from the older people. They live in the suburbs, are middle aged, and rarely ever see an older person in their daily lives. They just simply don't see older people in any part of their lives, so they don't have any priority. They rarely get out of their offices. They need to get out and see what is actually happening to old people in nursing homes, in the rural areas, and in small towns.

Senator, I grew up in Missouri and have worked for years with the Missouri Council of Senior Citizens and with retired railroaders in Missouri. I know the problems of rural older people in Missouri and across the country. But the officials in OMB do not. It is not part of their world. If we can get them out to see rural Missouri, it would be a major help. Maybe we can get the Appropriations Committee to increase OMB's travel allowance to get out and see what the real world is like.

## BUREAUCRATS SHOULD LEARN MEANING OF 37-50-53

When we use the figures 36-26-34, everybody knows what they mean. But when we use the figures of 37-50-53 or 10-18-25, too many bureaucrats don't know what they mean. They are a little dumber and maybe a little less sexy, but they are important. People over the age of 45 represent 37 percent of the population, 50 percent of the work force, and 53 percent of the unemployed.

The figures 10-18-25 are: 10 percent of the population, 18 percent of the voting age population, and 25 percent of those who turn out to vote in off-year elections.

Congress is much more sensitive to the figures and is aware of the problems of older people. However, budgeteers and the bureaucrats simply don't see these figures. Some way we must involve them in the problems of older people. We must get them to see and talk and work with older people.

People have talked about the Assistant for Older People to the President. I would trade that any day for an Assistant for Older People to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget so we could have some real meaningful impact on budget and planning processes. That is where the action is. That is where we need an assistant for older people. When Director Schultz comes I hope you will ask him the question—"Congress wants to set a higher priority for aging. How would you suggest that we structure it? What changes would you recommend? You are the management expert and have been a professor in business administration. You have worked on problems of organizations in the Federal Government. What would you recommend?"

"Here is what our intent is. How should we go about it? Would the Office of Management and Budget supply to us the design possible, so that we can get more than 4 percent of the Department of Labor's programs going to people over 45? Only 4 percent now go to people over 45.

"OEO's programs are a little better than they were; they are still woefully inadequate. The older workers' and older peoples' programs get shortchanged."

I would suggest Congress put the monkey right on the back of the Office of Management and Budget as to the solution.

You mentioned yesterday about Conference reports and other reports. Technical reports are necessary. Reports of this committee have served a major function in providing information that we can't get printed, in any other way, in the field of aging. They are very important. But the reports of Congress, including committee reports, legislative history of the Congress, and special reports, are not being read today by the people who are making policy decisions in Government. In some way the Congress should come up with some new formats, and new designs so that Congress can communicate with operating agency staff, the departmental regional directors and the people in the Office of Management and Budget. They are deluged with all kinds of printed material. There ought to have been something coming from the Congress that is at least as attractive as the Manpower magazine of the Department of Labor.

## DECISIONMAKERS NOT HEARING WILL OF CONGRESS

For the last couple years, I have found that it is not very easy for a civil servant, down at the grade 13 or 14, to request copies of bills, copies of reports, or other kinds of things from the Congress. We have to sort of sneak copies in the back way so that people inside can even tell what the Congress is talking about or thinking about. In some way the Congress should change its operating printing procedures, somehow, so that the man in the regional office who is making the decisions concerning the programs will hear what you are saying—because right now he isn't.

The legislative intent is not getting through. I can document this further if you would like.

I have made a list of Carstenson's 10 "Laws of Bureaucrats."

I. Bureaucrats don't read hearings of congressional committees.

II. Bureaucrats don't read committee reports or bill reports, but do read reports in the Washington Post, New York Times, and perhaps Time Magazine.

III. Bureaucrats rarely read the Congressional Record. To request a copy of bills currently being discussed by Congress is a cardinal sin.

IV. Bureaucrats read only those sections of the law which apply to that section which they administer.

V. To request additional information on congressional intent of sections of a bill is to admit incompetency. Departmental lawyers interpret most legislation initially and regional offices interpret it the rest of the way rarely based upon true legislative history in Congress and in most cases the interpretations are never tested in court.

VI. Cost effectiveness and cost benefit are the critical terms today. Efficiency is more important than impact of programs on individuals.

VII. Bureaucrats fear the Office of Management and Budget more than any congressional committee including the Appropriations Committee.

VIII. Too popular programs are worse than poor programs. Popular programs stir up requests and get you in trouble with the Office of Management and Budget. Poor programs do not. If you get into trouble with the Office of Management and Budget—they will get you in a reorganization move.

IX. Bureaucrats should consult only with other bureaucrats in the same agency and all travel should be restricted to regional offices of a person's own agency.

X. Let problems sit in the in-box long enough and push them around to other units for comment—and the problem usually goes away.

I would like to make a few comments on the White House Conference. The questionnaire that was used was poorly designed. I think they realized it. They should have pretested it. It just was very bad and was a waste of the taxpayers' money.

The White House Conference on Aging staff have not made use of enough of the people who worked on the 1961 White House Conference. While they have used Wilma Donahue and Clark Tibbits, there are many other people around who could have helped them. It wasn't until you announced these hearings that they have been starting to turn to people with experience, like Bill Fitch and Bernie Nash.

Frankly, the Conference has gotten off to a bad start. People have raised real questions about it. It has taken too long to get clearances for committee members.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS DELAYED

On the question of whether or not there has been political influence in the selection of the task forces, I think there has been some. I think the main problem is that clearance had to take place at such a high

level, and the AoA is such a low level that it took months for the papers to get clearance. Instead of having a clear channel upward—even though John Martin is Assistant to the President—Martin has to go through all the levels. This is what has taken the time, has made complications, and has caused the doubt, suspicions, and concerns, and has delayed the background papers.

It has taken too long to write the background papers, though they are difficult to write. The first ones we have seen were the ones given us last Saturday. They really pushed hard on printing them because they knew your hearings were scheduled. They knew that the Planning Committee was quite concerned.

Also they knew the National Council on Aging Conference was coming in. They were under the gun. The papers could have been a little better. There have been some people, such as Governor Blue, who have expressed deep concerns about the quality of the papers. At least it gives us something in hand to work with which we should have had some months ago.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

One, this committee do everything in its power to help the House establish a House Committee on Aging.

Two, I would like to see the Administration on Aging as a separate unit, reporting directly to the Secretary. However, I have to admit, after 10 years of struggling on this, that the bureaucracy will probably win. I suggest instead that they take AoA—if it can't be made an independent agency—and put it over with the Social Security Administration. At least there will be some allies. At least they will be concerned about older people. SRS is going to be so tied up for so many years in trying to straighten out the welfare mess that they will never have time for aging. To leave it in that Agency means only delay. They are going to pull staff and carry moneys away from AoA to help on the big problems of the welfare. If AoA is put in Social Security, AoA will at least have some allies. A man like Herman Brotman tries to research the whole field of aging alone. At least over in Social Security they have some allies in the Social Security research sections and program analysis.

Interagency coordination in the field of aging is important and it is absolutely essential that the Office of Management and Budget be involved in that process. There is where the action is. One way is as an independent commission composed of three members plus the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging. But, ask the OMB to help you in the construction of an effective design.

Senator EAGLETON. Doctor, I agree with your analysis that OMB is where the action is. Earlier in your testimony you said you would rather have a special assistant to Schultz than a special assistant to Nixon. I might even agree with you on that.

#### INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCILS

Where I part company with you, not in terms of philosophy, but just in terms of my own personal disposition, are these interagency coordinating councils or whatever their titles may be. I have had

some exposure to some of those. I won't indict all of them—but the ones I have had exposure to, I think are a total flop—whether you have three Cabinet members that comprise a coordinating council, three Deputy Secretaries or Undersecretaries.

I have yet to see one, myself, that has worked.

Have you seen some that have worked?

Mr. CARSTENSON. Well, admittedly this would be a little unique type of operation. This would be with three Commissioners appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and then adding two additional members, the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging, and the Director of the Office of Budget and Management.

This Commission ought to have some money to encourage inter-agency cooperation. If they had maybe \$30 million, they could use it to encourage the interagency joint efforts, special creative things and new efforts within and between the agencies, I think you could get the kind of cooperation and coordination.

If you bring people together from different agencies and if they think that anything they do might cost them some of their own money, they are not going to cooperate. If there is a pot of money that will encourage cooperation and coordination they will be all for it, and you can get all sorts of cooperation that way. If they might get another \$0.5 million for their new project if they cooperate, they will be ready to do it.

One of the hopes we had originally for the Administration on Aging, was that they would use some of their money to pool it with other agencies. Once I proposed to Bill Bechill and to Mary Switzer, that they take some of their money, \$1 million or \$2 million and go to the Labor Department saying: "We will put this together with you if you really come up with a good older workers' program." They decided, instead, to operate all their programs separately.

Senator EAGLETON. Let me ask you this question, since you represent an organization that obviously is primarily concerned with rural America.

How well do you think rural issues were dealt with in the preliminary publications for the White House Conference?

#### PROBLEMS OF RURAL ELDERLY AMERICANS NOT MENTIONED

Mr. CARSTENSON. Handbooks—I didn't see any real mention of rural problems, small towns particularly where older people lived. I didn't see much that was in the handbooks that related to it.

I have hopes that some of the State conferences in the Midwest will focus more on the rural problems. But in the materials I have seen, there hasn't been much emphasis on rural. Rural areas contain about a third of all older people. It is a group that has lower income, poorer health, and more serious transportation problems.

Senator EAGLETON. A final question, and then I will refer you to Senator Schweiker.

You mentioned in your initial statement the political screening process. Would you elaborate on whatever information you have on that; and at what level the screening was being done?

Mr. CARSTENSON. As far as I know, they had to go to the White House for approval.

They screen committees to a certain extent. This has been tighter screening than in past administrations, either the Eisenhower administration or the Kennedy or Johnson administrations.

One of the things that has happened all over the Federal Government that does concern me, is the special kind of screening of civil service jobs. Anybody over grade 13—a new person coming on—applicants for civil service jobs—are being looked at pretty carefully for political screening. This is not just for AoA or HEW, it is a whole Federal system. I am concerned that we may be having sort of a breakdown in our Civil Service System. It is something that people ought to take a look at. I have heard this from people in several different departments, that it is very quietly done.

Senator EAGLETON. Senator Schweiker.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am sorry I was a little bit late.

I just wondered if you would, Doctor, summarize for me some of your suggestions relating to the White House Conference, and what we might be doing differently or could do better. I know you touched some here, but could you capsulize your views?

Mr. CARSTENSON. The first one is: I am glad you held this hearing, because it has moved the planning staff on aging to move much more rapidly; it has helped obtain the clearance at higher echelons to enable John Martin and his staff to move. It has helped higher priority in HEW for this action.

You may have to have another one to help boost it along, because the Administration on Aging is so far down the totem pole. It seems like only action by this committee can get the priority.

I am feeling much better than I was last Thursday, about the possibility of real participation by the delegates coming into the White House Conference. There are changes that were made last Saturday at the planning meeting. For example, each subsection will have a chance to elect a vice chairman of the subsection and that person will be involved in the process of preparing the resolutions and summarizing them. This means that the delegates will have a fairly good chance their resolutions won't get screened out.

I think John Martin and his staff ought to be commended for making these changes, and working with the planning committee to straighten out what was a pretty bad situation.

That is one of the only reasons I have—my testimony has been in rough form—because, in the past few days, there have been many changes. If the Administration on Aging and the White House Conference staff does the job of increasing the involvement of minorities, it will help. They should make some additional appointments. This will again improve the White House Conference.

#### COMMITTEE CREDITED FOR AID TO WHCA DELEGATES

This committee can take full credit for the additional funds for travel, providing travel costs for the delegates, particularly the older low-income delegates. This is terribly important. If you hadn't done it, I think the Conference would have been a total waste of time. I think this action has been a real help.



There is need for additional staff in the AoA to plan now for action after the Conference. This means helping States and communities do the planning now so that the Conference won't just die after December. I hope that there will be budget for a post-Conference follow-up in 1972. This did not happen in 1961. The Kennedy administration dropped the ball in the follow-up of the 1960 White House Conference. John Martin has been talking about it, but there needs to be some budget for planning, so that there can be follow-through after the Conference.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator EAGLETON. Doctor, I have one other question that has popped into my head. It is not precisely germane to the issue.

Why is it that Missouri doesn't have a Green Thumb program?

#### LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG OLDER PEOPLE

Mr. CARSTENSON. Part of it is the same reason that the Governor of Iowa and Senator Hughes and Senator Miller haven't been able to get a Green Thumb program for the State of Iowa. It was very relevant to the hearing about the effectiveness of the Administration on Aging. Only 4 percent of all the manpower funds—title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, MDTA, and OJT—go to help people over age 45. The Labor Department has fallen drastically short of tackling the serious problems of long-term unemployment among older people. We have not had any real help from the Administration on Aging.

You know, AoA just doesn't have the "clout" to go over and talk with Schultz, and Weber, and Secretary Hodgson, and say: "Look, there are a million people with long-term unemployment in the over-45 group. You have got to give them an equitable share of the action."

Second is that we haven't been asked by the Governor of Missouri, like we have in the case of the Governor of Iowa, the Commission on Aging, and the Senators. Our mutual friend, Marjorie Melton, who is from Missouri, is in Arkansas today, working on developing our Green Thumb program. She wants Green Thumb in Missouri. Especially since my own home State is Missouri, I would sure like to get a Green Thumb program there, if I could.

Senator EAGLETON. Let's work on that.

Do you have any questions?

Senator HUGHES. No.

Senator EAGLETON. Thank you, Doctor.

We appreciate your presentation and we especially appreciate your courtesy in deferring your testimony yesterday and coming back today.

Mr. CARSTENSON. Thank you very much.

You might get Senator Schweiker to take you over and show you a real good Green Thumb program in Pennsylvania.

Senator SCHWEIKER. I am glad you brought it up. I don't want to rub it in.

Senator EAGLETON. We have one additional witness who was not on the announced witness list.

I will yield to Senator Hughes of Iowa to introduce the witness, and he will conclude these hearings in my absence.

Senator Hughes.

Senator HUGHES. Mr. Morris, I want to welcome you before the Subcommittee on Aging and I appreciate the fact that you are willing to be here and testify, and having visited with you earlier, I know that you have some fairly specific problems you want to discuss; and, I won't take the subcommittee's time with a long and generous introduction, but simply allow you to enter that, to state to the committee your official capacity and your opinions.

#### **STATEMENT OF C. E. MORRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PLANNED ACTION FOR COMMUNITY ELDERLY, DES MOINES, IOWA**

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Senator.

When I came this morning, I certainly had no idea I was going to be sitting in this chair.

For the past 3½ years I have been working in the city of Des Moines, in the Des Moines area under a project known as PACE—which is Planned Action for Community Elderly. It has been funded under the Older Americans Act and the Commission on Aging for the State of Iowa, as the administrator for the funds.

Some of us, and many of us who are working with that program, are definitely concerned on three different points:

1. The minority group of the elderly who are 55-and-over, and a majority 65-and-over in the greater Des Moines area; and, with personal experience in San Francisco, Seattle, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, Kansas City, and St. Louis, where I have gone to some effort to examine this problem which has been bothering me, personally, and been bothering my board of directors. Number one is the minority group.

#### **MINORITY GROUPS FIND DIFFICULTY TESTIFYING**

When Senate hearings or Government officials hold hearings in the various cities, the minority group just doesn't get an opportunity to testify before those committees. Now, you may say: "Well, why not, and if you feel this way why don't you send a note up to the chairman and ask for permission to do so?"

Well, this was tried on one occasion, and I am just a small person. I am not a political person; I am not a politician. I am a social worker and I am interested in the elderly because this is my field. I feel that these hearings ought to be held out in the States where people such as those who are welfare workers, public health officials, and social workers—who work directly with the low-income elderly—should be heard in some manner. Especially in the field of Medicare and other problems which directly concern them.

2. We are definitely concerned in Des Moines, and the greater Des Moines area, with the overlapping of Federal funds—which makes three Federal agencies all funding the elderly programs.

Now, for 2½ years Project PACE, which is allotted \$20,000 a year; \$10,000 of that goes for an executive director, who is the only paid person, other than a secretary. The rest who operate the program are over 250 volunteers. About 50 percent of these are teenagers and college students. The others are adults.

Model Cities has quite a sum of money in the area, and duplicates the very services that Project PACE has been operating within the Model Cities area. The Office of Economic Opportunity through the Greater Opportunity program within the city and they, too, applied several thousand dollars—employ an executive director, same as Model Cities. They set up offices, the latest in Xerox machines, the latest in telephonic equipment, nice plush thick carpets, and this is all for the elderly—when the project that they already had going is still doing the majority of work within the area.

The question is: How much of this is being done throughout the Federal program on aging?

3. The last part that is bothering us is that some 60 percent, you will find, of the elderly live in cheap hotels, in rooming houses, and—in our city and county—chicken shacks and ex-hog pens.

#### HUNGRY—AND AFRAID TO OBJECT

These people are hungry; they are afraid. They are afraid to say one word, because, they are afraid if they do object their welfare funds will be cut off. We know of instances where this has actually happened.

Many of these people, when they reach the age of 80, 90 years old, are lonely; they are alone; they have no one to care for them. They have no one that cares a darn whether they live or die. Then when they finally become so ill that they lie there, they are bundled off to a custodial—a nursing home facility. In our State—as in many States—many of these have been lower than snake pits.

Our program has been responsible for closing up some of these nursing and custodial homes. One instance—where these people had been beaten by laths taken from the side of a home, where plaster has been put over it—I know; and can testify to this, definitely, that it is true. I have seen the lath marks on the bodies of 80-year-old women.

I know that these people go hungry. I know that they lie there day after day in their own filth. I know that they have their mouths taped shut with adhesive tape—because they dared to ask for a bedpan at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, while the aides played cards. I know this to be a fact. It is a matter of grand jury records that can be proven.

I can also produce documented evidence where a person, a diabetic going into a diabetic coma—he had nobody in this world—nobody cared whether he went into that diabetic coma or whether he didn't. He was living in a foster home, supposedly, which was operating as a nursing center—without a license. The State of Iowa had no laws; and, the local people were so afraid that nobody dared to object as to what was going on in that institution.

I did, and we put a person there for 3 days to gather the evidence. Not only did we get that evidence, but we had the direct sworn testimony and notarized testimony of an elderly person who saw this man's

face shoved into a plate of mashed potatoes. When he arrived at Boardlawn Hospital at 11 o'clock in the morning, a part of those mashed potatoes were still in his mouth. He died that night at 6:20. The diagnosis was diabetic coma.

We could get no one to listen to us. We have case, after case, after case.

Now, Iowa and Des Moines have no monopoly on the problems of the elderly. But we do know that elderly people are living in these cheap hotels. Forced into these conditions many of them are not even on Social Security; some of them are on Social Security, but still have families, their income is low—they have to seek the cheapest possible means of living.

#### EARNINGS LIMITATION CREATES UNEMPLOYMENT FACTOR

We also know that many of these people could work if they were permitted to work. The \$1,380 that they are allowed under Social Security—many of them are not permitted to work by employers who will not hire them, because they don't want people to work up to \$1,380 and stop.

I don't want to take too much of your time. But taxes and city codes—what do you do with an 80-year-old lady who for 45 years owned and operated a little home? They didn't ask for welfare; all she wanted to do was live like a human being, and be treated as a human being. Therefore, she took in seven men roomers and she allowed these men to cook in their rooms. Along comes a city that puts through an ordinance; and nobody even knew the ordinance was going through until after it was too late to do anything about it. It affected the elderly within that city almost 100 percent.

So the 80-year-old lady is now forced to do one of two things. Either shut down her operation or install a bathroom in each one of these little rooms—because the code says that no two people can share the same bath.

As a result of a broken heart, because she could not keep her property, she died. Her home was sold for below-the-market value to a developer who wanted that property.

These elderly people are being abused all over the Nation. Yet we find no one, or at least I haven't found anyone—and believe me, at this National Conference on Aging which I am attending now, I heard several people get up and voice similar opinions to mine—who seemingly cares.

Yesterday I was given a book of the report of the Senate hearings, which is about that thick [indicating]. I understand it is to be released on April 5. What good is it? What good is the White House Conference if something isn't going to be done—and isn't being done—for the poverty-poor elderly of this Nation who are not getting the fair break.

#### POOR ELDERLY CANNOT AFFORD TO ATTEND CONVENTION

You can talk all you want to about the White House Conference, but I have yet—and I have attended many hearings in many States and regional meetings on the White House Conference—I have yet to hear one person voice an opinion, or to make any suggestion, or to

include the poverty minority groups—who are living in the conditions I am telling you about this morning.

Now, in our State we are having a White House conference; a State White House conference in May. Our people can't attend that, even though they want to attend it, they can't attend it. The reason they can't attend it is because they don't have the \$5 registration fee. Five dollars will feed some of these people for a whole week—and that is all they have. They have no transportation—they have no one to speak out for them.

We are asking—and my point—I came to Senator Hughes, and I went to Senator Miller, and I went to Congressman Neal Smith yesterday, because we know these men, and we know that they feel that the elderly should have a part of the program. They are entitled to live. They built this country, and we don't feel that we should be excluded!

Thank you very much.

Senator HUGHES. Thank you very much, Mr. Morris.

Could you give me the time span in which you witnessed these atrocities to the aging?

Mr. MORRIS. Could I, sir—I didn't get that.

Senator HUGHES. When did it happen? Was it last year? This year?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, it was in December of 1970.

Senator HUGHES. December of 1970?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, and it is going on all the time, Senator.

Senator HUGHES. Are there any organizations representing poor, elderly people in America, to your knowledge?

#### NO NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR POOR ELDERLY

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir; not to my knowledge. The American Association of Retired Persons, who originally sponsored Project PACE; after I had been there 3 weeks, the regional director from Kansas City came and said: "You must cease and stop working with the poverty poor. Our program will not permit it." The National Council on Aging has backed us, but I do not feel—and I say this with the greatest respect for the Council—I do not feel that they have a program for the poor.

Senator HUGHES. Mr. Morris, when did you go to work for PACE?

Mr. MORRIS. July 1 of 1968.

Senator HUGHES. What was your occupation before that?

Mr. MORRIS. I was field consultant and director of youth services for the Iowa Easter Seal Society for 8 years.

Senator HUGHES. And you have lived in Iowa since 1961?

Mr. MORRIS. Right, sir.

Senator HUGHES. Have you had any experience with the aging in other States of the Union?

Mr. MORRIS. The only experience I have had with aging in other States is when, last year, I was invited to go to San Francisco—which is my own State, hometown. At that time I was given permission to work in plainclothes. I was allowed to go anywhere, to see anything, and ask any questions I wanted about the elderly in San Francisco.

I definitely went into the low-income-bracket field, and what I saw was simply shocking. I mention skid row, alcoholism, and say a lot of these people are alcoholics; a lot of them are drug addicts, which is why they are on skid row in the first place. They are not there by their own choice.

In San Francisco I sat on the curb at 2 o'clock in the morning and talked to these winos; I went to union leaders, and I went to social leaders. In Los Angeles, with Mayor Yorty's committee, I had the privilege and was invited to speak before the mayor's commission and the mayor's committee. I got a standing applause when I hit out as hard as I hit out, because Los Angeles is full of it—particularly the nursing home atrocities—Pittsburgh, Kansas City, New York, are the same.

Senator HUGHES. Are you familiar with the statistics on Iowa, in comparison with the rest of the Nation, on aging?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, the State of Iowa is second. Florida is first, and the State of Iowa is second.

Senator HUGHES. In other words we have the second highest percentage, relative to total population, on the aging in America?

Mr. MORRIS. Right, sir; yes, sir.

Senator HUGHES. What percentage of our total population is that; do you know?

Mr. MORRIS. Sir, I couldn't answer that.

Senator HUGHES. Nationally I believe it is 10 percent now, so I am assuming it is probably higher.

Mr. MORRIS. I couldn't say. I know in the greater Des Moines area we have over 28,000 senior citizens.

Senator HUGHES. Do you have any official estimate of what percentage of that total aging population is in the poverty category?

Mr. MORRIS. In the city of Des Moines?

Senator HUGHES. Whatever your experience would be.

Mr. MORRIS. I would say 60 percent; one out of every four.

Senator HUGHES. Are in the poverty category?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator HUGHES. One out of every four?

Mr. MORRIS. Right, I think that will hold pretty much true across the Nation.

Senator HUGHES. Is the Office of Economic Opportunity providing any services to the poverty aging in Iowa, to your knowledge?

### TITLE III PROJECT NOT FOR POVERTY-POOR ELDERLY

Mr. MORRIS. None; other than one particular project which they opened about 4 months ago and funded—and this was a project under Greater Opportunity—that is the only one I know. The rest of the center they do, but not for poverty. They set up senior citizen centers. They take tours, and they provide cards and dancing and that type of thing. We were told 2 years ago by an official out of Kansas City, and of our own State of Iowa commission, that we had to do this type of a program under the title III funds; that is what title III funds were for. Our board of directors objected and we were told we had to do it or we faced the loss of our funds.

Our board voted not to do it. How in the world can I tell Mr. Nichols, who is living in a chicken shack in the southeast bottoms—which is a poverty area as you have never seen it—that I can't help him to get his food stamps; and, on an icy day when he is locked in, I can't take him to the Safeway store to buy his food—unless I first teach him how to dance.

Senator HUGHES. Do you have any knowledge of any other areas of Iowa, other than Polk County?

Mr. MORRIS. I have been all over the State of Iowa.

Senator HUGHES. Relative to the aging.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator HUGHES. The rural poor?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator HUGHES. The smalltown poor?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator HUGHES. What are the conditions of the poor in the small towns in Iowa?

Mr. MORRIS. The small towns are practically forgotten. In many of the areas where they had title III funds working, when the time came they were closed out and it left nothing and these people just sit there.

Senator HUGHES. Isn't it true that there is no longer any transportation available, even to take the aged from their homes to buy their groceries?

Mr. MORRIS. This is absolutely correct.

Senator HUGHES. Or to get to a doctor to obtain medical care if they need it?

Mr. MORRIS. This is our chief point. They all get their food somehow, but how do they get to the clinics? How do they get their fuel? They sit there. We have had case after case where these people lay there, for 2, 3, 4 weeks, dead—and nobody knew it, because nobody cared.

Senator HUGHES. Are there any visitation programs in the rural small towns in Iowa?

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir; very few, mostly in the larger cities, but I don't know of any in the small towns.

Senator HUGHES. You say people die and lay there 3 or 4 weeks?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir; we have put in a telephone assurance program, operated by our teenage cadets, where we try to get these—

Senator HUGHES. You are talking about Polk County. I am talking about small towns.

Mr. MORRIS. It is very few—Davenport was one program; Sioux City has some, but the small town just hasn't had it.

Senator HUGHES. Take my hometown of 2,300 people. Are there any services there, at all, for the elderly?

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir.

Senator HUGHES. Most small towns are repositories for the elderly.

Mr. MORRIS. Right, because of—

Senator HUGHES. The percentage of population would probably be 40 percent in elderly categories in these small, rural towns. So the problem isn't all in the city.

Mr. MORRIS. Right.

Senator HUGHES. And yet there are no services available at all?

Mr. MORRIS. You are right.

Senator HUGHES. How about hospital services?

Mr. MORRIS. Very little; very little.

Senator HUGHES. Ambulance service?

Mr. MORRIS. None.

Senator HUGHES. Are there any ambulance services available in most small towns?

Mr. MORRIS. None except what the highway patrol and city police can provide. But, Senator, even if they did come into the large city and go to the hospital, they have to sit there for 3, 4, 5 hours before they get any attention. I am talking about these skid rows, as they are referred to, and the cheap hotels, I referred to as bums. Let them get into a little bit of trouble, and then they are dirty old men, and nobody cares. They throw them in the jail and forget it.

Senator HUGHES. Most of these people are on Old Age Assistance?

#### LIEN LAW UNACCEPTABLE FOR OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. MORRIS. No, well, no they are not, and the reason they are not on Old Age Assistance—many of them—is because of a lien law. They don't want Old Age Assistance. They want the security of their own home.

Senator HUGHES. Describe the lien law for the record, just briefly.

Mr. MORRIS. The lien law is when you go on Old Age Assistance your home is taken by the welfare department. If you pass away, it becomes the property of the State until the amount of money they paid you for welfare is taken out; and, then whatever is left goes for what you want it to.

Senator HUGHES. When the State takes it over, what do they usually do with it?

Mr. MORRIS. Right now they are just sitting on it, boarded it up.

Senator HUGHES. Boarded up and just sitting there.

Mr. MORRIS. We have hundreds of these homes that are boarded up. I have asked repeatedly if we could take down the boards and rent them out so there would be an income.

Senator HUGHES. Are they good homes?

Mr. MORRIS. Some of them, but the majority are not. I would say 50 percent could be used—probably 75 percent—if you consider the chicken shacks they are living in now.

Senator HUGHES. In other words, the aging could use them if they were available?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; by all means.

Senator HUGHES. What is the minimum Old Age Assistance in Iowa?

Mr. MORRIS. One hundred and thirteen dollars a month.

Senator HUGHES. What would it cost for fuel in a home in Iowa in winter, let's say in February, per month?

Mr. MORRIS. I can tell you that because I am the guardian conservator for 18 people. They averaged around \$30 a month during the cold winter. In the summertime they just roast, because they don't have any air conditioning, so the rate goes down.

Senator HUGHES. Do the aging have any protection on tax increases in Iowa?



Mr. MORRIS. Well, the tax——

Senator HUGHES. On property taxes?

Mr. MORRIS. The taxation problem is, of course, one of their biggest headaches—because the taxes are going up, and everything else is going up, but their income isn't. We are trying to get through now, in the city of Des Moines, where, if your income is \$1,300 or less per year, and your assessed value of your home is \$9,000, your taxes will be forgiven. But here again we are running into trouble, because the people up in the higher echelons say: "Well, these people had an opportunity, why didn't they save when they were young then they wouldn't be in this position." I am 63 years old. I tried to save, too. But I don't have anything today, and I know how these people are.

As far as taxes are concerned, this year there is going to be a lot of these people not able to make it.

Senator HUGHES. The point is that if you have an elderly person living in a small home, and the property taxes are a very minimal amount of \$60 a year, and a total income on Old Age Assistance is what you described; during an Iowa winter, with food and medical needs, can individuals such as this possibly survive?

Mr. MORRIS. They can survive. They don't live; they just exist. They are surviving because they can't do anything else—until somebody takes their home away from them.

Senator HUGHES. You mentioned another area which I would like to ask you just two or three questions.

How do these people get narcotic drugs prescribed for them?

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I could shock you this morning if I——

Senator HUGHES. I would like to be shocked.

#### NARCOTIC DRUG OVERUSE CAUSES SERIOUS CONCERN

Mr. MORRIS. If I could have my files here and show you documented files—giving you as one example a man who was 94 years old, whose wife was 92. These two people were in our local hospital, under Medicare, when they were finally—they were there for 3 months. Their bills were over \$12,000. The percentage of drugs in those cases was absolutely shocking. Now, I am a former administrator of Medicare in the Public Health Service. I know a little something about it. The lady passed away 3 days after I was appointed by the courts as their guardian conservator.

We removed the gentleman; put him in a nursing home, and in 4 months' time this man's drug bill went from \$20 to \$104—\$104 a month for drugs. Now, this is one example.

When we complained to the doctor, he said: "Are you a doctor, a medical man?" And we said: "No, but we are administrators and we know something about it." He said: "Until you become a licensed physician it would be best to keep your mouth shut." When we told this man we would remove this patient, he informed us we didn't have the authority to do so. But we did remove him within 45 minutes after this conference.

He went under the care of Dr. Harold Anderson, who does care about the elderly. We put him in another local nursing home—and for 3 weeks this man had to be held in restraint for drug removal. Today, I pay anywhere from \$16 to \$18 a month for his drugs.

These people are being tranquilized to death by doctors who never see them.

Senator HUGHES. In the area your organization serves, how many individuals addicted to drugs, do you estimate, are addicts as a result of the prescribed legal medication? Do you have any opinion?

Mr. MORRIS. Sir, I couldn't answer that; only on my own personal knowledge. Now that I have been objecting—have been closing, and been instrumental in making some of these places close down—the conditions in the Des Moines area are greatly improved. They are getting the message—but they are not getting it in the large metropolitan areas, from what I have been told here.

Senator HUGHES. Are elderly people, living alone, being given bottles of tranquilizers to take themselves?

Mr. MORRIS. I cannot answer that. I don't know.

Senator HUGHES. You mentioned alcohol in relation to the indigent. Does the elderly alcoholic have any chance of treatment or care at all?

Mr. MORRIS. None that I know. We have the Harrison Treatment Center in Des Moines which attempts to do a good job; but, they take them in, dry them out, and turn them out. I can cite the case of Mr. Fitzsimmons. I do not hesitate to mention his name because it is authentic. He came from the Harrison Clinic. He came to our office—the employment office could care less about these people. I am talking about the Federal employment system. They don't want these elderly people. They can't place them; they don't want to be bothered with them.

This man goes to get a job; he is 62 years old. Who wants him? We get him a job. As soon as they found out he had been in the Harrison Treatment Center, they didn't want him. So here he is, at the Manhattan Hotel, with his rent coming due on Monday and he has no rent. Can you blame him? I don't.

Senator HUGHES. Mr. Morris, you estimated, if I recall correctly, that one out of four within your jurisdiction are poverty poor; that their capabilities of getting along and conditions of their livelihood, and the fact, if I recall your original testimony, that they actually have no voice in America.

Mr. MORRIS. I don't know where it is if they do. This is the first time in 3 years—of course I have never asked—I didn't expect to appear here this morning—I just don't know of any voice. I don't know of anyone that particularly cares. The welfare people are so busy, and such a large number of cases. They just can't give individual help.

Mr. ORIOL. Mr. Morris, I just wonder if you could fill us in on what the funding status of PACE is?

#### PACE FUNDS TERMINATED AT END OF THIRD YEAR

Mr. MORRIS. The funding status will run out on June 30; and, we have been told by the Iowa Commission on Aging there are no funds to keep us going any longer. This was a pilot program. When Senator Hughes was Governor, the Iowa Commission on Aging was very much interested in this whole program.

Mr. ORIOL. Would this be the end of 3 years or 4 years?

Mr. MORRIS. Three.

Mr. ORIOL. You could not get the fourth year?

Mr. MORRIS. They tell us that there is no money. Now, they say to us: "Why don't you get local funds?" "Why don't you get United Funds?" We went to the United Fund. The first help we could get in United Funds was 1972. Then they said, if you make application now you cannot make any effort to raise funds—even though you have not been accepted.

Well, what are we going to do after June—what shall we do with this program? As one State official said to us the other day, "We are using \$60,000 of Federal funds and you are going to let it all go down the drain."

Mr. ORIOL. Now, that's \$60,000 Federal funds, plus how much? Is it State matching?

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Mr. ORIOL. No matching?

Mr. MORRIS. No; this is \$20,000 a year for 3 years. Now, our local Des Moines area Council on Aging, which is the sponsor of the project, does have a membership—and we have 1,400 paid up. We have raised probably \$4,000 to \$5,000 in addition—which has been spent.

Mr. ORIOL. Is that 1,400 the number of people you now serve?

Mr. MORRIS. That is the actual members, not the number we serve.

Mr. ORIOL. About how many people do you now serve?

Mr. MORRIS. How many we serve yearly or over the past—

Mr. ORIOL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Yearly; this past year, since July 1 we have served very close to 4,000 people. This is the low-income group, poverty group—4,000.

Mr. ORIOL. Is that confined to a specific geographical area, or do you serve the whole Des Moines range?

Mr. MORRIS. We serve all the Polk and Warren Counties. Warren is considered a rural area.

Mr. ORIOL. If you had additional funding could you serve additional people?

Mr. MORRIS. By all means—

Mr. ORIOL. About how many would you think you could serve?

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to recall that remark. If we had additional funds, we could do a better job of serving those we now have and increase the number to serve.

Mr. ORIOL. How would you serve them better?

#### FUNDS WOULD ENABLE SOCIAL SERVICE TO POOR ELDERLY

Mr. MORRIS. If we had additional funds, we would have a social worker. Right now I am the only person. I am on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If some poor person gets involved, or they discover something at 3 o'clock in the morning, I am the guy that gets called. They have to have volunteers. If we had additional funds, we could set up a center which these people could come to. We could help with better social service. We could have better home visitations. We could get better transportation, because we would have people who could get the volunteers lined up to transport.

As it is now, our volunteers and myself have been doing this all along.

Mr. ORIOL. How many are on the staff?

Mr. MORRIS. Just myself.

Mr. ORIOL. Just yourself?

Mr. MORRIS. And one secretary and two student part-time secretaries at \$1.50 an hour. Our secretaries are three professional secretaries who donate their services 1 day a week. The other 2 days we employ a secretary from the Kelly Girl Services. We have no permanent secretary.

Mr. ORIOL. Does the area you serve encompass the Model Cities neighborhood?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, it does, and until they started 6 months ago, we did all of their work—and are still doing 75 to 80 percent of it.

Mr. ORIOL. Even though they have more funding?

Mr. MORRIS. Surely, because they do not have trained people who know how to do an overall program. They are wonderful people. I am not criticizing their people. They tell me, "Mr. Morris, we either spend this money or we lose it."

Mr. ORIOL. That is my question; with their funding couldn't they do part of the job you now do?

Mr. MORRIS. In their own city; yes—I mean, within their own area.

Mr. ORIOL. Is there a move afoot to get them, at least, to take care of that area with the services you provide?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, providing we train the people.

Mr. ORIOL. Are you capable of doing that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ORIOL. Is that now happening?

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Mr. ORIOL. Why not?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't know. We had the contract already to go. It was written up. Our board approved it. It went back to the Model Cities, and that is the last we ever heard of it.

Mr. ORIOL. But as of now PACE will terminate on June 30, unless something happens?

Mr. MORRIS. Right.

Mr. ORIOL. Thank you. That is all.

Senator HUGHES. Mr. Morris, have you talked to the Governor about the problems you are having?

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir; I haven't. I think politics are—of course, I know we have to have politics; but I think politics are one of the main problems we have, and one of the main problems we are facing. When appointments are made, they are made on a political basis to fill these commissions—and not on the basis of people who work with these people, and who understand these people, and know what they are doing.

I have respect for bureaucracy as long as bureaucracy knows, and is able to do, the job they are assigned or elected to do.

Senator HUGHES. Thank you very much, Mr. Morris, for your testimony this morning.

If there are no further questions, the hearing is closed.

The joint committee is in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the joint committee was recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

# APPENDIXES

## Appendix 1

### MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY WILLIAM C. FITCH

#### ITEM 1. A RESOLUTION<sup>1</sup>

PRESENTED TO THE FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SENIOR CENTERS AT THE STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 28, 1971

Whereas we, the participants in the first annual conference of the National Institute of Senior Centers, in an expression of our concern about the problems of senior citizens and the problems related to the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, which the President has said

With careful planning and with broad representative participation can help develop a more adequate national policy for older Americans and,

Whereas Mr. William C. Fitch, executive director of the National Council on Aging, has stated,

There are many of us who deplore the fact that, to date, funds have not been appropriated to insure the attendance of older persons including the elderly poor at the White House Conference. I believe it was the intent of those who sponsored and supported the legislation that opportunities would be created for the elderly to speak out in their own behalf, and,

Whereas Mr. John B. Martin, Special Assistant to the President for the Aging, has stated,

It is important to remember that many of our Nations older persons are poor. It is vital that the older poor be represented in conference planning. Therefore, be it

*Resolved* that sixty (60) percent of the delegates from each state to the 1971 White House conference on aging be directly from the elderly poor community, with equitable representation from minority groups, and be it further

*Resolved* that senior centers play a significant role in the selection process of these delegates, with community action agencies as joint selectors, and be it further

*Resolved* that these aforementioned selections be certified delegates, not subject to approval by the Governors of the States, and be it further

*Resolved* that every aforementioned delegate so selected and certified be completely financed for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging in advance, such expenses to include transportation to and from the Conference and all expenses appertaining thereto, and be it further

*Resolved* that all recommendations, policies, and programs emanating from the 1971 White House Conference on Aging be totally implemented and translated into direct action within one (1) year immediately following the Conference, and be it further

*Resolved* that no program benefitting the Aging presently existing be cut-back, terminated or otherwise reduced financially or in any other way,

And being aware that with thousands of senior centers providing programs and services which presently are reaching less than eight (8) percent of the Nation's elderly, be it further

*Resolved* that funding for all aging programs and services be increased, so as to meet the needs of the poor, and so as to extend all programs and services to the aging to include those elderly persons living on marginal incomes close to the poverty level, be it further

<sup>1</sup> See p. 227.

*Resolved* that the President immediately and forthwith establish a Department on the Aging at the Cabinet level, this Department to be autonomous and a separate entity with full authority over all programs and policies for the aging, be it further

*Resolved* that all avenues of resource be utilized for this Department, with specific and total utilization of the interest derived from and accruing to the \$37.5 billion surplus in the Old Age Survivors and Disability Insurance Fund, and therefore,

We respectfully petition this body, the first Conference of the National Institute of Senior Centers, to endorse and support these resolutions in order to assure broad representative participation of the elderly in the 1971 White House Conference on Aging and to affirm our resolve to work to guarantee the dignity, well-being and security of every aged citizen of our Nation.

## ITEM 2. NEW IMPERATIVES FOR OLDER AMERICANS<sup>2</sup>

### A DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES

We the participants in the seventh Conference of National Organizations convened by the National Council on the Aging from forty-two States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, in order to improve the quality of life for middle-aged and older persons by calling public attention to the major problems of aging and promoting effective alternatives for their solution to hereby support as imperatives the goals contained and described in this declaration and urge the serious commitment of the resources of society through its government and social institutions in their achievement.

We recognize that the declaration of objectives of the Older Americans Act of 1965 establishes the basic public policy goals for the Nation.

We maintain that significant studies:

"*The Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance*," by the United States Senate Special Committee on Aging;

"*Toward a Brighter Future for the Elderly*," by the 1970 President's Task Force on Aging; and

"*The Golden Years . . . A Tarnished Myth*," A Report of Project FIND, by the National Council on the Aging

confirm our failure to achieve these goals and validate the urgency for national reaffirmation of our commitment.

Therefore, in order to fulfill the commitments made in the past and to meet these objectives, the following action program for the 1970's is presented:

(a) The prompt establishment of "an adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American Standard of Living" as specified in the Older Americans Act of 1965. Adequacy means more than mere survival—no elderly American should live below the poverty level.

(b) Eliminate discrimination against the elderly by increasing Federal Manpower Funds to provide placement, training and job assistance programs for the middle-aged and older worker as well as youth and minority groups which now receive priority.

(c) The provision of expanded and specialized health program facilities and rehabilitative and preventive care including mental health services for older Americans who require more care than younger age groups.

(d) The establishment and enforcement of national standards for any facility to guarantee quality physical and mental health care and decent living conditions.

(e) The establishment of comprehensive programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in older people.

(f) Earmark a sufficient proportion of Federal housing funds to meet the special needs of the elderly who are, in general, economically disadvantaged. Various methods should be employed.

(g) Development of mass transportation and/or diverse mobility systems which are responsive to the unique needs of older people.

(h) The development of citizen-controlled State, regional and local planning policies and structures which will ensure the delivery of comprehensive services to older people by professionally competent staff deployed so as to be accessible to all who need such services without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

<sup>2</sup> See statement, p. 228.

(i) The expansion of community comprehensive central information and referral services throughout the Nation.

(j) Recognition of the crucial need for continuing education for older people and increase in Federal expenditures for education based upon the number in the population rather than on the basis of life expectancy.

(k) That special emphasis be directed to the minority groups and to the older poor.

In order to effect action toward these goals and to promote the advancement of a national policy on aging, we urge that other groups having a special interest in and concern for middle-aged and older people join with us in concerted action to assure that:

(1) All appropriate existing legislation be evaluated for provisions or absence of provision related to the needs of older people and that this assessment result in decisions on courses of action to assure equitable allocation of programs, resources, (with the necessary financial appropriation) for older people.

(2) Every proposal for new national social legislation shall take into account the special needs of older people; that such legislation include specific provisions related to these needs as well as the technical assistance and financial appropriation required for their implementation.

(3) That every older person is afforded the opportunity for real participation in programs for community service and social action.

(4) That a range of options is open to them so that they can make choices.

(5) A principle of social accountability be established (whereby all levels of government and voluntary sectors will account to their constituents for their progress on an annual or more frequent basis in fulfilling their states objectives) just as government reaches out and makes certain that every citizen meet his responsibilities to government, it is incumbent upon government to reach out and make certain that every elderly citizen receive the care that he is entitled to whether through government or the private sector.

(6) The need to be sensitive to the unique cultural heritages among the people of this Nation and to recognize that older persons are the custodians thereof.

We also urge that all governmental and nongovernmental organizations examine their programs and services for relevance to the pressing needs of middle-aged and older people and take action to insure that sufficient organizational resources are directed to the achievement of the above goals.

March 31, 1971.

## Appendix 2

### LETTERS AND STATEMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

#### ITEM 1. LETTER FROM WILLIAM D. BECHILL, CHAIRMAN, SOCIAL POLICY SEQUENCE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND COMMUNITY PLANNING, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT BALTIMORE

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND COMMUNITY PLANNING,  
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,  
Baltimore, Md., March 30, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your letter of March 12 inviting my comments regarding various issues related to the programs of the Administration on Aging and the forthcoming White House Conference on Aging.

There are five areas regarding these and other matters affecting present policies and programs for older people that I would like to comment upon as follows:

1. *Effect on Administration Budget Requests for the Administration on Aging.* I am greatly disappointed at the reduced level of funding recommended by the Administration for the programs of the Older Americans Act. Two years ago, in my testimony in support of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969, I stressed that the proposed authorization levels were realistic limits, especially if funding levels were increased to sustain the momentum that had been building in the early years of the program. The \$29.5 million requested in the 1972 budget is shockingly low as a result. I am particularly concerned that the budget request continues to reduce the funds available to the States for necessary community planning and services; reduces the funds available for the Foster Grandparent Program, a program that has done so much to change the image of older people; provides only a small and late start for the R.S.V.P. program authorized in the 1969 Amendments; and reduces funds for research, demonstration, and training. There is absolutely no justification for such reductions in the light of the known needs that exist among the older population. At the minimum, I would urge that appropriations for 1972 be \$65 million, divided as follows: \$25 million for community grant programs, \$5 million each for areawide model projects under Title III of the Act, for statewide planning, evaluation, and coordination, and for the R.S.V.P., volunteer program, \$15 million for the Foster Grandparent Program, and \$10 million for research, demonstration, and training grants, with funds in this latter program earmarked for demonstrations in the area of transportation, services to the minority group elderly, and increased support of training programs.

2. *White House Conference on Aging.* I have had no part in the planning or preparation for the Conference at the national level since leaving the Administration on Aging two years ago. Whatever problems may exist in the terms of the pace of preparation and structure are probably due to the failure to secure funds for the planning of the Conference until a year ago.

3. *Extension of the Older Americans Act.* I believe that the Older Americans Act should be extended through July 1, 1976, with major amendments that would strengthen the coordination role of AOA and provide authority to make general purpose grants to colleges and universities for support of regional centers for training and research in the field of social gerontology and aging.

4. *Organizational Changes.* It is clear from the experience of the last three and half years that it was a mistake to have placed the Administration on Aging in the Social and Rehabilitation Service. There is no easy



answer to the organizational dilemma of the AOA. Two possible approaches might be considered. First, if the Congress approves the establishment of a new Department of Human Resources. I would urge that the Administration on Aging be made an independent agency in the new Department, and have among its operating responsibilities, the federal standard setting and enforcement authority for the licensing of nursing homes, homes for the aging, and other facilities caring for older people. For a change, this might guarantee that the licensing agency would primarily be motivated by the needs of the older person rather than other reasons. Second, the agency could be transferred now to the Office of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In either instance, sufficient funds should be available to permit AOA to fully carry out its dual role as a program operator and a focal point for coordination and policy leadership in behalf of older people at the federal level.

5. *An Income Status Benefit for the needy aged, blind, and disabled.* I have long felt that the Social Security retirement benefit program and the Old Age Assistance program should be consolidated at the point of monthly payment, although the separate financing of these two programs should be preserved. As you know, something close to this idea is now under consideration in the Congress. I believe that the present Old Age Assistance Aid to the Blind, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled programs should be transferred to the Social Security Administration and administered as one program, Adult Allowances.

The federal payment should be set at amounts for both single persons and couples, who are now receiving such assistance, or would qualify in the future, that would lift them out of poverty. The effects of an adequate benefit, provided with no stigma, administered by the Social Security Administration, would be immeasurable on elevating the lives and dignity of the needy aged, blind, and disabled persons of the nation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. BECHILL,  
*Chairman, Social Policy Sequence.*

**ITEM 2. LETTER FROM PEGGY M. BEST, PROJECT DIRECTOR, HOT MEALS FOR THE ELDERLY, SENIOR CITIZENS ASSOCIATION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.**

*April 7, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Let me start by apologizing for not responding earlier. Your inquiry came just before our big nutrition workshop which I coordinated and somehow your letter was overlooked. I am enclosing brochure on that workshop which was very stimulating and has already shown some positive community reaction.<sup>a</sup>

We are presently serving 250 seniors weekly in our three schools and an additional 85 people in our expanded program sponsored by the Mid-Wilshire Churches (brochures attached). Our particular program has been 100% endorsed by the Los Angeles School district so that we could initiate programs in neighborhood schools throughout the district and serve upwards of three thousand seniors if funds were available. Our district is one of the largest in the country.

When it became evident that the Senior Citizen Association could not maintain this program past the Federal funding, and no other funding was available, we began to explore other means of continuation. This included Homes for The Aging, hospitals, Head Start Kitchens, park facilities and neighborhood churches. We have been negotiating with the types of facilities in different district of Los Angeles and in some districts the program will be continued using volunteers at a possible minimum cost to the senior participant. My board agrees with me that we have a moral and physical commitment to our seniors to find ways of continuing the program without Federal funds and paid staffing. In several of our program sites we are the only activity the senior has all week, so we are important to him. Although our meal served once a week does not singularly keep the senior alive, it does give him assurance of our concern and people to turn to in time of trouble.

The social services we provide to our seniors are an important component in one total programing. This does not disclude the nutrition education lectures and

<sup>a</sup> Retained in committee files.

fun activities which the seniors participate in planning and implementing. We provide a total package which helps the senior enjoy the program and also feel useful by participating.

The discontinuation of this meal program with no other program replacements will permit the senior to again withdraw into his isolated world. The senior needs more programs and more services if he is to survive in this rapidly depersonalized world.

We believe that the major social problems affecting seniors are not being considered in a high priority in governmental planning. With the White House Conference only six months away, the President has not yet given recognition to its importance. This apathy is also reflected in our State's response so that we who work daily with seniors must hurry and do in six months all the preliminary steps which should have been put in execution in 1970.

You inquired specifically about the priority of nutrition programs so I shall respond to that. We believe that nutrition problems and health programs cannot be separated. There is a direct correlation between poor dietary habits and health problems of our seniors. The findings of data about the effect of long time dietary problems and health problems should be of great benefit in nutrition planning not only for seniors, but for younger people.

The Senate should charge HEW with the responsibility of implementing a preventative program of more interesting and informative nutrition programs in every level of school, combining this with interesting, attractive balanced meals served in learning institutions to counteract health deterioration because of dietary neglect. We look forward to meeting with your committee on your next trip to Los Angeles.

Yours in Aging.

PEGGY M. BEST,

*Project Director, Hot Meals For the Elderly.*

---

ITEM 3. LETTER FROM ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

APRIL 5, 1971.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to submit for the record AFL-CIO concerns about the Administration's most regrettable actions in cutting the budget for the Administration on Aging and on the program and planning for the White House Conference on Aging.

*Administration on Aging*

The Administration on Aging, the agency that was created by the Older Americans Act, has always been under-financed and under-staffed. As a result the law has never been fully implemented. Despite such high-sounding phrases in Administration's statements as "strategy designed to concentrate effort in limited high-priority areas," the AOA has been severely cut about 10 percent. When account is taken of increased costs, the cut is even greater. Research and training funds have been cut. There have also been funding reductions in Community Programs under Title III and in the Foster Grandparents program.

We are also concerned about the transfer of the Foster Grandparents Program to the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP). We consider the Foster Grandparents Program an employment program since it pays regular wages for hours worked. The RSVP is strictly a volunteer program to stimulate meaningful activity by the elderly. The transfer of the Foster Grandparents Program to the latter would likely change the character of the program—a change we oppose.

In spite of the compelling need for these programs for serving the aged, a psychology of retrenchment prevails in the high levels of the present Administration. The elderly people in our population are the least equipped to fight inflation or to make sacrifices to slow its pace.

I commend you and the Committee for creating a forum for calling to public attention these short-sighted and ill-advised cuts in funding. It is these efforts by the Senate Special Committee on Aging that have done so much to make possible many of the social gains that have been achieved by our elderly popula-

tion in recent years. In these endeavors, please be assured that you will have our support and that the AFL-CIO will be doing everything possible to see that these vitally important programs for the elderly will be properly funded.

*White House Conference on Aging*

It is the sincere hope of the AFL-CIO that this conference will effectively come to grips with the problems faced by older Americans, and will produce a national policy for the elderly during the 1970's. Unfortunately, there are indications that the conference is developing in a manner that will do little to achieve this objective and may be used for partisan political purposes.

There are 14 technical committees for this conference with a membership of 150-200. Only a handful are from organized labor. The claim has been made that the membership of technical committees is determined by expertise and is not based on relationships to organizations. The labor movement has experts in most, if not all, the subjects covered by the technical committees. Unfortunately, this potential source of experts was ignored and a disproportionate number selected from employers. For example, the technical committee on income, one of the few committees with an expert from organized labor, has 14 members of whom 5 are employer or insurance executives and several others are executives of private consulting firms. Similarly, it is hard to see how the input of expertise on the technical committee on housing and transportation could be complete without expert representation from the AFL-CIO building trades and transportation unions.

The technical committees also have a disproportionate number of "experts" from providers of services and few from consumer groups. This virtual ignoring of consumer experts is hard to understand since the elderly of the nation are generally consumers and not providers of services. For example, one of the technical committees of crucial importance to the elderly, the one concerned with health matters, has a majority of members who could be classified as providers of service. Similarly, in the important technical committee on housing, only one member might be considered a consumer representative but a majority fall in the provider category.

The Conference seems to be developing without adequate representation from minority groups. A disproportionate number of economic and social problems of the elderly are among aged minority groups—problems which the White House Conference must confront if it expects to make an impact. A successful conference will require a greater participation by minority groups. The leadership of the conference is now making some efforts to rectify this problem. We urge you and the Committee to use your influence to see that these efforts do not fall.

A partisan political bias seems to be entering the decision-making process of the Conference. We have been told that political clearance is required for many positions related to the conference and a number of persons have been voted, though highly qualified, for political reasons. The White House Conference should operate on a "bring us together" approach so that all elements of American society can unite in an effort to resolve the problems of our elderly population.

In view of these developments, the hearings of the Senate Special Committee on Aging are particularly timely and necessary. The AFL-CIO pledges all possible assistance to you and the Committee in any effort to secure greater funding for AOA programs and to insure a successful White House Conference on Aging.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,  
*Director, Department of Legislation.*

ITEM 4. LETTER FROM JOSEPH H. BUNZEL, PROFESSOR OF  
SOCIOLOGY, STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BUFFALO

APRIL 28, 1971.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your letter dated March 24 (but received only recently) in which you requested my views with regard to:

the effect on training programs of the proposed \$1.15 million reduction in funding for Title V projects as well as—

the effect of the recent transfer of Title V programs to the ten Social and Rehabilitation Services regions and—

the pace of the preparations for the White House Conference on the Aged.

With respect to the first two questions, I do not feel that I can contribute significantly beyond the point of expressing profound concern about the whole manner in which Congressional authorizations are proposed to be cut.

With regard to training in gerontology itself our situation here is atypical. We have succeeded in including one course in social gerontology into the regular curriculum and we have infused gerontological content into such courses as sociology of the city, social theory and especially the introductory courses; we have also assigned old age topics for studies wherever feasible. We have not at any time been funded or financially supported from any source—federal, state or local—except for an occasional lecture that members of some agencies have given upon our invitation and without remuneration; consequently, our own training will progress according to the interest of students and community personnel and without regard to the availability of federal funds.

Moreover, I was able to gather some opinions from county executives to whom it seems obvious that pushing a specialized agency into the pool of rehabilitative services entails the risk of drowning it in the variety of other legitimate concerns.

In general, I can hardly hope to improve on the well documented presentations that you and your committee have heard and the statements of the representatives of voluntary organizations and groups as well as members of your own committee who have spoken out eloquently on or outside of the Senate floor. There is little that I can add to their expressions of deep concern and especially to the strong criticism voiced.

However, with regard to the preparation for the 1971 White House Conference on the Aged, I should like to make some basic observations. The White House Conference was conceived and scheduled in order to develop a broad national policy with regard to aging and the elderly. It is not sematic quibbling if I take issue with the definition given and apparently followed by an unnamed White House staffer on page three in the February-March issue of *Aging* that policy "is a feasible plan for achieving a short range objective as opposed to long range targets or specific programs."

This, by all definitions, is not a policy and certainly cannot be called a broad national policy. A policy is much rather a basic evaluation and assessment of situational factors operating as a general plan for guiding decisions, judging the feasibility and acceptability of means toward a desired end. Policy makers decide, choose and evaluate the relevance of available knowledge for the solution of particular problems. This thousand people can not do; they are neither responsible nor accountable to an electorate for their suggestions. They study processes and engage in a problem solving activity, they clarify goals, describe trends, analyze conditions, project future developments and invent, evaluate and select alternatives to follow Lasswell's reasoning.

The attempt to prepare groups for the conference by training them in policy formation "thinking methodically about the problems of older people long before delegates to the national Conference are selected," is based on an untenable premise and strikes me as a prime example of inauthenticity.

Moreover, the pseudo-democratic selection process for the conference excluded almost automatically all serious critics of the gerontological establishment, concentrating on names and positions. The elderly individual in the United States knows full well that the administrative arm of his government is not responsive to his needs. His only hope is legislative arm for little can be expected from a timid judiciary elected by a basically apathetic middle class.

Thus, almost regardless of his financial status, he is bitter to the point of alienation. This fact shines through all letters that I have received on occasion of my interviews and can be authenticated almost daily in the complaint column of newspapers and magazines.

Because of the dearth of work, unemployment and internal tension, the large group of the young is also on the brink of alienation and because the White House Conference on Youth has been, for all appearances, a resounding failure, it is essential that the White House Conference on Aging does not suffer the same fate.

It cannot be stressed enough that we do not have to deal here with a "problem" that can be "solved" by technology and money; rather it is an attitude that needs recognition and corresponding action. The White House Conference as

presently conceived is simply an attempt to morcelize a general and prettify a grave situation. The administration for aging is caught in a web of inauthenticity not of its making and individual good will is of little avail. Aging and the elderly, however, are not problems though they may be beset with problems. Aging is a process and the elderly, like anybody else, are in flux. Processes demand insight and the way leads from research to policy, from policy to action.

The White House Conference is going to be confronted with a tremendous amount of paper and expert opinion, some of it possibly valid. It is hopefully going to give a voice to some of the elderly themselves including minorities but underneath the effort lurks an attitude that underlies every behavior, and attitude that is basically totally wrong. It is, as I have had the privilege to point out previously, (in my statement to the House Ways and Means Committee, November 1969) an involuntary attitude which I called gerontophobia and which is, I believe, coming to be increasingly recognized as a basic national trait.

Regardless of the extremely valuable work that has been done in favor of the elderly, in the forefront of which stands, as a landmark the report of your committee, the national gerontophobic attitude remains unchanged. How deeply this attitude influences behavior may be seen from the fact that a short reply to the attack in the *Reader's Digest* on me and other "expansionists" was not accepted by a number of appropriate governmental and other publications; therefore, I take the liberty of including it for the record at this time.<sup>4</sup>

Permit me to illustrate this attitude in a matter that is very urgent and very much in the limelight: the question of Medicare, Medicaid and Health Insurance. At this moment, and characteristically *before* the White House Conference, the Administration has put forward its national health insurance proposal and so has the American Medical Association, at the same time slashing benefits arbitrarily and drastically. These actions speak more poignantly than any high-sounding proposals.

These proposals are similarly designed. Tax revenues would be used to buy private health insurance for low income people. They constitute a boom for the insurance companies and their backers, the medical and allied health organizations, and spell disaster for the middle class.

But even the much more advanced bill that a distinguished member of your committee has co-sponsored and that leaves out private insurance, is not entirely without dangers. A Health Security Board, if created, will be helpless, just as Blue Cross is today against sudden economy drives, regional differentials, underfinancing of institutions and schools, the creation of medical monopolies. *Whereas the first two plans are totally unacceptable and should be rejected out of hand even this one suffers seriously from the built-in possibilities of abuse, because it is based not on feasibility but on acceptability. The difficulty, however, is that what is acceptable to even the gerontological establishment, must necessarily adopt its value premises and thus actually postpones and prevents change.*

Without uncritically accepting the national health plan set forth by Mr. Tom Brodenheimer in the March-April issue of the *Health Rights News*, or identifying with all of its policies, I should like to take the liberty of calling your attention to the supplementary features that this plan presents to Senator Kennedy's bill; especially because it constitutes a clear break with the kind of thinking that makes gerontophobia possible and almost inevitable.

It is sad to find many ostensibly committed to the gerontological enterprise who are, in fact, unwilling to face unpleasant realities. The number of persons and organizations possessed by mythical thinking with regard to aging and the elderly is just as large if not larger among gerontologists, broadly speaking, than among the general population. The only social theory so far brought forth is blatantly gerontophobic; the theory of disengagement is being justifiably criticized but for the wrong reasons. In fact, its mythical content is continuously quoted and transmitted as sheer revelation.

Gerontophobia seems to be the only possible reason why, for instance, outstanding gerontologists who have written and edited numerous papers and books on a variety of subjects in the field, are not only reluctant out outright hostile to accept the only age-specific social theory which offers a relatively simple hypothesis to cover a complex body of facts. Gerontophobia provides the

<sup>4</sup> Retained in committee files.

only possible explanation for a whole symposium on *action for aging* being dropped unceremoniously from the program of a learned society.

It is particularly difficult to understand why in the maze of existing programs the only integrating agency would be downgraded and rendered impotent when, in fact, the only hope for societal change would lie in a strongly coordinated and coordinating national agency which could effectively combat the national malaise with which we are concerned.

Each of the many numerous organizations, agencies and groups serves a particular vested interest; most obviously, the insurance companies have found their way to national organizations whose efforts are oriented toward the "up-beat." Individual ambitions join with group goals of material and non-material vested interests professing overtly rendering service but expressing covert attitudes and latent neurotic processes.

The elderly as a group are still the most exploited, most abused, most helpless minority-of-status, in our youth health and work-oriented society. Your committee is almost the only resource to which they may turn for exposing frauds and abuse directed at them. The recent investigation of Representative Edith Green into the nation's poverty money shows clearly how congressional intent can be perverted into private gains. But even, the advice which well-intentioned helpers receive—the earnings test comes to mind—shows the vested interests of powerful and politically potent groups disregarding cavalierly *only* one and one-half million possible beneficiaries; that test should be abolished or, as I have suggested its limits should be raised to \$25,000.

The real test to be applied ought to be the percentage of retirement income to work-income which should not fall below 65 percent.

I just received the *Second Reader* of the White House Conference on Aging—even in outward appearance a grim fairy tale indeed.

Thus, it might be respectfully suggested that the sources and uses of funds of organizations established to serve the elderly be reviewed for possible legislative action.

Truly, it is one thing to be reality-conscious and to attempt adjusting the individual and his life to society and it is quite another to serve preconceived, almost prenatal ideas in order to resist changing those institutions which supposedly serve the welfare of that same individual.

Because "old age is not the necessary conclusion to human existence . . . Once one has understood what the condition of old people is, one cannot be content to demand more generous 'politics of old age,' higher pensions, decent housing, and organized leisure activities. It is the whole system which is at stake, and the demand can only be radical: to change life." (Simone de Beauvoir: "On Aging," *Ramparts*, September, 1970), This we can do solely by insight into our motives and attitudes with which to shape our policies to guide our actions. Thank you for your courtesy and consideration.

Faithfully yours,

JOSEPH H. BUNZEL,  
*Professor of Sociology.*

ITEM 5. LETTER FROM JEAN WALLACE CAREY, STAFF ASSOCIATE FOR AGING, COMMUNITY SERVICE SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK, N.Y.

APRIL 14, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: We are pleased to file a statement on issues related to the Administration on Aging in accordance with your mid-March request.

The Community Service Society of New York is a voluntary nonsectarian agency dedicated since 1848 to the strengthening of family life and the betterment of community life. The Committee on Aging within the Department of Public Affairs is a citizens' committee concerned particularly about the well-being of the elderly.

Beginning in 1966 and annually thereafter, we have voiced our conviction about the importance of a broadened legislative base for expanding both services and opportunities for older men and women throughout the nation. We reiterate that conviction today. We are on record in support of the Older Americans Act and amendments to strengthen it. Most particularly we urged and applauded the enactment of a new Title VI denominated the National Older Americans Volunteer Program, and especially the inclusion of a Retired Senior Volunteer Program in Part A of that Title.

Our relations with the Administration on Aging have been close and cordial. We have benefited from the expert consultation generously tendered by staff in the launching and on-going operation of SERVE—a highly successful three-year demonstration-research project on Staten Island made possible by a Title IV grant supplemented by local monies. We have been pleased to see the SERVE concept validated and extended throughout New York State under a Title III grant from the New York State Office for the Aging beginning October 1, 1969 for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of new community service volunteer programs by the elderly throughout the State. And we are gratified that the SERVE experience has been studied with care by a management firm retained to draw up guidelines for the RSVP program.

We view with dismay the downgrading of the Administration on Aging, the gradual transferral of its major functions and the announced proposal to move a variety of programs to a separate umbrella agency for all federal voluntary action programs denominated ACTION.

The declining fortunes and gradual dismantlement of AoA are crystal-clear from the most cursory examination of the background information compiled by your own Committee and distributed March 24, 1971. Dismaying indeed is the comparison for the Older Americans Act of the appropriation for fiscal 1971, the allocation by the Office of Management and Budget for fiscal 1972, and the Congressional authorization for fiscal 1972.

Against an overall appropriation of \$32 million for fiscal 1971, the recommended allocation is \$29.5 million for fiscal 1972, the latter being a sum far below the Congressional authorization of \$105 million. Reduced in fiscal 1972 are allocations for Title III community grants and areawide model programs (\$9.35 million as against a current \$11.2 million), Title IV research and development grants (\$1.8 million vs. \$2.8 million), Title V training grants (\$1.85 million down from \$3 million), and Title VI Part B grants for the foster grandparent program (\$7.5 million reduced from \$10.5 million). There is a hold-the-line allocation of \$4 million in state agency grants. Increased is the allocation of \$5 million for RSVP under Part A of Title VI from a token \$500,000 for pilot programs, but this program is not yet underway nationally and reportedly is to be shifted to ACTION along with Vista, the Peace Corps, Foster Grandparents and other programs.

Cuts in federal funding for the Older Americans Act seem inconsistent with the announced goal of the White House Conference on Aging. Moreover, the talked-about shift of RSVP and its mix with other programs in the ACTION mechanism give rise to fears that RSVP may never come into being and, if it does, will lose its identity and visibility.

Out of our own first-hand knowledge and appraisal of the current situation, we conclude that there is continued need for a strong federal program for the aging as envisaged in the Older Americans Act. Today's situation is grave for 20 million older Americans who need a courageous advocate within the Administration. Needed too, is a strong voice and pressure from the Congress in legislative enactments and continued efforts to give substance to clear Congressional intentions to attempt to meet the basic human needs of older men and women. Here the record evidences the concern of the Senate Special Committee and the Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

We appreciate the invitation to file testimony for inclusion in the hearing record. Be assured of our continuing concern and our own efforts to better the situation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) JEAN WALLACE CAREY,  
*Staff Associate for Aging.*

ITEM 6. LETTER FROM DEAN WILBUR J. COHEN, CO-CHAIRMAN, INSTITUTE OF GERONTOLOGY, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN AND WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.

MARCH 22, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: This is in response to your letter of March 12 inviting me to express my views in connection with the hearings you will be holding on March 25 related to the Administration on Aging and the forthcoming White House Conference on Aging.

My personal views on several current matters relating to Aging are as Follows:

1. *Appropriations to the AOA.* I am deeply disappointed at the failure of the Executive Branch to recommend more adequate funding of the Older Americans Act. I believe it is important that total appropriations for 1971-72 be at least \$52.5 million—one-half of the authorization.

2. *Extension of the OAA.* The Older Americans Act should be extended for 5 years with appropriate amendments. The extension legislation should provide for the establishment of an advisory Council to be appointed in 1973 to evaluate the Act and its administration and to recommend any changes.

3. *The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.* Additional appropriations should be made to the NICHD for research in Aging. An addition \$15 million should be provided for 1971-72.

4. *Social Security.* An additional increase in social security should be effective January 1, 1972. This increase should be at least 25 percent consisting of an across-the-board increase of 10 percent, an increase in the minimum monthly benefit equivalent to a 5 percent increase across the board, and an increase in various provisions totalling 10 percent (such as an increase in widows benefits, the retirement test, and the method of calculating average earnings for benefit purposes).

5. *Medicare.* Medicare should be improved by (a) including the disabled and (b) covering prescription drugs which are necessary for older persons. The age for eligibility for Medicare should be lowered to 60, effective July 1, 1973. Parts A and B of Medicare should be combined so that aged retired persons would not be required to pay monthly premiums after age 65.

6. *Old Age Assistance.* The existing Federal payments to the States for the aged, blind and disabled should be repealed and instead a direct Federal payment be made initially of \$160 a month to a single individual and \$240 for a couple. This payment should be administered by the Social Security Administration. States which currently provide higher amounts should be required to supplement up to their existing levels. This payment should be increased in future years and should be an amount sufficient to eliminate poverty among the aged, blind and disabled.

7. *Location of AOA.* I believe the Administration on Aging should be taken out of the Social and Rehabilitation Service. There are three alternative locations which should be explored: (a) transferring the AOA to the Social Security Administration and making the Commissioner of Social Security the Commissioner of Social Security and Aging; (b) transferring the AOA to the Secretary's Office and placing it under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services; and (c) transferring it to the Secretary's office and placing it under the supervision of the Under Secretary.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,

Dean, Co-Chairman, Institute of Gerontology, The University of Michigan  
and Wayne State University.

ITEM 7. LETTER FROM CARL EISDORFER, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHIATRY, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF AGING AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, DUKE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER, DURHAM, N.C.

APRIL 9, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your letter of 12 March 1971, soliciting a statement on the current status of the Administration on Aging and the forthcoming White House Conference on Aging

Let me indicate that it is almost with a feeling of hopelessness that I respond to this letter. All of the predictions made by many of us over the past years concerning the deteriorating situation vis a vis the Federal government's posture toward the aging, have apparently come to fruition. Simply put, it was anticipated that in times of relative deprivation, the aged, because of their secondary role in our society, would suffer more despite their obviously greater need than would other groups. To save your first point for last, let me indicate what I am sure many people have already indicated. There is no one even vaguely interested in the progress of the White House Conference on Aging who has not been concerned about the obvious foot dragging and the slow pace at which that confer-



ence is moving. It is woefully short of funds and there is every indication that it has been already relegated to a non-status. The organizational changes effecting the AOA are part of the same situation in that that organization has been progressively stripped of its autonomy and it has become more and more subordinated to the point where it has virtually lost its capacity to initiate innovative research and training ventures in aging.

As an example of this subordination, the Training and Research and Development Divisions have both been taken out of the AOA and subordinated to the S.R.S. Division of HEW. The budgets, in a time when the needs and interests in new programs in aging is growing at a rapid rate have been deeply cut. Please note that in fiscal 1967, the Research and Development Program of AOA was 4.155 million dollars, the proposal for fiscal 1972 is 1.8 million. A similar cut was proposed for training. The facts speak more eloquently than rhetoric.

The question of whether Congress should extend the Older American Act in 1972, or seek an alternative has been taken up in many circles. There appears to be little disagreement on the need for a federal agency or agencies at a high enough level to get the job done. In the present situation, the AOA has been, in the main, re-organized and subverted. The possibility that a new higher level structure would be more effective is an entertaining possibility and should certainly be explored. This could be the case, particularly if it could include the bio-medical and behavioral research which has also been badly hurt by the current budget proposals.

In essence, what is being seen is a rather broad policy of downgrading the priority of the AOA and of programs relating to the needs of the elderly. The strongest Congressional support and enlightened public awareness of this policy are needed to alter this trend.

Sincerely,

CARL EISDORFER, Ph.D., M.D.,  
*Professor of Psychiatry, Director.*

---

ITEM 8. LETTER FROM H. J. FRIEDSAM, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR  
STUDIES IN AGING, NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your letter of March 22 inviting me to submit a statement on the proposed cutback in funding for training under Title V of the Older Americans Act, particularly as it may affect our program. I shall comment briefly on each of the questions raised in your letter.

The training program in aging at North Texas State University is now nearing the end of its third year. Currently thirty-four students are enrolled, all of whom are graduate students working towards Master's degrees. The largest single group of students is engaged in a program for administration of retirement facilities, but many are studying in related fields such as public administration, speech pathology, and library service.

At the end of the current semester some thirty students will have completed the program. Our graduates are employed in a variety of responsible positions in the field of aging, ranging from administrators of retirement facilities to consultants to national organizations. Most of those who will graduate this spring have already accepted similar positions.

It is not possible to state precisely what impact the proposed cutback will have on our program until the Administration on Aging and the Social and Rehabilitation Service determine the policies to be followed in adjusting to the reduced level of funding under Title V. However, if one assumes that the cutback will be "across the board" for existing programs, it is certain that our program would suffer severely. It would undoubtedly be necessary to reduce the number of student stipends available, and therefore the number of students in training. In consequence we would be operating our program below capacity.

In this connection let me point out that a training program cannot reduce its faculty and other fixed costs in proportion to a reduction in student enrollment. The courses essential to the program still have to be taught, and fewer students would only mean smaller classes. Obviously this will result in a higher cost per student, which is not only undesirable but also unnecessary since by definition we have the faculty and facilities to continue our program at its present level.

A cutback in funds would require that we abandon plans and hopes for expansion of our long-term training program. With additional funds we could sup-

port more students in the fields in which we presently offer training and could expand the program to include other professional fields in which there are serious shortages of trained personnel to work with the elderly.

A cutback would also require that we abandon plans to develop short-term training programs. When we originally established our program, it was our intention to move from the base provided by long-term training into a variety of types of short-term training. Unfortunately, even at present budgetary levels funds have not been available to permit us to take this step.

The need is there. We constantly receive inquiries about summer programs, special institutes, workshops, etc. from both individuals and organizations. We are unable to respond affirmatively to these requests, and so far as I am aware, there is no educational institution in our region which conducts short-term training in aging on a regular, systematic basis. In my opinion additional funds should be made available to the Administration on Aging to encourage such training. I believe that an amount approximating 15 to 20 per cent of the current AoA training budget could be effectively utilized for this purpose.

Since I am convinced that the present level of funding under Title V (\$3,000,000) is insufficient to meet the critical shortage of trained personnel in the field of aging, it follows that I consider the requested level (\$1,850,000) totally inadequate. The increasing number of older persons and particularly the even more rapidly increasing number of very old persons, who often require a wide range of services, must result in new and expanded service programs to meet their needs and, therefore, in greater demands for personnel in the field of aging.

If these programs are to utilize trained personnel, what is required is a significant expansion in training funds under Title V rather than a cutback. I am not in a position to estimate what the exact level of funding should be, but an increase of \$1.15 million rather than a reduction by that amount for 1971-72 seems to me to be entirely in order.

Sincerely yours,

H. J. FRIEDSAM,  
*Director, Center for Studies in Aging.*

---

ITEM 9. LETTER FROM EONE HARGER, ANNANDALE, N.J.

ANNANDALE, N.J., *April 18, 1971.*

DEAR SENATE CHURCH: I am pleased to be asked to add my personal observations to your Committee's evaluation of the Administration on Aging as it has been developed since its establishment by the Older Americans Act of 1965. I was among those who worked long and hard for passage of the Act and contributed to the thinking that went into the provisions of the legislation. I was also among the first state administrators to utilize the funding mechanisms of the legislation to strengthen and expand state action in the field of aging.

Against that background, my present opinion is that the implementation of the Older Americans Act by H.E.W. has been a distortion of the intent of the law and has, by interpreting its purposes as those of "service" within a welfare context, aggravated rather than alleviated or prevented the problems it was designed to handle.

The general purpose of the Older Americans Act as set forth in Title I emphasizes equal opportunity for older people and underlines the value and dignity of the individual. "Services for" are referred to only twice and within the context of having them available when *needed*. Title II lists eight specific functions of the Administration on Aging through which the agency is to work toward long range and idealistic goals enumerated in Title I. Here again "services" are mentioned minimally and only in relation to "stimulation of the more effective use of available services for the aged and aging." Use of "aging," as opposed to "aged", should also be noted. I mention these points because of apparent administrative confusion that equates the Administration on Aging with "services to the elderly."

Actually the Older Americans Act of 1965, in the form it finally passed, was not all that either its sponsors or its supporters had in mind. Its final form was the compromise that was possible against the opposition of the Department of H.E.W., especially Wilbur Cohen, then Under-Secretary. The major compromise was in the placement of the agency within H.E.W. instead of within the Presi-

dent's office where it would serve as a tool for watching and improving the operation of all Departments in the matter of aging.

The principal arguments put forth for establishing a special office on aging were:

- To provide a base for calling attention to the dramatic extension of life expectancy combined with the decreased demand for labor because of technological change, with the resulting retirement of growing numbers from the active work force, and
- To coordinate (not take over) existing fragmented programs that related to aging and encourage agencies to include older people in their planning and relate programs of other groups, and
- To initiate both research and demonstrations of new techniques that might prevent or alleviate problems.

Many believed that placement of the office within the direct responsibility of the President was necessary to give visibility and clout to the Office on Aging. Reasons for *not* putting the office in an existing government department, especially H.E.W., included:

- The Office on Aging was not intended to carry the same operating responsibility as other divisions within H.E.W.;
- The need was not for a new bureaucracy but for a special organization with an advocacy perspective to centralize and interpret data and other information;
- The situation re aging was not that of a de-limited group, but something that will affect everyone who lives long enough, having implications for younger generations in terms of both responsibilities and personal prospects;
- Coordination cannot be achieved by one Department for other departments. The management of competing, vertical monoliths within government is the responsibility of the President's office and an Office on Aging would be a tool for inter-departmental management;
- There was need for the Federal government to set a pattern that would provide leadership to State organizational arrangements.

Opposition to the concept came from sources that apparently viewed aging from a too narrow perspective—some social workers whose professional viewpoint was that of “services to”; management specialists who also equated this with “service to”; and bureaucrats who saw it as a threat to some empire building. The proponents of an office on aging apart from existing departments lost because placement within a department was “the only politically achievable arrangement”. Regrettably, the record since the passage of the Older Americans Act in its present form has proven that the worst fears were justified, as demonstrated by:

- The Administration on Aging has been repeatedly “reorganized” with downgrading each time so that now it is lodged within the Social Services component of H.E.W.—a complete failure to understand “aging” as a broad social problem, let alone recognize the role assigned to AOA by Congress.
- The States have taken their cue from the Federal example and in state after state uninformed “systems” men are destroying the concept by subsuming the Offices on Aging into Departments of Community Affairs, Human Resources, or similar operating conglomerates.
- The rivalry between Federal agencies for programs has been aggravated by trying to make the Administration on Aging an operating program and putting it into direct competition—instead of the AOA spinning off successful demonstrations into appropriate places for continuing support.

The most recent reorganization within HEW has stripped the Administration on Aging of almost everything that it was intended to do. With removal of Titles IV and V to Social and Rehabilitation Services and areawide projects to Regional Offices, both the Administration on Aging and the State Offices on Aging have been downgraded. This is particularly distressing since last year's amendments to the Older Americans Act were specifically directed to strengthening State units by allotting them administrative funds for Statewide planning, evaluation and coordination.

Even the recent amendments to the Older Americans Act providing for areawide projects have been misinterpreted and distorted from the original intent, if reports I have had are valid. In discussions prior to submitting the recommendations which resulted in the “areawide projects” amendment, the indicated intent was to provide a mechanism for experimenting across jurisdictional lines to solve “regional problems”. I am told that the implementation has been narrowly lim-

ited to "information and referral projects that also operate services for the elderly." This is clearly a step backward to the old welfare concepts which the Older Americans Act was designed to abolish and/or replace.

Both the budget cuts for the Administration on Aging, as well as budget cuts of other programs related to older people, are basically a reflection of age related values. The immediate effect will be to waste money already expended to begin programs under Title III by prematurely terminating projects that hold promise of having lasting value. In New Jersey, it has been indicated that all food and educational projects under Title III will have to go, regardless of whether they have been in operation for three years. Among the projects affected is one at a State college which has a Title III for education for Aging in its Adult Education Resource Center. This is a Statewide project and is carrying out in the highest degree the original intent of the Older Americans Act. The announced reduced financing to State offices under the proposed Federal budget will cancel it at the end of its first year.

The cuts of Title III funds seem to bear a close relationship to the reorganization of the Administration on Aging inasmuch as the amount removed from Title III equals the amount allocated for "areawide projects". Additionally disturbing is the administrative decision to assign responsibility for these funds to the Regional Offices of H.E.W., by-passing both the Administration on Aging and the State Offices. It is possible that the word "regional" has been misinterpreted in the implementation process. Regardless of the reason, this further fragments programs and an administration of funds for aging, the very things that the Older Americans Act was established to overcome.

The numbers game, as exemplified by PPBS, is undoubtedly a factor contributing to the budget decisions that have been made. Incorrect application of value judgments by numbers *only* has undoubtedly done a major disservice in this case. It is regrettable that what was the fore-runner of a new kind of administrative practice should be near complete collapse without it having been used as intended to help prevent the development of social problems. It is especially sad, since organizational approaches that support the original AOA concept are now being reported at increasingly frequent intervals, such as:

- The about-face of the Community Service Society of New York from its traditional family and individual approach to deal with "the complex of social ills that bears on the individual". (New York Times, January 31, 1971.)
- The latest Pentagon reorganization which will follow the principal of separating operations from policy making.
- The impending inclusion of "social audits" even in the evaluation of the business community.

The same lack of understanding that has characterized the treatment of the Administration on Aging appears to characterize most of what has been done in preparation for the White House Conference on Aging. One would expect an evaluation of what had taken place since the previous White House Conference on Aging as a base from which to move. So far as I can determine, none has bothered to compare what has happened since 1961 with what was recommended. The written material for the 1970 Conference that I have seen seems to reflect a national regression in attitudes toward older people and calls for choices between serving older people and serving children. (See workbook for the Education section as an example.) What has been generated so far seems to be recitals of their woes by organized older people, instead of community resolve to grasp new opportunity which the phenomenon of modern aging represents. There does not seem to be a national policy emerging against which each individual decision can be tested.

The almost total failure of the present Administration on Aging leads one to wonder whether it would not be better to allow AOA to fade away with the expiration of the Older Americans Act in 1972. Either it must be raised immediately to its intended stature and given new leadership or it should be replaced by something that can accomplish the original intent. I am not at all sure that having what exists now is better than nothing at all. The present organization may actually be doing more harm than good.

Sincerely yours,

EONE HARGER.

[Enclosures].

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS,  
*Trenton, N.J., April 1, 1971.*

HON. ROBERT K. HAELIG, JR.,  
*Assemblyman, District 7A,  
Middlesex, N.J.*

DEAR BOB: It was with deep interest that I read Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2028, concerning the Division on Aging in the Department of Community Affairs.

Please be assured that not only I, as Commissioner of this Department, but my entire staff are most concerned with the senior citizens of this State. These senior citizens of New Jersey justly require our strongest efforts to improve and enhance the quality of their lives. It is for this very reason that the functions of the Division on Aging *have been integrated* into the Division of Human Resources within our Department. By associating this program with the Division of Human Resources, without either a reduction in salary levels or staff, we are integrating the interests of our senior citizens throughout the Department and, as a result, we will strengthen the interest on problems of the aged.

I am most cognizant of the concerns of our older citizens who fear that their best interests might be jeopardized without a separate Division. However, I am deeply concerned with serving those interests in the most effective possible way and I am convinced that implementing the recommendations of the Governor's Management Study Commission improves our ability to do that.

The report advocates that the elderly, as one of our State's great human resources, should not be considered apart from the rest of the population. Their voices should be heard in shaping every program affecting their lives. The elderly should have representation in all areas of the Department of Community Affairs—in housing, in program development, in recreation, in employment, in community services and, in fact, in any areas which contributes to the well-being of the elderly and equally in any area in which the elderly can make a contribution. This kind of wide representation cannot work effectively if we retain an isolated, self-contained Division. It is, therefore, our belief and the belief of the Governor's Management Study Commission that Aging should be one of the eleven sections of the Division of Human Resources and be equally represented within the Division of Housing as well. In this manner, it retains its identity and gains the flexibility to best carry out its legislative mandate to develop information, referral services and programs for senior citizens and to integrate their total needs into the over-all plans of the State.

I should like to note, at this point, that we do not in any way sacrifice our claims to Federal funds under Title III and Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965. The Governor has the power to designate the Division of Human Resources of the Department of Community Affairs as the official agency serving the aged, thus retaining our funding eligibility.

At this time, I should also like to refute any and all reports that services for our older citizens would be shifted to the Division of Public Welfare. This is untrue and would be greatly inappropriate. I should also note that the Department will continue to fund and assist the existing fourteen County Offices on Aging, which serve as an extension of the State's efforts in behalf of its senior citizens. The prospects are excellent that all twenty-one Counties will have such an office by the end of 1971. As a result, both in the Department and in the offices, our thrust would be to bring information, services, and assistance programs closer to the elderly.

Under the Department of Community Affairs' new plan, the interests of older New Jerseyans should permeate every pertinent area of this Department and, indeed, every other agency of State Government. This parallels our philosophy that the elderly should be integrated in every area of community life and not put aside with no link to the young. A typical example of this philosophy in practice is the Department's "Foster Grandparents' Program," which has demonstrated how vital that link can be to both generations, whereby elderly people care for handicapped children in a close mutually sustaining relationship.

The same philosophy has been used in disseminating news about the Department of Community Affairs to its wide and varied publics. "Community," the Department's free monthly newsletter, was designed from its inception as a comprehensive information vehicle that contains news and feature articles about the programs and policies of the Department. In this way, it has reflected the inter-

relationship and interdependency among our many housing, human resource, local government and planning endeavors—without isolating any one segment. Yet, the periodical has on many occasions focused on particular areas of concern, such as housing, youth employment, and others. In fact, the May issue of "Community" will be devoted entirely to the efforts underway in New Jersey to meet the growing needs of our older residents, in keeping with the designation of May as "Senior Citizen Month" by the Governor. This is the kind of coverage that can best serve the total information needs of all of our constituents.

In summation, the integration of functions for the elderly within the Department of Community Affairs fulfills our legislative mandate, continues to entitle us to Federal funds for senior citizens, and strengthens the impact of the older generation in all areas of government. I strongly believe that the cross-fertilization of ideas produced by this new relationship can only help revitalize our program for both young and old in the communities of our State.

Sincerely,

EDMUND T. HUME.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS,  
*Trenton, N.J., April 2, 1971.*

HON. ELMER SMITH,  
*Commissioner of Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Region II, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, N.Y.*

DEAR COMMISSIONER SMITH: In view of the recent newspaper articles concerning our Division on Aging, I thought it best to clarify the situation vis a vis our reorganization plans and objectives.

Early in his Administration, Governor Cahill enlisted the aid of prominent New Jersey businessmen to conduct a thorough study of State Government. This study, much like the study performed at the federal level for President Nixon, recommended organizational changes in most State departments, including our own. The fundamental change here restructures the Department from an unwieldy eight divisions to four. Some of these units which held division status had fewer people and narrower responsibilities than most of our bureaus. Their status as divisions contributed to isolationism which is inconsistent with today's broader and more comprehensive programmatic needs.

This restructuring places most of the functions presently being performed on behalf of the aging, youth, etc. into a Division of Human Resources. None of these functions will be lost. As a matter of fact, this amalgamation will upgrade the level of services, increase coordination among programs of like purpose, better utilize existing resources, and broaden exposure to new and/or expanding programs such as housing, health services, nutrition, etc. It should be pointed out that other divisions of the Department have and will continue to provide substantial services to the aging through our Model Cities Program and Housing Finance Agency.

At the Governor's direction and with the concurrence of the Legislature, we propose that services to the aging will best be served through a specially designated unit—Program Development, Aging. The unit would be under the direct supervision of the Director, Division of Human Resources, and would have the ability to call on resources, personnel and fiscal, heretofore unavailable to the Division on Aging. The unit's input can, from its new organizational position, broaden its impact on a much wider range of programs at both the state and local levels.

This Administration has already demonstrated its commitment to the aging through the passage of A-439, a law that greatly expands the state's financial contribution to county offices on aging. . . . this commitment will continue and expand.

Most of the arguments aired in recent weeks reflect a narrow and overly-bureaucratic approach contrary to sound and effective administration. The arguments have centered around the retention of an organizational title and, in a sense, stress the maintenance of the status quo. It is not our intention to remain dead center, but rather to move forward with both a new organization and new ideas.

The States, as well as the Federal Government, are finding it increasingly difficult to operate under a structure that was imposed in by-gone decades. Daily we hear the cry of the citizen-taxpayer for more and better services. However,

in order to accommodate this demand, in the face of shrinking and widely deployed resources, modern, effective and practical administrative techniques must be employed.

Again, may I assure you that none of the viability or existing functions of the Division on Aging will be lost. Personnel will be retained, and through the Civil Service system many who had reached a dead end can be upgraded. Functions and programs for the aging will benefit greatly from the leverage and facilities available in the Division of Human Resources.

Sincerely,

EDMUND T. HUME.

ITEM 10. LETTER FROM MARGARET A. HOSSACK, SENIOR CITIZEN PROGRAM COORDINATOR, SECRETARY, MAYOR'S SENIOR CITIZEN COUNCIL, DETROIT, MICH.

CITY OF DETROIT,  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION,  
*Detroit, Mich., April 2, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: The proposed cutbacks in Administration on Aging funding by \$2.5 million from fiscal 1971 appropriations appears to be a deliberate attempt to virtually eliminate the Administration on Aging and the State Offices on Aging.

Authorized funding for the Older American's Act for fiscal year 1972 of \$105 million has been reduced by 28 percent in the Administration's budget which only requests \$29.5 million, further weakening the Administration on Aging.

This move can only reflect that the many needs of our Older Americans have a very low priority.

These cutbacks in AoA funding will affect every community in America that has a concern for its older citizens. State Agencies will exist in name only. Services to the elderly will be slashed and Senior Centers will be closed. No new programs will be funded and the gaps in service will widen.

The crisis in the cities will be heightened as the needs of the elderly are compounded by spiralling costs, inadequate transportation systems, lack of employment opportunities, and a shortage of low cost housing.

The increasing demands for services and programs by the elderly, the need for adequately trained personnel and for research programs in aging, cannot be met with the current funding proposed.

We strongly urge that members of Congress act favorably to restore to full authorization the funds for the Older American's Act when the Labor-H.E.W. appropriations bill is considered.

We further urge the restoration of the organizational structure, position and function of the Administration on Aging as was intended by Congress when the Older American's Act became law.

Any alternative will serve to nullify the successful achievements to date and will reinforce in the minds of millions of Older Americans and their families that no one really cares.

Sincerely,

MARGARET A. HOSSACK,  
*Senior Citizen Program Coordinator, Secretary, Mayor's Senior Citizen Council.*

ITEM 11. LETTER FROM WALTER C. LAMPE, PRESIDENT, WALTER C. LAMPE AND ASSOCIATES, INC., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

WALTER C. LAMPE AND ASSOCIATES, INC.,  
*San Francisco, Calif., April 12, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: We have been reading the Senate Committee in Aging reports with great interest and note particularly that you wish to expedite the delivery of service to the aged. We have two specific examples in which action by HUD would provide housing for almost 400 elderly persons and families and would simultaneously permit us to provide a range of additional services such as food services, health services, and social services operated under a companion program which is now active. We refer to two proposed housing

projects in Western Addition Urban Renewal Area of San Francisco. These are both proposed under the 236 Elderly financing program. One site is vacant at the present time and the other site will be ready as soon as construction can be scheduled. The proposed projects are Royal Adah Arms, FHA Case #121-44192 NPR and El Bethel Arms, FHA Case #121-44195 NPR. The action required is an allocation of Section 236 subsidy funds and a concomitant issuance of a Feasibility Letter by FHA. These are non-profit projects which have been approved by the City and the Redevelopment Agency. We are now proceeding with our final construction drawing and we believe that this is an example in which HUD has not kept pace with the efforts of the private sector to carry out the objectives of housing and related services to low income, elderly persons and families. The writer would be happy to furnish you with additional information if you wish and solicits your interest and intercession.

Very truly yours,

WALTER LAMPE,  
*President.*

ITEM 12. LETTER FROM O. J. LONG, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
COLONIAL CLUB OF SUN PRAIRIE, WIS.

COLONIAL CLUB, INC.,  
*Sun Prairie, Wis., April 2, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I am O. J. Long, a little guy and a member of one small center for the elderly in one small town in the middle west, Sun Prairie, Wisconsin.

However, I am one of those isolated and often forgotten older Americans that the Congress had in mind when it established and funded the Older Americans Act. So, maybe, my brief testimony will be somewhat useful to the Committee.

In Wisconsin we hear a lot about the "Wausau Story;" I'd like to tell you about the "Sun Prairie Story."

A group of older citizens got together to discuss our problem. We decided we needed services and a place to go. We looked around for resources. We discovered the Older Americans Act and applied for a grant.

Fortunately, such a program existed and we were eligible, as a community, for assistance. We were delighted to read in the Act provisions for a three year period in which to develop the strength needed for a long and useful service. We recognized the wisdom of the declining ratio of federal to local funding sources.

We're a proud and independent bunch. We're proud of our achievements and of our success in making our nation productive and wealthy. We're independent because (most of us) we have social security benefits. But we also have unmet needs.

We recognize that our number one need is for an adequate income; however, we also realize that we need to remain active and in touch with other people our own age and even those who are younger.

As a group, the senior citizens of Sun Prairie began meeting to discuss what we could do about *our* problems.

Well, we planned a program, found a couple of rooms in a basement of the museum, cleaned them up and opened our doors.

And the elderly people came. We re-established contact after years of separation and loneliness. That's what a Title III grant did for some old folks in rural Wisconsin.

But it did more than that.

Before a year of activity and services had passed, we had proved to the community the merit of our program and the high degree of involvement of our fellow citizens.

With that early success, we found that we were able to release local funds. One local company, The Wisconsin Cheeseman of Sun Prairie, offered to build and give to the senior citizens a center second to none: a gift valued at \$200,000. The Cheeseman also assigned some staff members to assist the Colonial Club in its operations.

Other businesses and the city joined in raising the money needed to continue a well balanced program for the oldsters. A little Older Americans Act grant—less than \$15,000—has released local resources many times the amount of the grant.

That's what you intended, was it not?



I have praised here a worthy program, Title III. Unfortunately, the Sun Prairie story is not as bright as it could have been.

We requested a second year grant, to help us continue to build what we had begun, but we were turned down and told there was simply not enough money in the Older Americans Act to fund our project for a second year. All we received was what was unspent during our first year of operations.

This decision, based on a lack of funds, caused us to come close to the brink of closing our center; we simply had not had enough time to develop the financial strength to retain our staff and continue our program. Our good start almost became our unfortunate finish. Had not the Wisconsin Cheeseman and some other local friends come to the rescue, we would have closed our doors.

The Older Americans Act was developed to provide time for organizations such as ours to get a good start, but the level of funding violates that sound principle. Small communities such as ours need to start slowly and soundly to develop a lasting program. Other communities need the encouragement of a grant and the promise of sufficient time to develop strong roots.

It seems strange to me, an old man 82 summers old, that in a day when we have money for just about everything from guns to foreign aid, there is not enough money to provide for our older people the services which keep us alive and useful.

I respectfully request the Senate Committee to urge the President and the Congress to fund this worthy program at a level adequate to meet the real needs of older citizens. It's not good business to start a good thing and then fail to provide for its growth.

I believe there are many communities like Sun Prairie and many companies like the Wisconsin Cheeseman eager to assist us older Americans, but we need a start. The tax moneys you allocate are the fruit of our labor through many years. We have earned a right to a share in the bounty. We need the support of federal funds to do a job that must be done. I know, as do you, that loneliness among the elderly is as deadly as cancer; at least as much money should be invested in making our later years worth living.

Please help us. The Sun Prairie story is a story of cooperation and commitment, a story that can be written in communities all over America for the benefit of older folks. You have the power to accomplish this. Please do.

Very truly yours,

O. J. LONG,

*Executive Committee of the Colonial Club of Sun Prairie, Wis.*

ITEM 13. LETTERS FROM TONY E. McNEVIN, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM IN GERONTOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND, KINGSTON, R.I.

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND,  
*Kingston, R.I., March 18, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I sincerely congratulate you on your appointment to the Senate Special Committee on Aging. I know that you have long had an active interest in the problems associated with aging and that you will work effectively toward eliminating those obstacles to life satisfaction currently encountered by this and future generations of elderly individuals.

As you know, the program in Gerontology which is centered at the University of Rhode Island and coordinated through the New England Center for Continuing Education has a New England regional mandate for education in Social Gerontology. This function has been served through cooperation with other New England universities and state divisions on aging, sponsorship of training programs for those dealing with problems of the aged, development of new programs, gerontological research, and university courses in gerontology. During the past year, the program has been very involved in contributing to recommendations to the 1971 White House Conference on Aging.

I am currently very concerned about proposed cutbacks in funding for the fiscal year 1972. Such a cutback would have serious effects upon a wide range of programs for the elderly. Thus, at a time when we could conceivably reap great benefit by continuing work already in process, we stand to lose much of what we have already gained. It is essential that much more intensive research and social experimentation be immediately implemented toward assuring a higher quality of life for future generations of older individuals. It is equally as important to initiate and maintain more imaginative and effective programs

for dealing with both personal and structural problems of those currently encountering those problems associated with growing older in our society.

I am even more concerned about the lack of coherent National Policy on Aging for the United States. To date, there has been relatively little direction given either research or programming for the aged. There has been almost no emphasis upon future planning for the elderly, and many programs have consisted of stop-gap measures designed to temporarily alleviate difficulties in certain problem-specific areas. Since we can isolate many such problem areas there is an abundance of problem-specific programs. Evaluation of these programs has not been sufficient making it impossible for us to adequately gauge their effectiveness. It would seem, however, that this stop-gap approach is both an uneconomical and less effective means of dealing with the problems of the aged than would be a standardized program rooted within general governmental policy. In short, I feel that there are many inherent dangers in attempting to meet the needs without the unifying effects of policy.

Hopefully, the White House Conference will provide opportunities for a thorough evaluation of past actions and impetus for instituting more far-reaching recommendations. We look forward to a continuing relationship with the Special Committee on Aging. You may be sure of this Program's cooperation in accomplishing your objectives.

Sincerely,

TONY E. MCNEVIN,  
*Director.*

APRIL 12, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I would like to express my sincere appreciation for this opportunity to comment upon problems of the elderly and planning for the White House Conference on Aging. As director of the New England Regional Program in Gerontology which is centered at the University of Rhode Island, I am very concerned with both of these topics.

Any discussion of problems confronting any segment of the national population must include not only the nature of these problems and direct, problem-related treatment, but the social etiology of such problems. In discussing problems of the aged we must, at the outset emphasize that these problems do not differ significantly in kind from problems experienced within the general population, but differ, primarily, in intensity and in the coping capabilities of the older population. Our older population is often represented as furnishing a set of "unique" social problems amenable only to unique conceptualization and action. In fact younger persons have health difficulties, adjustment difficulties, economic difficulties, and difficulties centering upon delivery of services. But the elderly have more of each. The younger individual has fewer of most kinds of problems and is able to cope with their occurrence more expeditiously. Thus at a time in life when one may expect more of the same problems that he has probably already encountered, he finds that he has less with which to solve them. We must, then, inquire into the reasons both for the increase of problems with age and the diminished coping abilities of the aged.

To a very great degree, the same forces are at the roots of both of the preceding phenomena. Most problems of the aged are not attributable to age itself (with the exception of health problems), but to social conditions differentially affecting the aged. Age-related difficulties with health will probably always be a problem although medical technology is constantly improving our capabilities for alleviating much of the suffering historically associated with the loss of health. Obstacles to happiness rooted within the social structure, on the other hand, are amenable to almost complete eradication. If these impediments are properly cast aside through a judicious process of change, we might eventually be faced with health difficulties as the only obstacle to the life satisfaction of the elderly. Compared to our current dilemma, this would be an almost idyllic outcome.

It is my conclusion that the crux of the problem lies in fact that the elderly individual loses self-respect, autonomy, and access to social institutions and services through losing his status as a free economic agent. This status loss results from forced retirement with concomitant loss of income and insufficient allowance for income needs of dependents. Retirement would seem, almost inevitably, to require a change in self concept for the worker who has met his own needs through his own toil during all his adult life. He must reconcile himself to his sudden membership in the dependency ratio of the society. If we cannot insure the older person the opportunity to support his own economic needs, we must insure that their needs are met and, at the same time, consider the effects of such outside support upon the self concept of the recipients. It seems patently

unwise to institute a "special" program for every discrete need of the older person. The development of hundreds of such special programs for the aged is, in its effect, comparable to paying an employee with company "chits" rather than a negotiable income. The personal effects of such programming is almost less autonomy and personal freedom of choice. Advocating personal autonomy for the older person, is essentially, the advocacy of minimal programming. Further, if society is sincere in its commitment to the needs of the elderly, these discrete programs would require funds to the extent that they would, in the final analysis, be more costly than ensuring adequate income and furnishing a minimum of such programming. In the final analysis, the most effective and efficient method of solving most age-related problems will consist of enabling of the elderly to contract for their own needs and pay from their own resources. We gain little through establishing a pattern of dealing with the aged as society's poor relatives, as with any other group, it would seem desirable to support the older persons role as an economic agent and thereby allow the machinery for the satisfaction of his needs to evolve within the marketplace.

If we are to transform the older person into an autonomous economic agent, we must assign the problem a much higher priority. First, the young must be willing to pay a higher monetary price to assure adequate income for the elderly. Actually, this might have not only the obvious effect of assuring future financial benefits to the young, but may also contribute to the feeling that they will "deserve" such benefits and better allow the maintenance of healthy self concept. Also, we should consider a more general realignment of national priorities. We cannot institute a national policy on aging within a political vacuum. Other policies and commitments will be necessarily affected through such change. It seems appropriate that we seriously discuss the place of a policy on aging within the context of policy determinations in other areas of national concern.

Finally, there is a very great difference between a social policy on aging and a political policy on aging. Establishment of an acceptable social policy demands attention to the real problems and needs of the older population, while a political policy may consist of a more superficial dedication to needs which serves, primarily, the purposes of reducing mass discontent. The success of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging will depend, in large part, upon its placement between these two poles. One has cause to question in advance the success of the Conference on the basis of Administration policy during the past months. One might question the sincerity of an Administration which has appropriated less than one-third of the funds allocated by Congress for the Older Americans Act. This, coupled with a reorganization of the Administration on Aging which seems designed to strip it of its already relatively small influence, would seem to suggest that this Administration has already relegated problems of the aged to a position of low priority.

Hopefully, the thousands of elderly involved in the White House Conference will actively question these administrative decisions and work together towards comprehensive policy.

It would seem of extreme importance that this Administration utilize the issue of the aged as a means of demonstrating constructive attention to *needs* as opposed to *political pressure*. In the past, many social issues in this country have received reflexive rather than realistic consideration. We have become conditioned, to an extent, to requiring militance and mass discontent as prelude to constructive action. The resulting reflexive policies are often insecurely conceived, in comprehensive, and oblivious to future consequences and change.

I look forward to the White House Conference and will cooperate in any possible way to help ensure its success. Again, I would like to thank you for requesting my views.

Sincerely,

TONY E. MCNEVIN,  
*Director.*

---

ITEM 14. STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,  
FROM MRS. EARL MARVIN, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, NEW YORK, N.Y.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,  
*New York, N.Y., April 14, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Enclosed is the statement of the National Council of Jewish Women in support of the extension of the Older Americans Act and adequate funding for the Administration on Aging. We hope that the statement

will be made a part of the record of the hearings which were held at the end of March in cooperation with the Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EARL MARVIN,  
*National President.*

[Enclosure].

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, INC.

The National Council of Jewish Women, with a membership of 100,000 women throughout the United States, is pleased to add our testimony to the hearing record of the Senate Special Committee on Aging in cooperation with the Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

We, the National Council of Jewish Women, are definitely opposed to any budget cuts which would reduce the Administration on Aging funding. With the establishment of the 50 State offices on Aging since the inception of the Older Americans Act, it seems unreasonable that Congress would consider any cuts in a year of urgent needs and rising costs. Throughout the United States, the many experimentations and pilot projects in the area of the aging, are proving the necessity for continued Federal support.

The older citizen makes up a large part of our population, and with more men and women living longer every year, we are faced with serious problems as a nation. In the last year, over two million aged individuals fell below the Federal poverty level in annual income. This White House Conference of 1971 should give the older American the opportunity to be heard and their priorities to be established.

It is the opinion of the National Council of Jewish Women that additional funding at an earlier date should have been made available to the Administration on Aging for the plans and preparation of the White House Conference on Aging. A more advanced and thorough planning could have been established prior to the actual functioning of the Committees and Task Forces on Federal, State and Local levels.

The National Council of Jewish Women feels strongly that Congress should extend the Older Americans Act in 1972. We are opposed to seeking an alternative plan. Continued Federal support through the Older Americans Act at this time is extremely important. We are afraid, should an alternate plan be recommended, that in the interim, the current programs and funding will be stopped and all of the progress that has been gained over the last 10 years, will be lost. We, therefore, wish to go on record in favor of the extension, continuation and broadening of this act.

ITEM 15. LETTER FROM HON. GRAHAM A. PURCELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 13TH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: As you study legislation to extend the Older Americans Act, I request that you give careful consideration to the Foster Grandparent Program which is covered by this Act. This is a small program, but one which embodies the best of self-help principles.

The Foster Grandparent Program is not a welfare program. It is income supplement to our older, less fortunate citizens who *earn* their assistance by community service with children.

In the Thirteenth Congressional District of Texas, which I represent, these old people work at the Denton State Hospital with mentally retarded children. It is a mutually beneficial arrangement. Not only does Foster Grandparent provide badly needed income supplement to the elderly, it also gives them a purpose; they feel valued by their community; their experience is called upon—not allowed to waste away—and used to help unfortunate, often otherwise neglected, children.

These elderly citizens are not "on charity" or welfare, but are being paid for a very real service. They have their self-respect and the community receives the benefit of their talents and long experience.

We need more—not fewer—of these programs. We need to support fully—not cut back—funding for self-help programs. Our welfare bill is growing by leaps and bounds. It threatens to bankrupt many of our cities. It places increased pressure on our national economy. It is high time we throw our support and focus on programs like Foster Grandparent in which self-respect of the less fortunate is maintained, in which all parties involved are benefited.

The authorization for Foster Grandparent Program is \$25 million annually. In fiscal year 71 the appropriation was \$10.5 million. The Administration has made a fiscal year 72 request of only \$7.5 million—that is a reduction of 28%. This means that Foster Grandparent programs all over the country will have to be cut back. It is far wiser, it seems to me, to cut back on “doles” than to cut back on legitimate “self-help” programs! I ask your full support for this program. I would hope, further, that you can recommend a higher level of funding than the Administration requests.

I will appreciate it if you will have this letter entered in the record of your hearings on the Older Americans Act.

Sincerely,

GRAHAM PURCELL.

ITEM 16. LETTER FROM FRANK M. ROBISON, ACTING DIRECTOR,  
COLUMBIA CLUB, SEATTLE, WASH.

FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH,  
*Seattle, Wash., March 24, 1971.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I received your letter of March 15, post marked March 17, on March 23, 1971 and will be most happy to provide you with desired information regarding our “defunct” nutrition program.

This packet of material contains my correspondence with Senator Magnuson; Jessie S. Gertman, Deputy Director Research and Development Grants; Dr. Walter Hundley, Director of Seattle Model Cities; A Resume of the Columbia Club; Quarterly Public Information Report January 5, 1971; Copy of Funding Proposal Columbia Club 1971; Final Report of Columbia Club Project—Demonstration Grant number 93-P7512010-03, Title IV Research and Development Grants Program, Administration on Aging, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

This packet should provide you with all potent data pertaining to this project.

I have been advised by our State Department of Health Services that all Old Age Assistance funds will be *Decreased* by the amount of Social Security Benefits increased in 1970 and 1971. I was further informed that this was the “intent of the Social Security Benefit increases.” If this is the case the older people in the greatest need will receive no help from this much publicized increase in Social Security Benefits.

There has been numerous “Research and Demonstration” projects to establish the needed facts. We now need on going projects to benefit our older citizens.

I commend you for your efforts in behalf of our Senior Citizens, I have been well informed of your work in the Congress and Senate by my friends in Idaho County.

If I can be of any other assistance to you or your Committee please advise me.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. ROBISON.

[Enclosures.]

DECEMBER 26, 1970.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON,  
*U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: It is with deepest regret that I must inform you the Columbia Club will have to cease as a Nutrition Program for Senior Citizens.

Permission has been granted by Dr. Tavis, H.E.W. Grants Administrator, to extend the operation to January 4, 1971. This decision was based on the fact budgeted funds have been conserved, leaving a balance above expenditures. The Church will underwrite any deficit resulting from the extension.

I have been most hopeful, after writing proposals and revisions, plus meetings and personal contacts, that Model Cities of Seattle would have some funds for continuing this worthwhile project. To date, there has been no response.

A copy of my letter to Dr. Hundley and a resume of the Columbia Club are attached for your information.

Dr. Robert A. Uphoff, Mr. Walter Kugler and I are personally grateful to you for your support and interest in behalf of these Senior Citizens served by the Columbia Club.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK M. ROBISON,  
*Acting Director Columbia Club.*

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON,  
October 10, 1970.

JESSIE S. GERTMAN,  
*Deputy Director, Research and Development Grants, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. GERTMAN: Thanks for your letter telling of your safe return from your trip in Japan. I am sure it was a memorable trip.

To obtain funding for the Columbia Club, I have made every effort to obtain local financial support from philanthropic foundations, United Good Neighbor Fund and others with no success, due to the depressed economical conditions of the area.

Following your earlier suggestion, local Model Cities was contacted twice regarding funding. At each meeting I was informed there was no Nutrition Project within their guide lines and Columbia Club was outside their geographical boundry. Local offices of HUD, HEW, and OEO were contacted. Seattle-King County Economic Opportunity Board are checking on the possibility of funding the Project.

Sharon Fujii called Wednesday, 10/7, for a meeting with Dr. Herbert Lazenby and myself to explore the possibility of incorporating Columbia Club with Model Cities. Dr. Uphoff and I met with them Friday, 10/9 and laid groundwork for a proposal. I will meet with them again Monday 10/12, at which time we will have 'facts and figures' necessary to begin drafting a proposal.

Based upon our discussion Friday, there now appears possibilities for incorporating Columbia Club with Model Cities. Miss Fujii and Dr. Lazenby are knowledgeable of the purpose and possibilities of Columbia Club. I am hopeful our planning will become a reality. You will be informed of any progress of the project.

In checking previous files, we find: 1. Over 350 files contain nothing more than a name of a person. These are being checked with "Extended Services For the Elderly" office to obtain any information they may have on these people. They are not participants at this time, but have been counted in the past reports. Extended Services for the Elderly, a community action program, did most of the interview work during the first 18 months of the Columbia Club. Their office address is 418 Jones Building, 3rd and Union, Seattle, Washington 98104.

2. Some participants live in their own homes in outlying areas, 45 other regular participants live in Federal Housing Turnkey apartments, with income and conveniences beyond what I believe to be maximum for participants in the Columbia Club. Many of the above mentioned groups have been helped by this Project and should become more self-sufficient.

With your concurrence, I would like to start "weaning process" to make room within the present budget for those who are in need of the nutrition and services offered.

Sharon Hara has undergone surgery for removal of a bone tumor in the right leg. She is now doing some work, although her leg is in a cast. I am sure she will be able to help complete statistics for ENKI Research Institute and the final report to your office on the project.

The following reports have been completed for ENKI:

667 Intake forms.

173 First 24 hr. recall forms.

84 Participant information forms.

69 Second recall forms.

382 hours of volunteer work has been done on these.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. ROBISON,  
*Acting Director, Columbia Club.*

DECEMBER 23, 1970.

DR. WALTER HUNDLEY,  
*Director, Model Cities,  
 Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR DR. HUNDLEY: Having received no communication from your office regarding funding for the Columbia Club Project, I must advise the staff of closing the Project on December 31, 1970. This notice will be delivered to them tomorrow, December 24, 1970 and become effective December 31, 1970.

A copy of this letter will be distributed to Dr. Robert A. Uphoff, Senior Minister; Mr. Allen Brown, Chairman, Administrative Board. A notice of this decision will be mailed to Dr. Marvin J. Taves, Director, Research and Development Grants, H.E.W., Washington, D.C., Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Henry Jackson and Mayor Wesley Ullman.

Sincerely,

FRANK ROBISON,  
*Acting Director, Columbia Club.*

SEATTLE MODEL CITY PROGRAM,  
 December 29, 1970.

MR. FRANK ROBISON,  
*Acting Director, Columbia Club, First United Methodist Church, Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR MR. ROBISON: In response to your letter of December 23, 1970 regarding funds for the Columbian Project, it is my understanding that Seattle Model City Program staff have been in close contact with you over the last few months attempting to develop a rationale for continued funding of the Columbia Club Project.

From our staff studies and inquiries, we have arrived at the conclusion that our limited resources could best be utilized in expending food services programs at three Skid Road Area sites. We would then provide transportation services to Columbia Club members who wish to participate in the program. We think that in this way, we can provide better services to move low income Skid Road residents at less cost.

I regret that circumstances force this conclusion.

Yours sincerely,

WALTER R. HUNDLEY,  
*Director, Seattle Model City Program.*

JANUARY 6, 1971.

DR. WALTER R. HUNDLEY,  
*Director, Seattle Model City Program,  
 Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR DR. HUNDLEY: Thanks for your letter of December 29, 1970 advising me of your staff decision to establish food service programs in the Skid Road area. My letter was written to you because an answer was needed from your office before closing the Columbia Club project.

I have found your Miss Sharon Fujii to be most efficient and cooperative and was pleased to work with her on this project.

Most participants of Columbia Club have asked, "where and when will Model City food services begin?" When this information is known to us, we will make every effort to pass word on to them.

There were many tears shed by these old people the last two days of December, 1970. 170 participants were with us on December 31.

I will cooperate in every possible way with your staff in reaching the Senior Citizens of this area who are in need of nutrition assistance.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. ROBISON.

FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH,  
 Seattle, Wash., Sept. 28, 1970.

#### RESUME OF THE COLUMBIA CLUB

This is a nutrition and outreach service for Senior Citizens living on a minimum income in the "downtown" area of Seattle, Washington.

This project provides a balanced nutritious meal at noon, five days per week for the lonely, low income Senior Citizens living in the oldest hotels and rooming houses in the surrounding downtown business area. Most of these people

have been tax-paying citizens during their productive years. Due to the unfortunate circumstances that befalls a large percentage of mankind, they live alone in one room, hot plate, walk-up type quarters.

Columbia Club is sponsored by The Seattle First United Methodist Church, 423 Marion, Seattle, Washington 98104. The project was named "Columbia Club" because the entrance to dining and recreational rooms is from Columbia Street in the downtown area and to avoid religious connotations.

The Church provides space, equipment, furnishings and utilities. Operating costs are funded to December 24, 1970 by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), through the Administration on Aging (AOA), a Title 4 Research and Demonstration Grant Program, No. AA-4-70-076-02. Original funding has been cut from June 30, 1971 to December 24, 1970. The need has been conclusively demonstrated, however, no funds from any source has been committed for the continuation of the project beyond December 24, 1970. We are anxious that this program or something like it should be continued in order that the lives of these several hundred people might continue to be enriched by better food and a social outlet.

Daily participation average is 140 to 160. Recreational activities are from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Interviews are held each day with those who are in need of extended services. These services are in the area of housing, medical, legal and financial. Over 1200 people are registered.

A detailed cost of operation is attached. This may be used as a basis for computing future funding. Salaries have been computed at 67% of full time for Director, 50% for Activities Director. All others are based on an hourly rate of 40 hours per week. Food services are provided by SeaTac Food Services of Seattle at net cost plus \$200, per month. This has proven to be the most reliable and economical method of providing food services.

As a church sponsored program, the governing body has been the Administrative Board of the Church. Specific responsibilities have been delegated to the Commission on Special Ministries, Mr. Walter Kugler, Chairman. Administrative direction has also been a part of the responsibility of Dr. Robert A. Uphoff, the Senior Minister.

The Administrative Board of the Church would be amenable to a Board of Directors to include citizens knowledgeable in the fields of Geriatrics, Nutrition and Social Work. It should be pointed out that First Church is sole sponsor of Bayview Manor, a Retirement Residence in Seattle and that Mr. Kugler is the Administrator thereof.

FRANK M. ROBISON,  
*Acting Director, Columbia Club.*

COLUMBIA CLUB—PROPOSED DETAILED COST OF OPERATION 1971

	Salary	Fringe benefits	Other	Indirect
<b>Title of position:</b>				
Administrator.....	\$7,560	-----	-----	-----
Secretary-hostess.....	5,280	\$230	-----	-----
Activities director.....	2,741	210	-----	-----
Contact specialist.....	5,382	326	-----	-----
Custodian.....	3,348	398	-----	-----
Dishwasher.....	4,910	650	-----	-----
<b>Sea-Tac Food service costs:</b>				
Cook.....	6,726	1,476	-----	-----
2 kitchen helpers.....	4,704	936	-----	-----
Raw food cost plus overhead.....	-----	-----	\$21,401	-----
Auditing.....	-----	-----	480	-----
Travel and subsistence.....	-----	-----	300	-----
<b>Supplies:</b>				
Office supplies.....	-----	-----	120	-----
Breakage and kitchen supplies.....	-----	-----	1,000	-----
Recreation supplies.....	-----	-----	200	-----
<b>Indirect costs:</b>				
Furniture and equipment.....	-----	-----	-----	\$2,640
8,620 sq. ft. floor space times \$3.....	-----	-----	-----	25,860
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>40,651</b>	<b>4,226</b>	<b>23,501</b>	<b>28,500</b>
<b>Total direct costs.....</b>	<b>68,378</b>	-----	-----	-----
<b>Less income.....</b>	<b>10,920</b>	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
<b>Net direct cost.....</b>	<b>57,458</b>	-----	-----	-----
<b>Indirect costs.....</b>	<b>28,500</b>	-----	-----	-----
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>85,958</b>	-----	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> 36,400 meals at \$0.30 (average 140 per day).



## COST OF MEALS FOR COLUMBIA CLUB, 1970

Month	Raw food	Food service and preparation	Cost per person
January.....	\$0.64	\$0.54	\$1.20
February.....	.65	.46	1.10
March.....	.66	.44	1.10
April.....	.69	.42	1.11
May.....	.71	.42	1.13
June.....	.73	.38	1.11
July.....	.69	.44	1.13
August.....	.74	.48	1.12
Average age of participants 70 plus.			
Monthly income (average) minimum \$68.75; maximum \$135.00.			

<sup>1</sup> Reflects vacation pay.

## COLUMBIA CLUB CUSTOMERS

September—1970	Number	September—1970—Continued	Number
1.....	161	18.....	140
2.....	155	21.....	140
3.....	130	22.....	131
4.....	162	23.....	135
8.....	155	24.....	145
9.....	162	25.....	132
10.....	128	28.....	155
11.....	149	29.....	132
14.....	156	30.....	132
15.....	135		
16.....	140	Total.....	3,012
17.....	128		

ITEM 17. LETTER FROM JAMES H. SCHULTZ, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF WELFARE ECONOMICS, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MASS.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY,  
Waltham, Mass., March 30, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Having had an opportunity as "general editor" to read all the recently completed background papers prepared for this year's White House Conference on Aging, I can report that very few problems associated with aging have been solved or significantly ameliorated since the last conference. In fact the rising numbers of aged persons, the growth of a technologically oriented society, the increase in urbanization together with the decay of the cities, the growth of available leisure associated with earlier retirement, and the widespread strains of social strife—are but a few of the factors which seem to have *increased* the problems facing the aged and the complexity of finding solutions to these problems.

The economic and social plight of so many of the aged today is graphic proof of the inability of the individual and his immediate family to cope with the complexities and unpredictabilities of life in a growth-oriented, industrialized society. Either we must indict successive generations of the population for lack of providence or incompetence, or we must acknowledge the need for increased private and public group action to plan for and assist people in dealing with the numerous vicissitudes of modern living.

As I indicated above, the background papers for this year's White House Conference document of the needs associated with the aged and call for the development of national policy to indicate program directions. No matter what the nature of the final recommendations—federal, state, or local government programs; programs developed and/or operated by the profit-making sector; or non-profit and voluntary organization programs—increasing numbers of trained specialists with various levels of education will be needed. Furthermore, continued experimentation with demonstration programs and basic research must continue if we are to devise the best solutions to various problems.

It is obvious to me that the justification for cutting aging funds (as well as other cuts) does not arise from the diminution of problems in aging or the inappropriateness of government assistance in solving these problems. We continue to be faced, fundamentally, with a "guns versus butter" budgetary choice and, in addition, a budgetary squeeze caused by the inability of the present

Administration to successfully use the economic tools at its command and thereby to prevent the scandalously wasteful under-utilization of resources (labor and capital) available to this country for increasing individual incomes and solving social problems.

To put in perspective the Administration's budget request cut of \$2.5 million for aging and the \$75.5 million difference between that budget request and Congressional authorization—let me point out the following: A return nationally to an unemployment level of 4 percent would permit an increase in goods and services of at least \$30,000 million. The price of ineffective economic policies is quite obviously lower incomes for millions of Americans and lower government revenues to support necessary programs—aging programs being only one group.

Finally, as director of an aging training grant program, I am familiar with the difficult problem of attracting people into the field of aging—which is relatively new and, to many, lacks the glamour and status of other professional areas. In the last couple of years, however, there seems to be a significant improvement in this situation—partly as a result of the efforts and activities of training grant programs. Across-the-board cuts in these programs would be an immense waste of the future usefulness and potentials of these programs—benefits resulting from their growing experience and strengthening (due to curriculum development and faculty recruitment).

Sincerely,

JAMES H. SCHULTZ,  
*Associate Professor of Welfare Economics.*

ITEM 18. LETTER FROM MARGARET C. SCHWEINHAUT, CHAIRMAN,  
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES, COMMISSION ON AGING, BALTIMORE. MD.

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES,  
COMMISSION ON AGING,  
*Baltimore, Md., March 16, 1971.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,  
*Chairman, U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Members of the Maryland Commission on Aging are greatly disturbed with the continuing downgrading of the Administration on Aging.

The most recent evidence of the deterioration of AoA is the proposed reduction in the Community Grants budget from \$9 million in fiscal 1971 to \$5,350,000 in fiscal 1972. This follows on the heels of action within the last few months which removed the Titles IV and V of the Older Americans Act from the Administration on Aging and placed them in Social and Rehabilitation Services.

This deterioration of the Administration on Aging is contrary to the intent of Congress which has, through the 1969 Amendments to the Act, sought to strengthen and expand the effectiveness of both the Administration on Aging and State agencies. This intent was backed up with adequate funding. It would appear that AoA is being dismembered without consultation, much less the approval, of Congress.

If any further evidence were needed of the bewildering deterioration of AoA, I would cite the Foster Grandparent Program. This Program, which provides minimum income producing work for the elderly poor who work with mentally retarded children in institutions, has been universally applauded by government and nongovernment groups throughout the country. It is pointed to with pride as an outstanding example of what can be done to restore older citizens to a feeling of worth and usefulness while providing them with a small income for doing something that is both physically and emotionally rewarding to both the older person and the children assigned to them. And yet, this program funded for \$10,500,000 in 1971 faces a proposed budget of \$7,500,000 in 1972, a reduction of almost 30%.

Our Commission, and this writer in particular, recognize the need and desirability of efficient government operation, consolidating programs, avoiding duplication of effort, and minimizing bureaucracy. We also recognize, however, that the elderly people in this nation are among the most neglected, forgotten, and wasted group of citizens among us.

The funds provided AoA have been comparatively small and yet the results have been dramatic. Since the Older Americans Act was passed in 1965, thou-

sands of persons throughout the country have joined in an effort to create a better environment for the aged and aging.

The current downgrading of aging in a climate of preparation for the National White House Conference is disheartening and disillusioning.

Older people are again being pushed aside. Rhetoric will not help them. Aging should command the serious attention of Congress and State governments until we in this country have reached a point that one can grow old with reasonable assurance that, as an old man or old woman, opportunities to live independently with a variety of options available, are a reality and not just a dream. It has been said that for old people in this country, the American dream has become the American nightmare.

We ask your help and support in reversing this retrenchment affecting aging and elderly persons and to restore in the Federal government a visible, strong unit as was envisioned in the Older Americans Act of 1965 so that we can proceed with our efforts to bring about the necessary services older people need *and the kind of re-education* that will make growing old in this country an acceptable part of life instead of something to be stoically tolerated.

Very truly yours,

MARGARET C. SCHWEINHAUT,  
*Chairman.*

