

Y4 .ED 8/1: 01 1/5

1015

93/4
ED 8/1
02/15

OLDER AMERICANS NUTRITION PROGRAM

GOVERNMENT

Storage

MENTS

2 1974

LIBRARY

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 11105

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE VII OF THE OLDER AMERICANS
ACT RELATING TO THE NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE
ELDERLY TO PROVIDE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIA-
TIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 13 AND 14, 1974

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



KSU LIBRARIES

✓

111900 990009

29-754

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1974

3/10 11/8 63. 47

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida

EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut

CONTENTS

Hearings held in Washington, D.C.:	Page
February 13, 1974-----	1
February 14, 1974-----	25
Text of H.R. 11105-----	1
Statement of—	
Aaron, Daphne, Wilmington, Del.; Romaine Franklin, Cumberland, Md.; Diantha Lavoie, Morgantown, W. Va.; Patricia Meeker, Norfolk, Va.; Patrick Muldoon, executive director, community action program, Christiansburg, Va.; Sylvia Barg, executive director, senior wheels east, Philadelphia, Pa.; and James Carr, Nina Seitz and Mrs. Edward Bowers, a panel of nutrition project directors and participants-----	44
Flemming, Arthur S., Commissioner on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	8
Martin, John B., consultant, American Association of Retired Persons and American Association of Retired Teachers-----	2
Pepper, Hon. Claude, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, accompanied by Dr. Bruce Quint, executive director, Senior Centers of Dade County, Inc., Miami, Fla-----	26
Walker, Harry, executive director, Commission on Aging, Baltimore, Md. and president, National Association of State Directors on Aging, accompanied by Janet Martin, director of the nutrition program for the State of Maryland-----	38
Prepared statements, letters, newspaper article:	
Bloedon, Gerald A., executive secretary, Minnesota Governor's Citizens Council on Aging, statement submitted by-----	54
"Butz Urged to End Commodity Project For Child Nutrition," a newspaper article entitled-----	13
Flemming, Arthur S., Commissioner on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, letter from, enclosing information-----	14
Johnson, Hon. Harold T. (Bizz), a Representative in Congress from the State of California, prepared statement of-----	53
Keller, Hon. R. F., Deputy Comptroller General of the United States, letter to Hon. Claude Pepper, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, dated February 13, 1974-----	28
Martin, John B., consultant, American Association of Retired Persons and American Association of Retired Teachers:	
Letter from Caspar Weinberger, Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 20, 1973-----	5
Letter to Chairman Brademas, dated February 14, 1974-----	8
Remmich, Evelyn, nutrition specialist, Aging Services, State of North Dakota, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 14, 1974-----	56

OLDER AMERICANS NUTRITION PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:45 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas, Peyser, Grasso, Lehman, and Biaggi.

Staff members present: Jack Duncan, counsel, Christina M. Orth, assistant to the counsel, Martin La Vor, minority legislative associate.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Select Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, will come to order for the purpose of conducting hearings on H.R. 11105 and related bills to extend the nutrition program for the elderly.

[The text of H.R. 11105 follows:]

[H.R. 11105, 93d Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend title VII of the Older Americans Act relating to the nutrition program for the elderly to provide authorization of appropriations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 708 of the Older Americans Act is amended by striking out the word "and" before "\$150,000,000" and by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "\$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977".

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Chair should at the outset pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the Honorable Claude Pepper, for his diligence and leadership in seeking to provide adequate nutritional programs for the elderly.

In 1970 Mr. Pepper and I introduced the measure which ultimately became the nutrition program for the elderly, title VII of the Older Americans Act.

The program is today utilizing \$100 million for State formula grants to provide one hot, nutritious meal five times a week for older Americans.

Last October 25, Mr. Pepper and I, together with many members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Education and Labor, introduced H.R. 11105, a bill which would extend the nutrition program for 3 years and authorize expenditures of \$150 million for fiscal 1975, \$165 million for fiscal 1976, and \$200 million for fiscal year 1977.

The Chair feels constrained to point out that, although the legislation we are considering is 2 years old, only today is it being fully implemented.

The Chair regrets to note that this unhappy circumstance has come about because the President has repeatedly vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations measures which included the funding, requested by the President, for the nutrition program.

The President has in the past requested full funding for the nutrition program, which is encouraging evidence of his support for this program that means so much to thousands of older persons. That the program, however, is only now getting fully underway is discouraging testimony that we still have much to do in this area.

We are privileged to have with us today several distinguished public servants who have been leaders in the effort to provide adequate services for the 20 million Americans aged 65 and over.

Our first witness this morning will be Mr. John Martin, presently a consultant with the American Association for Retired Persons, and the former Commissioner of Aging.

Mr. Martin will be followed by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, the distinguished former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Chairman of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging.

Dr. Flemming is today wearing only one of his hats, that of the Commissioner of Aging. But I should also tell those present today that Dr. Flemming was recently nominated to replace my good friend Father Theodore Hesburgh as Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission.

Dr. Flemming, may I say I was very pleased while in South Bend, speaking at a seminar sponsored by the churches of my home community on problems of the aging, to learn that you will be visiting the University of Notre Dame in April to participate in a conference on aging, and, of course, you will be assured of a very warm welcome.

Dr. Flemming will be accompanied by Ms. Joan Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education Legislation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Martin, we are delighted to see you again, sir. Please have a seat and begin your statement.

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. MARTIN, CONSULTANT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED TEACHERS, ACCOMPANIED BY JANET WAGNER, PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate the opportunity to testify here today on H.R. 11105, a bill to extend the authorization for the title VII nutrition program under the Older Americans Act. I am here as consultant to and on behalf of the 6-million-member American Association of Retired Persons and National Retired Teachers Association.

I have with me Janet Wagner, a professional member of our association staff, who is an expert on nutrition matters.

The authorization for title VII of the Older Americans Act expires with fiscal 1974. Because of various delays in funding, the program has

had less than 1 year's operation. In fact, it appears that it will reach full operation under 1973-74 funding only in the last quarter of fiscal year 1974.

On March 27, 1973, while I was still serving as Commissioner on Aging, I wrote to Secretary Weinberger expressing my concern that the Administration might be planning to phase out the nutrition program under a single year of operation. The Secretary replied under date of April 20, 1973, as follows:

In regard to your concern about the future of the Nutrition Program, I would like to reassure you that the Administration would, under no circumstances, start such a substantial program, and then propose to let it lapse after only one year of operation. We are still hopeful that funding will become available for the Nutrition Program during 1973 and, of course, we have just finished testifying before the House Subcommittee in support of a \$100 million level of funding for the Nutrition Program for fiscal year 1974. Since you have brought this issue to my attention I will instruct the Assistant Secretary for Human Development, working with appropriate staff officers in the Department, to develop a comprehensive plan for the Nutrition Program in relationship to our other legislative and programmatic priorities.

I do not know to what extent the Assistant Secretary for Human Development has been able to carry out this instruction, but I am familiar with the fact that the program is now moving rapidly forward and that efforts have been and are being made to coordinate the title III and title VII programs. The question now is the extent to which the program will be encouraged by appropriate longer term authorization and funding to develop and expand to meet the needs of those it is designed to help.

One of the reasons for early delay in setting this program in motion has been an unwillingness to commit local funds and effort until the Federal program was funded and ready to move. Local officials have been burned in the past by the unrealized promise of Federal largesse. They are cautious also about entering programs where they fear that they may be left holding the bag for an entire program on which their original commitment was limited and for which the Federal commitment has been subsequently withdrawn. If the present program is extended for 1 year only, it will greatly strengthen the belief that the program will shortly be phased out and left to local initiative. It is important, therefore, that the authorization be renewed for a 3-year period, as is done by H.R. 11105, and that the authorization be increased to permit broadening of the program as well as to take account of increased food costs. It is also important that this legislation be passed promptly since no appropriation hearings will be held on title VII in the absence of an authorization.

Another aspect of the program which concerns us greatly is the quality of the program. We are aware that there has been strong pressure to get the program up to projected levels of meals served and that to do this it has been necessary, temporarily in some States, to delay insistence upon the provision of supportive services, on the training of project personnel before initiating the projects and on indepth gathering of data. We consider this a serious matter since we believe that the quality of the program depends not merely on the food served, but on related service components of the program as well, on proper training of project personnel, and on an adequate data base. We now understand that every effort will be made to have supportive services

in place by March 31, that most operating projects now have trained directors and that the quarterly NIS reporting program designed by Booz, Allen & Hamilton will be in operation by April 1 in addition to the present weekly interim reporting system.

Section 706(a) of title VII provides that:

Funds allotted to any State during any fiscal year pursuant to section 703 shall be disbursed by the State agency to recipients of grants or contracts who agree:

(6) to provide a setting conducive to expanding the nutrition project and to include, as a part of such project, recreational activities, informational, health and welfare counseling and referral services, where such services are not otherwise available;

(7) to include such training as may be necessary to enable the personnel to carry out the provisions of this title;

* * * * *

(11) to comply with such other standards as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe in order to assure the high quality of the nutrition project and its general effectiveness in attaining the objectives of this title.

As indicated above, we are now encouraged to believe that these objectives will be realized and further emphasized as the program matures. If this is done, the projects can become focal points around which many of the elements of the title III program can be grouped and made more effective.

While it is true that nutrition projects cannot be made part of title III comprehensive and coordinated systems on a mandatory basis, it is also true that where this can be done by agreement, it is highly desirable. We feel, therefore, that every effort should be made to continue development of the nutrition program as a multifaceted program in which food is the essential element binding the program together, but enriched by other services which will make it more than a place to eat and run.

Another question arises as to whether the program should be expanded to include older persons below the age 60 level. In our judgment this should not be undertaken at this time while the program is still meeting only a small part of the need among the over-60 group where need is great. The program needs a period of operation at full potential as a well-rounded, quality program. It needs careful data-gathering and thorough, on-site evaluation before substantial changes are proposed in the present format. We, therefore, urge enactment of H.R. 11105 without other substantive changes, but would urge that the authorized sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976 be set at \$200 million as in H.R. 11105, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977 be set at \$250 million. We believe that experience with the program and demand for its implementation will justify the higher figures.

In summary we believe (1) that prompt passage of legislation providing increased authorizations for a 3-year period is desirable and necessary, (2) that the quality of the program will be determined by the supportive services offered as well as by the number of meals served and should continue to be emphasized, (3) that every effort should be made to train project directors before initiating projects, (4) that in-depth reporting under NIS will be fully implemented and (5) that other substantive changes in the present legislation beyond renewal and increase of authorization should not be made at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Martin.

Before I put some questions to you, the Chair wants warmly to welcome several members of the staff of the Senate Special Committee on Aging chaired by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Senator Frank Church. We are very pleased to have all of you with us today.

Mr. Martin, I want to thank you for your carefully prepared statement as well as your quote from Secretary Weinberger's letter of March 27 to you, and I wonder if you could provide for inclusion in the official hearing record the complete text of that letter.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; I would be very glad to.

[The letter referred to follows:]

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1973.

HON. JOHN B. MARTIN,
Commissioner, Administration on Aging, Social and Rehabilitation Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Thank you for your kind letter of March 27 summarizing the status of Administration on Aging programs and expressing your concern about the future of the Nutrition Program.

First, I would like to thank you once again for your contributions to this Department and most especially for your very effective advocacy in behalf of the citizens of this nation. You have helped to achieve truly remarkable gains for the elderly during the past several years—lasting and significant gains that have improved the lives of millions of individuals.

In regard to your concern about the future of the Nutrition Program, I would like to reassure you that the Administration would, under no circumstances, start such a substantial program, and the propose to let it lapse after only one year of operation. We are still hopeful that funding will become available for the Nutrition Program during 1973 and of course, we have just finished testifying before the House Subcommittee in support of a \$100 million level of funding for the Nutrition Program for FY 1974. Since you have brought this issue to my attention I will instruct the Assistant Secretary for Human Development, working with the appropriate staff officers in the Department, to develop a comprehensive plan for the Nutrition Program in relationship to our other legislative and programmatic priorities.

I am delighted to hear that you plan to remain in Washington and continue your work in behalf of older persons.

Sincerely,

CASPAR WEINBERGER,
Secretary.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I note on page 2 of your statement you indicate local officials appear to be unwilling to commit themselves to the nutrition program for fear the Federal Government may turn the entire responsibility over to local government.

I note in this connection that Dr. Flemming's testimony will indicate that the administration favors but a 1-year extension of the program, whereas you have indicated that a 1-year extension might strengthen the fears of local officials. I wonder if you have any further observation as to what we might do to allay those fears?

Mr. MARTIN. I think, Congressman, the best evidence that the program is intended to be carried forward and broadened would be a longer authorization. The authorization for a year only seems to me to suggest to uneasy minds that it may not be turned into a long-range national program and I think it is as simple as that.

I know from my dealings with local officials, both State and county and city, that they in general don't like to get in programs which are going to be turned over to them in toto because this puts them in a bad light with their constituents and it makes them feel if they have

to cut back, that they are not doing their job. So this is a very common expression you get from local officials, "Well, don't bring us something that is going to put us on the spot when you are no longer supporting it."

Mr. BRADEMAs. I note also in your statement you indicate supportive services such as personnel training and data collection have been ignored in order to get the program started as quickly as possible. I wonder if you could indicate what effect this postponement or delay has had on the operation of the nutrition-for-the-elderly program?

Mr. MARTIN. I think the postponement was done to get the program moving, and I think the arrangements that have been made for instituting supportive services and others are going to be sufficient to provide us with a quality program as we go forward here. It is going to take a little while to get it fully geared up and fully operational, but I am not too concerned in light of the steps that have already been taken to see that those things are taken care of.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am also given to understand that some of the directions of some of these programs feel that the goal of the number of meals to be served—a goal set early in 1973—is, given the horrendous inflation that we have experienced over the last year, now an unrealistic one. This emphasis on the number of meals served, given the matter to which we just addressed ourselves—namely, the dispensing with the personnel training and data collection—in effect amounts to shoveling the food out without attention to the overall quality of the program. Is that a fair characterization?

Mr. MARTIN. The original figure that was used was 250,000 when we first began to calculate this, and it was later moved down to 206,000. I believe the projections are that the program will meet or vitally exceed that now, and I think that the projection was moved down in order to make sure that, taking account of increased food prices, it was necessary and would be possible to take care of the need for supportive services and proper data collection and so on.

I think that has been worked into the estimate.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Well, when we do get around in the program to meeting the requirements for supportive services, will complying with the need for those services lead to a diminution in the quality of the meals being served and/or a reduction in the number of meals served?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't think so. As I say, that is part of the plan and it is expected that those services would be available as part of the program on the present projections, which are about 206,000, 208,000 or 210,000. I think that this takes into account the fact that these other elements have to be part of a quality program.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you very much.

Governor Grasso?

Mrs. GRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join in thanking you for your presentation this morning and to tell you I have been watching the developments in the nutrition program in my own State of Connecticut. I think all of us regret we have lost precious time—time that might have been of assistance in providing good meals and also in trying to develop some supportive services.

My question is, do you believe that, with ever-increasing high costs of food and the costs that these meals will entail—with all of this—we will be able to develop the supportive service program we had envisaged for the total package?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I think we will be able to develop it. I think if the cost of meals keeps on going up and we try to serve the same number of meals now projected, then we would have trouble. We have no way of determining what the prices of food are going to be, and if that should go up another 20 percent or something of that sort, then we have real problems. Then if we want to maintain a quality program, we will have to cut back on the number of meals.

Of course that might be altered by additional local contributions to the cost of the program.

Mrs. GRASSO. Do we have any estimates as to what the true potential of this program would have been if we had had adequate funds?

Mr. MARTIN. You mean ultimately?

Mrs. GRASSO. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. The question has been raised and I would anticipate—just a horseback guess—that there may be as many as a million and a half or 2 million people who could benefit from the program, so it is not a small program.

Frankly, the number of meals we are able to serve at the present time doesn't begin to cover the amount of need, in my judgment.

Mrs. GRASSO. I have noted in so many places the gratitude and enthusiasm of the people who are able to participate in the program. I have also noted the discouragement that generally exists because so many other worthy people who might truly be able to benefit from such a program are being excluded.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no doubt a good deal of disappointment—people who would like to take part and can't take part because the number of slots are filled and they can't take on any more.

But that is perhaps in the nature of any beginning program: it doesn't cover the whole need at once. I think it is a wonderful program and I think that the time will come when Congress will see fit to provide funds for a much broader program than we have here today.

Mrs. GRASSO. I agree with you, and I hope when Congress does provide those funds we will have a President who will make sure they are made available to the people.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Martin, I would like to ask one other question.

You indicated your support not only for a 3-year bill, but also for levels of authorizations higher than those contained in the bill presently before us.

Could you give us any estimate—now if you have it, otherwise later on—of what would be the number of persons who could be served at those higher levels of authorization, indicating first the current level of the number of persons served by way of giving us a base year?

Mr. MARTIN. I think we can do that if we make some assumptions as to the level of prices—food prices.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Of course.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, if those go on up, that throws all your calculations out.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I think that would be very helpful.

I was struck by your observation that you did not think it appropriate at this time to lower the age level in that we were not sufficiently meeting the needs of those persons who presently qualify.

Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Martin. We appreciate very much your having taken the time to be with us today.

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you.

[The information requested follows:]

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS,
NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAs: As requested at the hearings on Title VII of the Older Americans Act, I am enclosing a copy of the letter from Secretary Weinberger to me under date of April 20, 1973 for inclusion in the record.

You also requested our estimate of the number of meals that could be served per day if authorizations for Fiscal Years 1975, 1976 and 1977 were to be set at \$150 million, \$200 million and \$250 million, respectively. Our estimate is rough since several factors are unknown. We have assumed no increase in the cost of food or cost of preparation or services. We feel certain that these costs will increase but have no real basis for judgement as to how much. Based on these assumptions, we believe that:

\$150 million will produce 319,277 meals per day, 5 days a week with supportive services,

\$200 million will produce 425,702 meals per day, 5 days a week with supportive services, and

\$250 million will produce 532,128 meals per day, 5 days a week with supportive services.

Since there is considerable turnover of participants and since not all participants are present every day, the number of participants in a given year will be greater than the number of meals per day. Early experience with demonstration projects indicates that the total number of participants in any given year might be twice the total number of meals served per day.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. MARTIN,
Consultant.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Dr. Flemming, we are very pleased to hear from you now, sir.

**STATEMENT OF ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, COMMISSIONER ON AGING,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, ACCOMPANIED BY JOAN HUTCHINSON MILLER, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION (EDUCATION)**

Mr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much your introductory comments. I also appreciate having the opportunity of listening to the presentation by my distinguished predecessor, Commissioner Martin.

I am very happy to have the opportunity of appearing before you and other members of the subcommittee in connection with your consideration of the extension of the authorization of a nutrition program for the elderly which is provided for in title VII of the Older Americans Act, as amended.

The following steps have been taken in connection with the implementation of this new program:

Funds were made available on July 1, 1973.

The Administration on Aging allotted \$99.6 million to the States on July 27, 1973.

The States completed the allocation of the \$99.6 million to 665 new nutrition projects on December 31, 1973, projects which will serve meals at 4,665 individual sites.

It is my purpose in this testimony to identify what has been done to date to implement the policies set forth by the Congress in title VII and then to identify what we plan to do in the immediate future.

Our overriding objective has been to make meal programs available to today's older persons just as quickly as possible.

In order to help achieve this objective we suspended for the first quarter of this calendar year the requirement for submitting a quarterly report on all aspects of the program.

We did institute, however, an interim weekly reporting requirement designed to help us determine how quickly meals were being made available to older persons.

The quarterly reports have been revised, based on suggestions from State and area agencies on aging, and will be required beginning with the second quarter of this calendar year.

We also authorized the States to suspend for 90 days the requirement that supporting services must be in place at the time a project starts provided they had assurances that steps were being taken to institute the supporting services.

The supporting services requirements may be suspended for another 90 days on recommendation of the State and with the approval of the Commissioner on Aging.

In 9 regions, 24 States have exercised the authority to suspend the requirement for 90 days; to date, no States have requested the approval of the Commissioner for an additional extension.

In allocating funds to the States we specified that all projects should be fully operational 90 days from the date the project was authorized to begin operations.

Our weekly report for the week ending February 1, 1974, showed that 80,979 meals were being served. The report we received on February 8, which we received after I developed this material, shows on that date that 87,732 meals were being served.

Within the past 2 weeks we requested the States to review each project and provide us with new estimates as to the number of daily meals they will be serving by March 31, 1974, and the number they will be serving when they are fully operational. The results are as follows:

(a) Number of daily meals that will be served by March 31, 1974: 199,529.

(b) Number of daily meals that will be served when projects are fully operational: 212,000.

We have also placed major emphasis on the States giving preference in awarding grants to projects that will serve low-income individuals and members of minority groups.

Our weekly reports from the States for the period ending February 1, 1974, show that the average number of daily meals being served to persons below the Census Bureau's poverty threshold was 56,582, or approximately 70 percent. That percentage did not change as a result of the report that we received for the week ending February 8, 1974.

This same report also shows that the average number of daily meals being served to members of minority groups was 30,285, or approximately 37 percent.

We plan, in the weeks and months which lie just ahead, to place emphasis on the implementation of the following objectives:

First, to develop an action program designed, in accordance with the policy set forth in title VII, to make full utilization of resources such as the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture and the Social Service titles of the Social Security Act. in order to broaden the base of the title VII program.

We have just established an Interdepartmental Task Force on Nutrition within the framework of the Cabinet-level Committee on Aging.

We have requested this task force to undertake, as its initial assignment, the development of an action program designed to carry out this objective.

Second, to accelerate the development of the supporting services provided for in the budgets of the title VII projects.

The States were authorized to use 20 percent of their allocations for this purpose.

We intend to do everything possible to make sure that, once the serving of meals has started, no time is lost in instituting the services called for in project plans.

Major emphasis will be placed on the initiation or strengthening of outreach programs.

We intend, working with Secretary Weinberger, to pursue vigorously the objective of making sure that the transportation needs of participants in nutrition projects, and the transportation needs of volunteers serving the projects, are recognized in working out policies for the use of gasoline.

The third objective is to develop an action program designed to relate to the nutrition projects resources in such areas as recreation, education, and health and welfare counseling, and referral services.

In some instances the expenditures of comparatively small sums of money under either title III or title VII can result in building bridges between the older persons participating in nutrition projects and other services.

In other instances these bridges can be built without the expenditure of additional funds.

This is another area where the Interdepartmental Task Force on Nutrition can be of substantial assistance.

The fourth objective is to continue and to strengthen training programs for participants in nutrition projects.

These programs have been and will continue to be designed to assist in the implementation of the provisions of title VII and to provide an understanding of the issues which confront persons working in the field of aging.

From September 1973, through January 1974, 733 persons have participated in nutrition training session sponsored by the Administration on Aging; it is estimated that an additional 567 will participate in similar programs by the end of fiscal year 1974, June 30.

Opportunities will be provided for followup training of a few days' duration after persons have been engaged in the operation of nutrition projects for a period of time.

In addition, plans are being developed to provide continuing opportunities for training in the field of aging in educational institutions, such as community colleges, located in the areas where both title III and title VII projects are underway.

The fifth objective is to monitor and assess, working through the State agencies on aging, the nutrition projects with the end in view of determining whether their programs are contributing to the major objectives set forth in title VII.

We believe that an early emphasis on this function is important in order to identify both the strengths and weaknesses of the concepts embodied in legislation and the steps taken to implement those concepts.

We also believe that this function is important in order to make it clear to all concerned that the Federal Government intends to follow-through on a provision such as the one incorporated in title VII; namely, that the States shall "provide assurances that, to the extent feasible, grants will be awarded to projects operated by and serving the needs of minority Indian and limited English-speaking eligible individuals in proportion to their numbers in the State."

Many questions relative to this program will have to remain unanswered until it has been in operation for a longer period of time.

Both the House and Senate committee in reporting the proposed title VII to their respective bodies referred to the desirability of initially providing for a 2-year authorization for the program.

The House committee stated that "the original 3-year authorization was amended to 2 years by the committee so as to permit an opportunity for evaluation of the nutrition projects by the Congress at an early date."

The Senate committee taking note of possible legislation relative to title III stated that it "limited the authorization of appropriations in S. 1163 to 2 years so that the nutrition program provided therein can be evaluated at an early date with a view to the proper role of this program in any broader scheme that may be proposed hereafter."

As the committee knows we are now in the process of implementing the new title III.

If the authorization is extended for 1 year as the administration recommends it means that we will be in the middle of the second year of operation when the issue again comes before the Congress.

This would be an opportune time for evaluation.

At the same time, the other provisions of the Older Americans Act will be before the Congress thus providing the opportunity of considering simultaneously our operating experiences under both titles III and VII.

Mr. Chairman we look forward to the opportunity of working with the Congress, the States and other public and private bodies in continuing to implement a program which is capable of replacing despair with hope in the lives of many older persons.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much Dr. Flemming, for a very helpful statement and I would like now to put a few questions to you, sir.

It is estimated that some 5 to 8 million older persons are in need of nutritional services and in your testimony you indicated when fully operational title VII will make possible the serving of but 212,000 daily meals.

What about the other, I suppose, 95 percent of the elderly in need of such services?

Mr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, I know that various figures have been used as to the number of persons that could profit from a program of this kind. As you appreciate, up to the present time no research project has provided a firm basis for estimating the number of persons who could profit; and any existing estimates, of course, have been arrived at oftentimes by persons whose opinions I respect, by subjective judgments that a given percentage of older persons, 60 or older, might need such services.

I feel that if the total strategy for title VII is put into place during the remainder of fiscal 1974 and operates throughout fiscal 1975, we will have a much clearer idea of the number of older persons it will serve with the resources now available to the departments and agencies involved in this strategy. We will begin to obtain answers to questions such as the following: To what extent can we use title VII funds as a multiplier by using them to start projects and then increase the number of participants of the projects by using resources available, for example, under the Food and Nutrition Services of the Department of Agriculture and the Social Services titles of the Social Security Act?

At the same time as we implement that portion of title III of the Older Americans Act, which calls for the development at the area level of current lists of older persons in need of services and opportunities, we will be developing a much firmer base for estimating the number of persons who should be reached by the national policy on nutrition as set forth in title VII.

As you recognize, Mr. Chairman, we believe that with our present funds we can serve about 200,000 meals 5 days a week on an annual basis. We do not yet know how many people will be involved in these programs. When we get our first full quarterly report, we will begin to develop figures which will indicate the number of persons that are being served through those projects.

There isn't any question in my mind at all but that the Government must confront the question that you addressed to me. I feel that I will be in a better position to respond to the question if we have some opportunity to evaluate the two aspects of the program set forth in title VII, namely the direct delivery of meals through funds provided by title VII and then the coordination of the other resources of the Federal Government as well as the public and private sectors at the State and local levels.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I take it from that response, Dr. Flemming, there is no doubt in your mind that there will for some time continue to be a need for a program of this kind for a good many more older Americans, than can be served under the present funding for the program?

Mr. FLEMMING. There is no question at all in my mind but that we have just started to deal with this need.

How many persons will be affected by this program is a question that I think we will be able to answer a few months hence.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I was interested in what you said a moment ago about the availability of foods from the Department of Agriculture and I noted on page 4 of your statement reference to your just having established an Interdepartmental Task Force on Nutrition within the framework, to quote you, "of Cabinet-level Committee on Aging."

Can you tell us how much money is currently being made available under section 707 of the act, which is the surplus commodities section providing such commodities, of surplus commodities as designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, for nutrition projects?

Mr. FLEMMING. We have started to collect that information even ahead of our first quarterly report and as soon as we have it, which will be within the next few days, I will be very glad to furnish it for the record. The quarterly report will call for that on a regular basis. Also, as you probably recognize, Mr. Chairman, we still have not had an opportunity to estimate the impact of the food stamp program on title VII because the Department of Agriculture has not yet issued its final regulations under the law which makes programs such as title VII programs eligible for food stamps.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I appreciate your intention to make available, if I understood you right, information in response to my question on this matter. I appreciate it all the more because I was most distressed to see in this morning's New York Times a story indicating that an internal memorandum to Secretary Butz recommended that the Agriculture Department stop procuring food commodities for schools, orphanages, and disaster victims.

Senator McGovern in a statement noted this memorandum was written by one Clayton Yeutter, Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Consumer Services, who proposed, to quote the UPI dispatch, " * * * that the Government get out of distributing food by June 30 next year."

Senator McGovern said in a criticism of the Secretary's proposal that it would work hardship on orphanages, schools, disaster victims, older Americans and institutions serving them, and especially the most undernourished among us.

I can't think of a more timely subject, Dr. Flemming, for you to bring as item No. 1 on the agenda of your new Interdepartmental Task Force on Nutrition. I think you should get ahold of my beloved fellow Hoosierite, Mr. Butz, and tell him that is a lot of baloney. I am sure Secretary Butz is aware of this since he must have read the New York Times.

[The article referred to follows:]

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1974]

BUTZ URGED TO END COMMODITY PROJECT FOR CHILD NUTRITION

WASHINGTON, Feb. 12 (UPI).—An internal memorandum to Earl L. Butz, the Secretary of Agriculture, that the Agriculture Department stop procuring food commodities for schools, orphanages and disaster victims, Senator George McGovern said today.

The memorandum, made public by the South Dakota Democrat, is from Clayton Yeutter, Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Consumer Services, and proposed that the Government get out of the business of buying and distributing food by June 30, 1975.

Senator McGovern said if the Yeutter proposal was implemented, "it would work real hardships on orphan homes, school children and school budgets, disaster victims and relief agencies, older Americans and the institutions serving them, and especially the most undernourished among us."

To forestall this, Mr. McGovern has introduced legislation extending the authority of the Agriculture Department—due to expire next June 30—to buy commodities at the market price, even if it is above full parity.

LEGISLATION OPPOSED

Mr. Yuetter recommended "all-out opposition to the McGovern legislation" and warned Secretary Butz that, "if it should pass, we'll be in the commodity procurement business forever."

Under the 1973 farm bill, the commodity distribution program for families will end June 30, or shortly thereafter, leaving commodity programs only for child nutrition, institutions and foreign distribution.

According to the memo released by Senator McGovern, Mr. Yuetter recommended a slow ending of institution programs in the current fiscal year "as much as possible, thereby minimizing the flak that will be received if and when complete termination takes place."

"Distribution to the schools should be reduced dramatically, and the shortfall replaced by cash, as is already permitted by law," the memorandum continued. "This, too, will reduce the shock if distribution is completely terminated on June 30, 1975."

Mr. FLEMMING. I will be glad to check up on that and the information we are now getting will be helpful in discussing the matter with Agriculture. It will show to what degree some of our projects are dependent on that particular source.

[The information referred to follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1974.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,

Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At the hearing before your subcommittee on the proposed extension of Title VII of the Older Americans Act, you requested:

- (1) information on the use of surplus commodities in the Title VII program; and
- (2) a summary of how State Agencies on Aging utilized the Title VII funds available for State administration of the Title VII program during fiscal year 1974.

39 States have one or more nutrition projects participating in the Department of Agriculture's Surplus Commodities Program. Fifteen States have no nutrition projects participating (American Samoa and the Trust Territories of the Pacific are not participating in the Title VII program at this time).

The estimated dollar value of the commodities used by Title VII projects from the inception of the program in the summer of 1973 through February 28, 1974 amounts to \$182,101. The estimated dollar value of commodities used in each State is shown on Attachment A.

The list of types of commodity foods used by nutrition projects through the Surplus Commodity Program is shown on Attachment B.

The amount of fiscal year 1973 Title VII funds used by State Agencies on Aging for State administration of the Title VII program is \$923,497, or only .9% of the \$99.6 million that was allotted to States for Title VII (as you recall, States could have used up to 10% of the funds for purposes of State administration). Attachment C shows a distribution of the \$923,497 used by the States.

Finally, Congressman Peyser requested at the hearing specific information about the status of the Title VII program in his district. I have sent a letter to the Congressman providing him with this data, and have attached a copy (Attachment D) for your information.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner on Aging.

Enclosures.

ATTACHMENT A

	<i>Estimated value of surplus com- modities</i>
Total	182, 101
Region I	7, 351
Connecticut	843
Maine	3, 678
Massachusetts	(1)
New Hampshire	556
Rhode Island	98
Vermont	2, 176
Region II	33, 523
New Jersey	404
New York	129
Puerto Rico	32, 744
Virgin Islands	216
Region III	8, 860
Delaware	226
District of Columbia	(1)
Maryland	320
Pennsylvania	6, 500
Virginia	1, 310
West Virginia	504
Region IV	5, 172
Alabama	(1)
Florida	(1)
Georgia	200
Kentucky	(1)
Mississippi	(1)
North Carolina	2, 607
South Carolina	453
Tennessee	1, 912
Region V	16, 300
Illinois	300
Indiana	(1)
Michigan	9, 000
Minnesota	(1)
Ohio	5, 000
Wisconsin	2, 000
Region VI	11, 018
Arkansas	(1)
Louisiana	(1)
New Mexico	(1)
Oklahoma	11, 018
Texas	(1)
Region VII	9, 028
Iowa	2, 220
Kansas	(1)
Missouri	3, 098
Nebraska	3, 710

ATTACHMENT A—Continued

	<i>Estimated value of surplus com- modities</i>
Region VIII-----	4, 628
Colorado-----	780
Montana-----	575
North Dakota-----	3, 000
South Dakota-----	(¹)
Utah-----	273
Wyoming-----	(¹)
Region IX-----	78, 866
American Samoa-----	(²)
Arizona-----	4, 536
California-----	7, 728
Guam-----	1, 200
Hawaii-----	17, 000
Nevada-----	48, 402
Trust Territory-----	(²)
Region X-----	7, 355
Alaska-----	342
Idaho-----	979
Oregon-----	5, 505
Washington-----	529

¹ Not used.² Not applicable.

ATTACHMENT B

The Types of Commodities being used by the States are:

Grains: Rice, All Purpose Flour, Baking Flour, Whole Wheat Flour, Corn Meal.

Dairy Products: Powdered Milk, Powdered Skim Milk, Butter, Egg Mix.

Noodles: Spaghetti, Macaroni, Noodles.

Cereals: Oatmeal, Rolled Oats, Rolled Wheat, Bulgar.

Oils: Salad Oil, Vegetable Oil, Cooking Oil, Lard.

Vegetables and Fruits: Grits, Lentils, Split Peas, Dried Beans, Grapefruit.

Miscellaneous: Peanut Butter, Mayonnaise, Canned Chicken.

ATTACHMENT C

STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATION COSTS

	Fiscal year 1973 title VII allotment	Fiscal year 1973 title VII administration funds used	Percent of fiscal year 1973 allotment
Total-----	99, 600, 000	923, 497	0.9
Region I-----	6, 306, 056	29, 186	.4
Connecticut-----	1, 358, 465	0	0
Maine-----	533, 588	0	0
Massachusetts-----	2, 885, 875	11, 091	.4
New Hampshire-----	509, 376	0	0
Rhode Island-----	509, 376	18, 095	.4
Vermont-----	509, 376	0	0
Region II-----	13, 715, 110	180, 456	.1
New Jersey-----	3, 308, 520	90, 000	.3
New York-----	9, 231, 300	0	0
Puerto Rico-----	908, 590	87, 956	10.0
Virgin Islands-----	246, 500	2, 500	.1

STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATION COSTS—Continued

	Fiscal year 1973 title VII allotment	Fiscal year 1973 title VII administration funds used	Percent of fiscal year 1973 allotment
Region III.....	11,491,739	304,063	3.0
Delaware.....	493,000	0	0
District of Columbia.....	504,376	0	0
Maryland.....	1,519,907	77,866	5.1
Pennsylvania.....	6,098,595	208,397	3.4
Virginia.....	1,846,299	0	0
West Virginia.....	934,562	17,800	1.9
Region IV.....	15,803,094	161,059	1.0
Alabama.....	1,616,973	50,000	3.0
Florida.....	4,704,547	0	0
Georgia.....	1,856,232	13,000	.7
Kentucky.....	1,549,402	43,880	2.8
Mississippi.....	1,076,753	0	0
North Carolina.....	2,118,145	0	0
South Carolina.....	902,579	41,500	4.6
Tennessee.....	1,888,463	12,679	.7
Region V.....	19,662,562	42,500	.2
Illinois.....	5,023,616	500	0
Indiana.....	2,259,936	0	0
Michigan.....	3,634,549	0	0
Minnesota.....	1,875,385	42,000	2.2
Ohio.....	4,731,013	0	0
Wisconsin.....	2,137,862	0	0
Region VI.....	9,430,123	13,811	.1
Arkansas.....	1,098,667	0	0
Louisiana.....	1,471,149	3,811	.1
New Mexico.....	309,376	0	0
Oklahoma.....	1,419,710	0	0
Texas.....	4,931,221	10,000	.2
Region VII.....	6,122,306	110,307	1.8
Iowa.....	1,521,231	96,308	6.3
Kansas.....	1,216,000	0	0
Missouri.....	2,586,898	0	0
Nebraska.....	798,177	13,999	1.7
Region VIII.....	2,994,974	0	0
Colorado.....	915,222	0	0
Montana.....	509,376	0	0
North Dakota.....	493,000	0	0
South Dakota.....	509,376	0	0
Utah.....	493,000	0	0
Wyoming.....	75,000	0	0
Region IX.....	10,539,027	0	0
American Samoa.....	0	0	0
Arizona.....	835,738	0	0
California.....	8,454,412	0	0
Guam.....	246,500	0	0
Hawaii.....	509,376	0	0
Nevada.....	493,000	0	0
Trust Territory.....	0	0	0
Region X.....	3,625,009	82,115	2.3
Alaska.....	493,000	0	0
Idaho.....	509,376	10,870	2.1
Oregon.....	1,067,365	14,642	1.4
Washington.....	1,555,268	56,603	3.6

ATTACHMENT D

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1974.

Hon. PETER A. PEYSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEYSER: At the hearing of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor relative to the extension of Title VII of the Older Americans Act, you requested information on the status of the Title VII program in your district.

As of this date, one project has been funded for its first year of operation at a level of \$85,667. This Title VII project is located in Yonkers, and it operates two congregate meal sites. One site is located in the Salvation Army facility and will serve 75 meals a day when fully operational. The other site is located at St. Augustine Episcopal Church and it will also serve 75 meals a day when fully operational.

The New York State Agency on Aging has reported that this project will be fully operational and serving 150 meals a day by the end of March 1974.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner on Aging.

MR. BRADEMAS. We try to maintain up-to-date oversight in this committee.

I have other questions, but want to yield to my colleagues to enable them to put some questions and then I will come back.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Peyser.

MR. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize for missing your testimony, though I have had opportunity now to review it.

DR. FLEMMING, there is one thing I would like to know about. I understand that 665 nutrition projects are now basically underway actually in the States. Do we have at this time, or is it too early, any specific projects that we could, say, select and examine and see just what type of projects they are, and who they were reaching? I represent the New York City area and, of course, I am interested to see what in that area—where there is such a great need—is happening. Do you have any information on that?

MR. FLEMMING. We would be very glad to identify for you the projects underway in your congressional district. We can do that for any of the congressional districts if the members of the committee would like to have us do so.

MR. PEYSER. I think this would be worthwhile for any of us to have. Can you describe at this time any of these projects, such as where they are being undertaken, not by location, but are these areas that they are setting up food programs in buildings or in centers and what basically is involved? Do you have any information on that at this time?

MR. FLEMMING. Well, the States are following the suggestion or the directive in the law as well as in the regulations and are utilizing churches, schools, and other institutional facilities as sites for the delivery of the meals.

I think you will find in your particular district that a utilization is being made of existing facilities operated by institutions such as the churches and the schools.

MR. PEYSER. I would appreciate it, as you suggested you could do. if you would make available some information to us on this specific area so that we would take a look. I know some members of the com-

mittee, myself included, would like to visit and examine some of these projects. I would like to see firsthand what is actually happening, but I have to first know where they are located. I am sure the other members would as well.

Mr. FLEMMING. We would be delighted to have you do that and have you share your reactions with us as to what you observe. This, in turn, would be very helpful to us in administering the program.

Mr. PEYSER. I would be delighted to do that.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mrs. Grasso.

Mrs. GRASSO. Thank you for your testimony. I want to tell you I have tried to visit as many of the centers in my district as possible. I have shared with the people their enthusiasm for the program. There has been volunteer assistance and our agencies have been utilized effectively and well.

One of the questions I would like to ask at this time is why does the administration feel that the authorization should only be extended for 1 year, even though this is an idea whose time has come?

Mr. FLEMMING. In my opening statement I endeavored to indicate the reasons back of the recommendation and I would like to make this statement in connection with the recommendation. When the Congress considers a year from now the extension of the Older Americans Act, it will have under consideration the question of how long the act should be extended. In the past it has been normally 3 years and I would certainly recommend that title VII be extended for whatever period of time the Older Americans Act is extended. As I indicated, we believe that a year's time would provide more information than is available today on the operation of title VII and a year from now it would be possible to consider title III and title VII together and to consider the operating experiences that we have had under both titles.

I certainly want to make it clear that I would never think of recommending that the title VII program be stopped a year from now. My thought is that a year from now it would be extended for whatever period the entire Older Americans Act is extended.

Mrs. GRASSO. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. I just want to say that those centers that are in operation are most effective, not only, as you say, from the nutrition point of view, but from the standpoint of morale. The senior citizens meet there and have found a place to come. But the senior citizens of my area have a problem of transportation. Many people in my area have to take at least three buses to get to a senior citizens' center. It is very discouraging.

I can only give you the problem. I cannot give you the answer.

Mr. FLEMMING. Thank you, Congressman Lehman. We, of course, recognize this as a major problem and, as I indicated in my testimony, we are working on it. I suspect when we have the opportunity of analyzing the way in which various projects use the 20 percent that is allowed for supporting services, we will discover that a good share of that money is used in order to cover transportation costs.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Biaggi.

Mr. BIAGGI. I have no questions of Dr. Flemming, but I would like to ask the Chair a question in connection with that article he read in the Times. What was the rationale offered for the discontinuance of the purchase by the Government?

Mr. BRADEMAs. The article to which I made reference, Mr. Biaggi, quotes the memo as saying that Assistant Secretary Yeutter recommended ending institution programs in the current fiscal year slowly "as much as possible, thereby minimizing the flak that will be received if and when complete termination takes place."

I interrupt the quotation to observe that I think we have already begun to launch some of that flak.

Mr. Yeutter goes on to say, "Distribution to the schools should be reduced dramatically and the shortfall replaced by cash as is already permitted by law. This, too, will reduce the shock if distribution is terminated on June 30, 1975."

Then Mr. Yeutter recommended, "All-out opposition to the McGovern legislation,"—referring to Senator McGovern's bill that would extend the authority of the Agriculture Department, which is set to expire next June to buy commodities at the market price even if it is above full parity.

Then Mr. Yeutter—I guess this is most on target to your question, Mr. Biaggi—warned Secretary Butz, again referring to Senator McGovern's bill, "if it should pass, we will be in the commodity procurement business forever."

I don't note any indication of Mr. Yeutter's awareness that people eat forever, but that is the best I can give you.

Mr. BIAGGI. We recognize that some people don't eat as long as they would like, life being what life is, but the fact is it does make a point. The Government being in the procurement business, frankly, doesn't excite me. My experience with the Defense Department in that connection has been enlightening and kind of leads to Mr. Yeutter's contention that they don't purchase properly. The whole procedure in that connection leaves a great deal to be desired.

They cannot compete effectively with industry and, in short, the central buying that inevitably results produces much difficulty. I am not saying that the purchases shouldn't be made and the supplies provided, that is not what I am saying. What I am suggesting is that alternate methods could well be looked into and I think experience with other agencies might sustain an intensive inquiry before we abandon Mr. Yeutter's suggestion.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I think, just commenting on it, my own view is that I can't think of a more sensible way to take advantage of commodities that may be available than by purchasing them for use in schools, orphanages, disaster victims, and older persons. If we can develop some alternative methods of procuring the foodstuffs requisite to provide for the nutritional needs of persons in these various situations, I am certainly willing to listen to them and, in fact, to indicate my sympathy with one of the points the gentleman from New York has just made.

I just look at all those incredible cost overruns in the Defense Department, to which my colleague made reference.

By getting a little integrity built into the military procurement process in this country, we could probably save enough money to feed the whole Republic, not simply the groups I have just named.

Let me, Dr. Flemming, ask you a couple of other questions. What kind of assistance is being provided to the persons who are receiving meals under the program; that is to say, is any attention presently being given to such questions as nutrition education or shopping assistance? Do you have any comments on that?

Mr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, the regulations, of course, include services of that nature within the 20-percent allocation for supporting services. We do not yet have breakdowns from the projects and the sites indicating just how that 20 percent either is being used or how they plan to use it.

As I indicated, our regulations do require the outreach service. That is No. 1 in priority, and I think we are all in agreement on that.

As I indicated in answer to an earlier question, I assume that the next largest expenditure will probably be in the area of transportation, but again, when we get the first quarterly reports, we will be able to provide you with that kind of information.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Speaking of transportation, I was pleased, Dr. Flemming, to see that in your statement you made some allusion to an effort on your part, working with Secretary Weinberger, to look into the transportation needs of the participants, as well as volunteers. I hope as you make these studies and develop some judgments, you will keep the subcommittee posted, because I think that the current shortages of gasoline can impose very severe hardships not only on participants in the program, but on the volunteers who may be driving.

Have you any early comments to make on that problem?

Mr. FLEMMING. Yes, I would like to make this comment. As you know, I had the opportunity during World War II of serving as a member of the War Manpower Commission and chairing the Labor-Management Committee of the Commission. During that period, we were up against similar problems. I think I learned that groups coming in with broad generalizations as to their needs didn't get very far. So we are working through the State agencies and the project directors in an effort to get specific evidence as to the problems they are up against right now. As we get that evidence, we will be very happy to share it with the committee, and of course, along with Secretary Weinberger, will use it as an effort to get action within the executive branch.

In addition, we are beginning to develop information as to the kind of advice, help, and assistance we can give to State agencies and to project directors when they run up against it. That is, where should they go within the area? Where should they go within State government? If that doesn't produce results, where should they go in Federal regional offices and so on.

I feel we have a very real obligation to act as advocates on every possible occasion in behalf of older persons in connection with this issue.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am glad to hear you say that. I have just written a letter to Mr. William Simon to express my own concern that he in his position as Director of the Federal Energy Office be sensitive to the needs of various groups in our society who we may call vulnerable, such as the elderly, young children, and the handicapped. In that connection, I wonder if, in the interdepartmental meeting to which you made reference, the Federal Energy Office is represented.

Mr. FLEMMING. They are not at this point, but one of the things I plan to do, working with Secretary Weinberger, is to have this issue discussed at a meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Aging and to invite Mr. Simon or his representative to attend that meeting.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am glad to hear that in view of our colloquy.

Let me turn to another question that has to do with administration at the State level of these programs. We are hearing from some States with a medium-sized population such as Minnesota and Maryland, that they need more funds for State administration in order to effectively and adequately administer the nutrition program. What can you tell us about that problem?

Mr. FLEMMING. As you know, the States were authorized to use this year up to 10 percent of the funds that have been made available to them for administration. Our latest report indicates that they have used \$1 million. In other words, they were authorized to use up to \$10 million and they have used only \$1 million. I think that is probably the final report because our reports indicate that all of the funds have now been allocated.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Is there any pattern, Dr. Flemming, in terms of the kind of States that seem to need less moneys, as distinguished from the kinds of States that seem to require more moneys, for administrative purposes, or is there not?

Mr. FLEMMING. I am not aware of a pattern. I would be glad to supply it for the record, a State-by-State breakdown as to the amount of money they have used for administration.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you. In that connection, have you any comments on whether or not it would be advisable for States to be allowed to submit one State operating plan for both titles III and VII—for the purpose possibly of eliminating some of the administrative costs, as well as stimulating a greater degree of cooperation between these two programs?

Mr. FLEMMING. As they submit their plans for 1975, they can submit at one and the same time their plan for title III and for title VII. I am aware of the legislative history in connection with this issue. As you know, the present law provides that the State may take the initiative in having agreements worked out between title III and title VII agencies, under which title VII would work in cooperation with title III.

In our regulations, we have done everything we can to encourage volunteer agreements of that kind. I look forward to the day when the title VII operation in an area is under the umbrella of the title III area of the agency on aging.

When I say that, I want to make it clear that I feel that for the indefinite future, title VII should, in effect, be a separate line item, that there shouldn't be any utilization of funds appropriated for title VII used for title III operations. On the other hand, if we can get this kind of cooperation, some of the resources available under title III can be used to provide some of the supporting services authorized under title VII and, to the extent that happens, more money will be released under title VII for food for older persons.

So I think that together we should work on encouraging this type of an interrelationship. But I do know that there are some persons who are concerned that title VII might get swallowed up in title III. I myself would oppose that. If the Congress makes it clear that title VII is to be handled as a line item, then we could profitably work out an arrangement under which title VII would operate under the umbrella of title III.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask you a question about a matter that comes up in respect to title VII also, that is regulations on food stamps. Now I understand that the proposed regulations for the use of food stamps in group meal services require that the meal service be recognized by the IRS as a tax-exempt organization and I ask the question, would this not pose some problems for current title VII projects that have not yet attained such status?

Mr. FLEMMING. Yes; it could. Most of the nonprofit organizations that will be utilized under title VII will undoubtedly have qualified under the IRS regulations, but I think we might take up with Agriculture the possibility of a phasing-in period. I think we would all agree that the nonprofit organization should ultimately qualify under the Internal Revenue Service regulations. But some of those that have just come into being under title VII should be given a period of time to establish their qualification.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask you, Dr. Flemming, another kind of question about another set of relationships. I refer here to the relationships between the nutrition programs and the supplemental security income alert. For example, could SSI alert not assist the nutrition projects in locating older persons who are hard to reach and who, indeed, may be in the greatest need of nutrition services. And could not SSI alert help indicate where nutrition project sites might be located?

Mr. FLEMMING. There is no question about that. We have built into SSI alert a procedure under which the volunteer who makes the contact with the isolated older person is given the opportunity of identifying the fact that the person could profit from a nutrition program as well as from other services. I am confident that an analysis of the returns from the volunteers will at times identify certain locations where there ought to be a nutrition program and where one is not underway.

We are going to do everything we can to build on the foundation that is developed by SSI alert in such a manner as to relate the volunteers and the other sources that are growing out of that project to the total program in the field of aging. I think that this presents some really exciting possibilities.

The SSI alert is moving ahead. My latest report indicated that there are now just under 20,000 volunteers that are out making contacts. I am confident that number is going to increase considerably over the period of the next few weeks.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you another question, Dr. Flemming, that derives from the SSI program generally, namely, to what extent will social services that are provided along with the title VII projects be considered as in-kind income under SSI, thereby causing reductions in SSI benefits to the elderly?

Mr. FLEMMING. That is an issue that the Department has been working on. It will not be counted as income, as I understand it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. What about other social services provided to elderly SSI recipients?

Mr. FLEMMING. My understanding, as the matter now stands, is that they will not be counted as income.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We thank you for coming and giving us the benefit of your testimony.

The subcommittee stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in this room when we shall conduct our second day of hearings. We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m. the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m. of the following day, Thursday, February 14, 1974.]

OLDER AMERICANS NUTRITION PROGRAM

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas and Lehman.

Staff members present: Jack Duncan, counsel; Gladys Walker, clerk; and Martin LaVor, minority legislative associate.

Mr. BRADEMAs. The Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor will come to order for the purpose of continuing hearings on H.R. 11105 and related bills to extend the nutrition program for the elderly, title VII of the Older Americans Act.

The Chair is pleased to note that yesterday the bill we are considering received the strong endorsement of the American Association of Retired Persons as well as a more limited expression of enthusiasm from the administration.

Today we are pleased to have with us a Member of Congress who has been a leader in attempts to lift the quality of life for the elderly, and is particularly identified with the nutrition program for the elderly, of which he was an original sponsor.

I speak of course, of our distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable Claude Pepper, who will be our first witness this morning.

Following Congressman Pepper will be Dr. Bruce Quint, executive director of the Senior Centers of Dade County, Inc.

Then we shall hear from an old friend of the Chair's, a man who has been of significant assistance to the members of this subcommittee in the past, Mr. Harry Walker, commissioner on aging for the State of Maryland, and director of the National Association of State Directors on Aging.

Following Mr. Walker, we shall hear from a panel of nutrition project directors.

I understand, as well, that several of the members of the panel have brought along with them some of the citizens who participate in the nutrition programs they direct.

The Chair would just note, finally, that our witness list today is a lengthy one and the Chair hopes, therefore, to the extent possible, the witnesses can summarize their prepared statements so that we might have time to put some questions to them.

We will, of course, include the full written statements in the official record of the hearings.

Mr. Pepper, it is a great pleasure to welcome you before this subcommittee and I hope you will go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. BRUCE QUINT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SENIOR CENTERS OF DADE COUNTY, INC., MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

First, I want to thank the able chairman for his kind words of introduction and particularly to express my gratitude for the report given me of the generous remarks in reference to me yesterday.

I am sorry I couldn't be here yesterday to have enjoyed the hearing that I am sure was complete, according to the reports that I had. I particularly thank my friend and the distinguished chairman for his kind words.

He knows how heartily I reciprocate his friendship.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have an opportunity to appear before you and the distinguished members of this subcommittee under the auspicious circumstances that have been created by the Administration on Aging's implementation of title VII, by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming's evaluation of the current program as expressed in his testimony before this subcommittee yesterday and by former Commissioner John B. Martin's testimony representing the views of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons.

I am confident, in view of the legislative history of this legislation, that you and the members of your subcommittee most particularly share my pleasure that our Federal Government is more than ever in our Nation's history committed to preserving the health, independence, and dignity of older Americans by offering the nutrition program for the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, when we recently introduced the Pepper-Brademas bill, H.R. 10551, to extend and expand the nutrition program, we provided for minimum increases to expand and continue the program.

In view of the increases in food prices, the projected shortages of food supplies, and most particularly in view of the energy crisis which has resulted in gasoline shortages that threaten the transportation element of the program to as great an extent as food shortages and prices, I wish to concur with Commissioner Martin's recommendation that the authorized sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, be set at \$200 million, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, be set at \$250 million.

There is now strong justification for such an increase.

First, there is the fact that the authorization in the original law for fiscal year 1974 was \$150 million.

Such an increase is based on sound budgeting principles which clearly dictate that when the evidence of need for a program is undisputed and the program is properly implemented and evaluated, an increase is necessary to further the program objectives and stimulate continuing matching support.

In this case, under the distinguished leadership of Dr. Flemming, the Commission on Aging is close on target in implementing the 1973 projects having allocated nearly \$100 million of the funds appropriated for 1973 as of December 31, 1973. The State and local support, and the participating older Americans' enthusiasm for the program have been outstanding.

As of February 1, 1974, Dr. Flemming told your committee yesterday, 80,979 meals were being served.

I understand as of March 31, 1974, the number is projected to almost 200,000 meals and soon thereafter the projects will be fully operational serving 212,000 meals per day.

According to our experience in Dade County—and Dr. Quint, director of our Senior Citizens Service, will speak to this right after me—this number of daily meals will reach only about 2.5 percent of the low-income elderly based on Dade County's approximate 2,500 meals per day.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we see even when we maximize the program after it is fully in effect in Dade County we will really be reaching only about 2.5 percent of the older Americans of low-income status.

We know there are approximately 4 or 5 million elderly who are living below the poverty level. The increases in authorization I am urging will provide an increased number of meals over our first year's experience because the foundations for the projects have been laid already. Based on our Dade County experience—and we have a population of about 1,300,000 there—I believe the 212,000 meals we are serving on a nationwide basis could be trebled or, in some cases, increased fivefold.

The increases are further justified in view of the fact that we soon will have the benefit of coordinating the SSI outreach programs with title VII. Title III services will soon be implemented and will create additional demands for more title VII projects.

It is sound budgeting practice and sound fiscal and stewardship policy for the Federal Government to increase authorization substantially now for this program to achieve maximum benefits from coordination with other Federal programs, and to continue to stimulate the State and local financial and volunteer support.

The increases in authorizations of \$150 million for 1975, \$200 million for 1976, and \$250 million for 1977 are sound and I believe imperative also in view of a report I have just received from the Comptroller General of the United States, informing me of the amount of revenue-sharing funds which have been allocated to expenditures designated to benefit the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, at my request, the Comptroller selected 250 local governments primarily on the basis of dollar significance and geographical dispersion. The selection included the 50 cities and the 50 counties that received the largest amounts of revenue-sharing funds for calendar year 1972.

These 250 governments received about \$1.658 billion through June 30, 1974, or about 38 percent of the approximately \$4.4 billion distributed to all local governments.

Including interest earnings on the revenue-sharing funds through June 30, 1973, about \$1.688 billion was available for use by the 250 governments.

The necessary legal and procedural steps were taken by 218 of the governments to authorize the expenditure of \$1.374 billion of these funds. The remaining 32 governments had not yet authorized the expenditure of their revenue-sharing funds.

Of the 218 governments, 28 authorized the expenditure of part of their revenue-sharing funds in programs or activities specifically and exclusively for the benefit of the elderly. These authorizations totaled about \$2.9 million, or about two-tenths of 1 percent of the total funds authorized for expenditures by the 218 governments.

In other words, of the 218 governments that devoted any money from their revenue-sharing funds for aid to the elderly, according to the general survey, the total amount allocated was two-tenths of 1 percent of the amount they received or less than \$3 million.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to get much done, it is going to have to come from the Congress and have directives in it that the funds be applied for the benefit of the elderly.

Expenditures range from a low of \$1,000 appropriated by Brighton, Vt., for operating and maintaining a senior citizens center to a high of \$785,716 appropriated by Pima County, Ariz., for purchasing a nursing home used primarily for care of the indigent elderly.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this report dated February 13, 1974, for the record. It confirms my strong belief that we must continue and immediately expand our Federal commitment to the elderly. It justifies my plea to your subcommittee to give earnest consideration to increasing the authorizations I have outlined for title VII as recommended by Mr. Moss.

I will add only in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, you know how strongly I share the high expectations that we have for this program and providing eventually, not only nutritious meals for the people who need to have those meals served in this country, but senior centers where social services and recreational and educational opportunities will be provided and there will be an opportunity for the elderly to enjoy the friendship and association of their fellows that will in a way ease the terrible loneliness which is the curse of so many of the elderly.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I ask that there be incorporated with my statement the report of the Comptroller General to which I referred.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Without objection it will be included.

[The document referred to follows:]

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1974.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: Your November 14, 1973, letter requested that we report on the extent to which general revenue sharing funds are being allocated to programs specifically and exclusively designed to benefit the elderly.

As agreed with your office, we analyzed data we had gathered as of June 30, 1973, on the uses of revenue sharing funds by 250 selected local governments. Although we did not specifically accumulate data on funds allocated by the 250 governments exclusively for the benefit of the elderly, we did obtain data on the types of programs or activities being financed wholly or partially with revenue sharing funds. Accordingly, we believe that from this data we can make a reasonably accurate estimate of the extent to which these governments had allocated the funds to programs specifically intended to assist the elderly.

The Revenue Sharing Act (Public Law 92-512) provided for the distribution of approximately \$30.2 billion to State and local governments for a 5-year program period. The Office of Revenue Sharing, Department of the Treasury, made initial payments under the Revenue Sharing program in December 1972 and had distributed about \$6.6 billion through June 30, 1973, to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and about 38,000 units of local government. Approximately one-third of the funds were distributed to the States and the remaining two-thirds to local governments.

One of the objectives of revenue sharing is to provide State and local governments with flexibility in using the funds. Accordingly, the act provides only general guidance as to how local governments can use the funds by requiring them to be spent within a specified, but quite extensive, list of priority areas. The priority areas are: maintenance and operating expenses for public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor or aged, and financial administration. In addition, a local government may use the funds for any ordinary and necessary capital expenditure.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS INCLUDED IN ANALYSIS

We selected the 250 governments primarily on the basis of dollar significance and geographical dispersion. The selection included the 50 cities and the 50 counties that received the largest amounts of revenue sharing funds for calendar year 1972. The 250 governments received about \$1.658 billion through June 30, 1973, or about 38 percent of the approximate \$4.4 billion distributed to all local governments.

FUNDS USED TO ASSIST THE ELDERLY

Including interest earnings on the revenue sharing funds through June 30, 1973, about \$1.688 billion was available for use by the 250 governments. The necessary legal and procedural steps were taken by 218 of the governments to authorize the expenditure of \$1.374 billion of these funds. The remaining 32 governments did not authorize the expenditure of any of the funds.

Of the 218 governments, 28 authorized the expenditure of part of their revenue sharing funds in programs or activities specifically and exclusively for the benefit of the elderly. These authorizations totaled about \$2.9 million, or about two-tenths of 1 percent of the total funds authorized for expenditure by the 418 governments.

Expenditures designated to benefit the elderly ranged from a low of \$1,000 appropriated by Brighton, Vermont, for operating and maintaining a senior citizens center to a high of \$785,716 appropriated by Pima county, Arizona, for purchasing a nursing home used primarily for care of the indigent elderly. Pima county had obtained the nursing home under a lease-purchase arrangement and used revenue sharing funds to exercise the purchase option.

The other 26 governments were financing a variety of programs for the elderly. The more significant programs included the following:

Jersey City appropriated \$400,000 to finance a public transportation discount program for senior citizens.

Sacramento county appropriated \$104,254 to finance a project being undertaken by the Sacramento County Legal Aid Society to provide legal services to the elderly.

Jefferson county, Alabama, authorized use of \$450,000 in revenue sharing funds received through June 30, 1973, to add an 83-bed wing to the county nursing home for the indigent aged. An additional \$150,000 was to be used to acquire equipment for the new wing.

Kansas City earmarked \$100,000 for a nutrition program for the elderly that was expected to provide food for 600 persons a day.

Clark county, Nevada, appropriated \$125,000 to acquire a building for use as a senior citizens center. The center will provide hobby, recreational, and social activities. An additional \$25,000 was earmarked for renovating the building. This project was being jointly undertaken with Las Vegas, which was participating in the initial capital costs and will be responsible for operating the center.

LIMITATIONS ON DATA

The data on the extent to which the selected governments used revenue sharing funds to assist the elderly was obtained primarily from governments' financial records and therefore represents the direct uses of the funds. Because of the inherent nature of the Revenue Sharing program, the actual results or effects of the funds may be different from the uses indicated by financial records.

When a recipient government uses revenue sharing to wholly or partially finance a program, which was previously financed or which would have been financed from its own resources, other uses may be made of its own freed resources. Freed local funds may be used for such things as tax reductions, increasing the level of funding for other programs, reducing the amount of outstanding debt, and so forth.

Because of such factors as changing amounts of revenue available to a government from its own sources and changing budgetary priorities, it is exceedingly difficult, and perhaps impossible in some jurisdictions, to objectively identify the actual results or effects of revenue sharing. Accordingly, in considering the information presented in this report, you should be aware that the actual effect the revenue sharing program may have on the local governments' assistance programs for the elderly could be different from that indicated.

We do not plan to make further distribution of this report unless you agree or publicly announce its contents.

We trust the above information is responsive to your needs.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER,
*Deputy Comptroller General
of the United States.*

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Pepper. Particularly I want to thank you for having made available to us the study of the Comptroller General on the use of revenue-sharing funds to assist the elderly—which indicates that less than 1 percent of revenue-sharing funds are being used for the elderly.

In my judgment that is a most significant contribution not only to our understanding of the need for legislation like the Older Americans Act but at least, speaking for myself, the Comptroller General's report represents one example of why I voted against the revenue-sharing program. I have felt that revenue sharing simply makes it easy to overlook at the State and local level the needs of the elderly, the handicapped, of young children, of those whom we may call the vulnerable in our society.

It may be that there are, at State and local government levels all over the country, officials who will be more responsive to the needs of other groups than appears to have been the case in respect of the elderly here, but I think this is really a very significant document you have produced.

I don't know if you have any further comments to make upon the relationship between revenue sharing and the needs of the elderly.

However, if you agree with that assessment, I leave that to you.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I will say I did support the revenue-sharing program and I think perhaps in the Rules Committee I was the critical vote on it. I have been very disappointed in the use made of the revenue-sharing funds by the States and other levels of government of our country.

I think as a whole they have not used those funds as helpfully and meaningfully as they could have.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I have just a couple of other questions, Mr. Pepper.

One of the things that troubled me about the otherwise excellent statement of Dr. Flemming yesterday was his expression of the administration's view that this program should be extended for just 1 year, in order, he said, to give us a better chance to evaluate the program with the rest of the Old Americans Act.

Do you have any comment on that?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, indeed I do. Mr. Chairman, I think that would be a grievous error for the Congress to adopt any such proposal.

This program has already proven itself very unmistakeably. Given the number of people who have been benefitted, as indicated, and the number of people who need these services provided and which the program offers, I think it would be tragic to cut its extension down to 1 year.

What more evaluation do we need than the experiences we have already had in one-half year. We have gotten the operational plans pretty well in effect and by March the number of meals that will be served, according to Dr. Flemming is 212,000 and we know that that is just a small percentage of the number of people who need the benefit of the program.

So I think it would be folly, and I would say worse than that, it would be tragic to terminate a program that has proven itself so meaningfully.

If you could just go out to these centers, as I am sure we have all done, and see these people enjoying the wonderful friendship and happy association, the good, balanced, nutritional meals and paying nothing if they are unable to pay, or 50 cents, as in my area, for that nutritional balanced meal and see the joy on the faces of those people and recognize what it means to them to have that opportunity, you wouldn't think of just extending the life of this bill just 1 year.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I think I understand your position.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAs. And I am sympathetic to it.

Finally I want to observe that the subcommittee will give the most serious consideration to your suggestion that we raise the authorization figures to the levels that you have recommended.

The chair feels somewhat surrounded by Dade County today—and is not at all distressed to be in such circumstances—and so calls upon one of the hardest working members of this subcommittee, Mr. Lehman, for such questions as he may wish to put.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to see my distinguished colleague and friend a member of this committee.

I know the work he is doing.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I don't think anyone who could appear before this committee has made a greater contribution for this kind of program for the elderly American than my distinguished colleague from South Florida.

It's a privilege to be here and listen to him and have his background of information available to this subcommittee.

As you know, with all the joy of those who are able to come and receive these nutritious meals, there is also the frustration of those who arrive there for whom there are not sufficient support services and meals. The other side of the coin is just as bitter as the good side of the coin is joyous and that is the problem this committee and this country will have to deal with.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to attest for the record my knowledge of the keen interest Mr. Lehman has in this program, the many visits he made to the centers, his deep concern for the problem and the valuable contribution he is making toward this matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. The committee should all go down and visit Claude Pepper Tower some day.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am going down to Miami tomorrow morning. That is a visit I hadn't counted on but maybe I will stop off on the way.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad you are going and hope you stay for a while.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you for your fine testimony.

We are now going to turn to hear from Dr. Bruce Quint, executive director for the Senior Centers of Dade County, Inc., Miami, Fla.

Mr. PEPPER. May I say Dr. Quint for 8 months now has been the director of our Senior Centers of Dade County. He has done a magnificent job in the service of our senior citizens and in the service of public interest and I am glad to commend him to your distinguished subcommittee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Dr. QUINT. Thank you, sir, and for Mr. Pepper's brilliant remarks about the program and the comments about myself.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as a director of a rather large direct service program for the elderly, I am often called upon to discuss the various components of our programs and to defend their worth in regard to their viability and impact.

Today I am here to discuss one such program. The title VII nutrition program under the Older Americans Act. Rather than attempt to defend the worth of such a program, I would like to turn the tables a bit. I would like to ask that any person who has knowledge of such nutrition programs and who has witnessed their implementation to defend why they would choose not to be an avid and vigorous supporter of such programs.

Allow me to briefly describe some of the experiences that the Senior Centers of Dade County, Inc., has had with the implementation of its nutrition program under title VII.

Senior Centers of Dade County, Inc., is a private, nonprofit agency that is comprised of eight centers. Each center is located in a low-income area in Miami and, according to the latest census tract data (1970), these areas are heavily populated with persons 60 years of age or older.

Needless to say, we have had very little difficulty in finding eligible individuals for our various programs. In fact, in regard to our nutrition program, we have found that the demand for this program far exceeds our ability to provide sufficient service. To be more specific, we are not able to serve enough hot meals to eligible members.

At present Senior Centers of Dade County has been contracted to serve 800 meals per day. We have approximately 5,000 elderly members at our centers and this number increases every day. Of course, one might comment that it is common knowledge that Miami has a large elderly population. However, I believe anywhere in our Nation it would be the obvious exception rather than the rule where one would find that the title VII nutrition program is sufficiently serving a majority of its potential recipients.

In order to understand the value of such a program, we must briefly address ourselves to the philosophy underlying its inception.

First, it has been well documented that the elderly of our Nation have serious nutritional needs. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated time and again that the elderly often bear the brunt of the consequences of our troubled age. Their fixed incomes have made them lose the battle of inflation.

Our youth-oriented society has forced them to often become second-class citizens; especially in regard to employment. Finally, the great freedom and mobility that individuals are privileged to have in

America has served to disrupt the concept of the traditional family unit and has placed the elderly in a position of being on their own and fending for themselves.

The purpose of title VII is not merely to provide to senior citizens one hot meal per day. It has been designed to offer them one balanced hot meal per day which provides at least one-third the required daily dietary allowances.

This program is further designed to bring elderly persons out of their houses and into a congregate setting so that they are exposed to other senior citizens. It permits them to be exposed to a wide variety of other social services so that the quality of their lives might be uplifted.

Let us speak very frankly: Simply putting one meal in a person's stomach does not appreciably alter a person's lifestyle. But getting an individual to eat a good meal in a congenial social setting and exposing them to other activities such as casework, health service, recreation, and leisure time activities, adult education, et cetera can appreciably alter their lives. Title VII permits us to do just this for our center members.

Please note that title VII provides for one meal per day, 5 days per week. Have you asked yourself what meal participants do for their other meals, and also what they do on days when there is no meal service?

At Senior Centers we provide nutrition education and shopping assistance. Specifically, we attempt to teach the best use of the food dollar—what foods are best to buy and how to prepare them—and we also arrange to take people conveniently to a shopping center because we understand that transportation for the elderly is a major problem.

One of the major concerns of the Older Americans Act is to aid the low-income, isolated, forgotten elderly. I can categorically state that under title VII we at Senior Centers have been able to do just that. And I can further categorically state we have positively and significantly affected many lives.

Of course, programs such as ours do have certain shortcomings. It is for this reason I stand before you today to ask your assistance. The Older Americans Act has permitted us to more substantially reach out and serve a long-time forgotten minority. But we have only begun to scratch the surface.

In Dade County we are allocated funds which permit us to serve meals to only 1 percent of its elderly population. Even our aforementioned supportive social services are extremely limited because of the great pressure we are under to serve more people.

I believe a good example of how well we are doing, and at the same time how we are hurting, is the following: At senior centers the elderly are aware under title VII a hot meal will be provided free of charge if they so desire. This fact then serves as motivation for them to come out of their house (which at times has been likened to a prison) and come down to the congregate meal site.

The elderly also know that there are only so many meals that can be served. They are aware that certain meals have been reserved to those senior citizens who are severely handicapped, seriously senile, and/or who have to be transported in from isolated poverty areas. But they also know that on any given day some people may not show

up so that there may be an available meal for them. On many days, then, we at senior centers are faced with a large group of senior citizens who have to be denied a meal that they so desperately need and desire. Even the lure of our other diverse activities loses some of its meaning and effect. After all, who wants to stay around for a number of activities if you can't eat and are going to be hungry.

The result is that on many occasions a great many of our center members become terribly frustrated. In turn we have lost some eligible program participants and quite frankly have created some negative feelings toward the center. What is so tragic is not that the elderly are frustrated because the program is a poor one, but that the program is so good that they can't get enough of it.

Title VII is successful. The lure of the potential meal has brought the people out of their homes and to our center. We have them. We know what to do with them. But, because of lack of funds and facilities, we haven't been able to do enough for them.

Compounding the problem of not being able to serve enough eligible elderly individuals are certain inconsistencies in the Federal rules and regulations.

For example, since July 1, 1973, no funds are allowed to be used for administrative costs on the State level. In Florida this has seriously impaired their ability to comprehensively administer the program.

Within the guidelines we are told to give priority to those who "cannot afford to eat adequately." However, we are told there can be no means test. In terms of practical issues, this latter regulation has forced us to an untenable situation.

Specifically, because of our limited meals quota, we have to be selective on who we can serve despite the fact we have more than our share of eligible meal participants.

Without a means test we must make a mythical determination of who is less able to afford to eat adequately. Needless to say, we have on occasion offended various individuals. This has then prompted various local officials to question the efficacy of such guidelines.

At this point we are faced with the question: Where do we go from here? Some individuals have suggested that the Federal Government see to it that every elderly person who needs a meal be able to get one. I do not feel that this is the solution.

To attempt to feed all the needy elderly in the country is an exorbitantly expensive task and I don't believe it is realistic for us to assume Congress will or can underwrite such an idea in light of our Nation's extensive financial concerns.

However, permit me to remind you that the value of the title VII nutrition program is not merely to supply one meal per day to the elderly.

The program's value lies in the fact that we are able to lure the elderly away from their home and out of their isolation. We are able to expose them to a wide variety of services and get them interested in their own living condition.

A few statistics that support the value of title VII comes directly from our monthly reports.

For example, in January of 1974, with an 800 meal quota, Senior Centers of Dade County was able to serve 1,624 different persons in the course of the month.

Moreover, these same individuals were involved in other programing as a result of being present for the meal. Our data shows that 564 took part in health services, another 398 were offered counseling and casework, 677 were involved in adult education programs; 760 were provided information and referral services; and all 1,624 were involved in our recreation and leisure time programs.

Congress should not be scared off by the large number of elderly that live in this country. We are developing innovative ways to reach a maximum number of needy elderly at relatively minimum costs, but we have only scratched the surface. It is imperative that our programs be continued and permitted to expand.

In closing, allow me to point out two critical factors: One, title VII allows us to address ourselves to a wide variety of needs of the elderly. The expansion of the program will permit us to see to it that a far greater number of elderly will be served with a minimum of frustration and moral outcry on their part.

Two, perhaps most important, the dividends that are returned on our investment far exceeds our expectations. For every dollar invested we are getting at least \$2 of service in return.

While I do not attempt to disparage other social service programs, I would challenge reliable spokesmen for other programs to demonstrate that their programs have had as great a success as ours in so short a time.

Critics for years have pointed out the limited success and accumulated waste that has been associated with drug programs and poverty programs to name a few.

Title VII in effect is a program without waste. Our success has been remarkable yet our needs have never been as great. From a pure businesslike approach, Congress has everything to gain and nothing to lose by supporting the Older Americans Act. From a social point of view, Congress is obligated to support the elderly. The elderly have been a forgotten minority that have comprised all the other minorities that have received Federal attention.

Finally, allow me to repeat an earlier comment. I would challenge those individuals who have knowledge of title VII nutrition programs and have witnessed their implementation to defend why they would choose not to be avid and vigorous supporters of such outstanding programs.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dr. Quint, for a most thoughtful statement.

Dr. Quint, you indicate in your statement your frustration that frequently more citizens arrive at your center than you are able to feed. Although your program obviously provides other services in addition to nutritional meals. I wonder if you have felt any pressure to concentrate on feeding people without sufficient regard to the quality of the program you are operating?

Dr. QUINT. We have been under a tremendous amount of pressure to expand the program and concentrate on the feeding of the senior citizens and there is no question that the quality of our program suffers when people come down who become discontented because they expect certain services and are not able to get it.

This overlaps into our other programs and dilutes the quality of the programs.

However, the pressure, because of the great number of people has been severe but we have been able with the increased number of people that come down to implement a greater number of programs than we ever had.

Perhaps the most significant thing about our program is that we are getting the people out of their home and into a center. Basically what this forces them to do is get up in the morning, put on their makeup, get dressed, and be presentable for other people.

You know yourself if you get up and just lounge around in the morning, things are pretty dreary. We are able to get them up and involved in social activities which adds a tremendous amount of significance to their lives.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I note also, Dr. Quint, in your statement you observed that although you are required to give priority to those who cannot afford to eat adequately, you are forbidden to impose a means test.

I think you are aware most of the members of this subcommittee have been opposed to a means test and will not be sympathetic to one in the future.

But I wonder if you have any suggestions, in light of your experience, to enable you and your colleagues across the country who administer these programs to concentrate on those with the greatest need while at the same time avoiding a classic means test.

Dr. QUINT. I, myself, am opposed to a means test also. Because of the feed guidelines, however, and because of the great number of people applying for services, we have to use some kind of criteria in order to select those most eligible for the service. This causes us to have certain guidelines that are ambiguous.

I would place more weight on the nutritional needs than others. While many people are among the great poverty level, there are many others existing just above the poverty level. Many people do not know how to prepare their meals because of their eating habits for years, and now they are elderly and their needs have changed and their eating habits no longer produce good health.

I would think that even though there might not be a means test, the fact that most of the nutrition program is geared to the low-income poverty person and most of the centers have outreach into these areas, we will be sure of getting those people whether we have a means test or not.

It is stated that "A person who can afford to eat adequately," but this person may need the meal more than you because we know for a fact this person comes from a poverty area and you don't, but the nutritional needs may be the same.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You made the statement on page 3: "For every dollar invested we are getting at least \$2 of service in return."

I can appreciate how that might be in the nature of a rhetorical statement, but it might also have a more objective basis, and I wonder if you could expand on that.

Dr. QUINT. Yes, it does, and I am glad you asked that question.

The amount of services that are being provided that are being paid for is limited. We have to rely on a tremendous amount of volunteers both from the people who come to the programs as well as from people in the community.

We have in our programs well over \$200,000 worth of free services being given to various centers.

I am not even talking now about the various community programs, the other community resources that are supporting the efforts, for example, in regard to our outreach.

The Dade County Urban Development, they have their social workers out in the communities who are talking to the elderly to get them into our programs.

The Dade County welfare program has their social workers out in the communities also talking about our programs. These people are not being paid by us, but they are able to support the program in a significant way.

We have a great number of nurses, people from the health department, social workers from various universities, teachers, lecturers coming in and, if we had to pay them, it would double the cost of our program.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Finally, I note you say since the first of July of 1973, no moneys have been allowed for administrative complaints on the State level. In addition, we have heard some complaints on this subcommittee that because the Labor-HEW appropriations bill was passed fairly late last year, the first year of full implementation of the program, that many programs at the local level have had a good deal of trouble in getting underway, not having, for example, had enough planning time. I wonder if you have any observation to make with respect to administrative difficulties involved in operating the program?

Dr. QUINT. Our program was fairly fortunate; we were operating under the title IV program for many years, and we didn't have the problems that some of the other countries in Florida have had because they didn't have a foundation from which to work.

The division on aging in Florida was limited in the amount of help they could provide to these people because they didn't have the funds necessary to pay the people who can come down and show them how to set up.

A lot of it in the beginning was trial and error. There was a lot of needless administrative problems that could have been easily solved if the administration did have the funds.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank Dr. Quint for coming up here and for the good job he is doing in the centers in Miami.

I want to ask one question. A couple of the centers we have visited had trouble with vandalism because they are not in the affluent centers of the towns. It doesn't bear directly on the question, but how are you able to deal with this problem, and is it going to be a problem we should provide for in the legislation to prevent these kinds of abuses?

Dr. QUINT. I don't think we will ever satisfactorily solve the problem of crime, particularly with the elderly, as long as the social conditions exist in the areas where the centers are located.

What we have done, I have made contacts with the police department, the housing authority, and with special peer counseling groups where they send people down to the various centers where we have a problem with crime and have these people stay on a volunteer basis and talk to the teenagers we know are involved in the activities.

Mr. LEHMAN. They still are vandalized from time to time?

Dr. QUINT. Yes; as you know, if a person wants to commit a crime, just somebody coming down and talking to them isn't necessarily a deterrent to that crime.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you again for a most helpful statement. We are grateful to you and Mr. Pepper for having come.

Our next witness is Mr. Harry Walker, executive director of the Commission on Aging in Baltimore, Md., and president of the National Association of State Directors on Aging.

Mr. Walker.

STATEMENT OF HARRY WALKER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMISSION ON AGING, BALTIMORE, MD., AND PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS ON AGING, ACCOMPANIED BY JANETTE MARTIN, DIRECTOR OF THE NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Walker, it's good to see you with us again. If you would like to introduce your associate——

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee.

Before beginning my statement, I would like to introduce the director of the nutrition program for the State of Maryland, Mrs. Janette Martin. She was formerly the director of the nutrition department at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore.

If the committee has questions following my testimony, I believe that her point of view from the State operation of a nutrition program will be of significant value.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before the committee today to report for the State units on aging on the nutrition program for the elderly.

Between the time that I was invited to appear and this morning, I had the opportunity to talk with a number of State directors throughout the country, and I would like to report that it is virtually unanimous that the States regard this program as an outstanding and excellent program and want to see it continued and expanded.

Title VII meets a basic need of a substantial number of older persons—that is, a decent hot meal on a regular schedule—and if the simple comfort of improved health were its only benefit, that alone would be worth the time and money.

But Congress wisely avoided the program taking on a "soup kitchen" image by building in the requirement for social services, thus the benefits of a balanced meal in a congenial setting not only promotes better health but provides a nucleus around which programs which will reduce isolation, promote socialization, and provide measurable physical and psychological benefits in a dignified way can and are being created.

I am sure everyone involved in the nutrition program recognizes that Congress deserves the gratitude of all the people for this.

Mr. Chairman, I know the committee does not need from me a review of the reasons that many elderly persons don't eat well and that a lack of adequate income is only one of the several reasons for the poor diet which is characteristic of many older Americans.

Nor I am sure do you want a recitation of the goals and objectives of title VII.

What I shall report on is the experience of the States, somewhat limited though it is, in implementing title VII of the Older Americans Act.

I hope I have already established the point that this program is very popular and very successful and that is the point of view of both the consumers as well as the providers.

But as with any new program, there are some rough spots and I would like to mention those that are among the most often mentioned by State agencies and these are not necessarily in any order of importance.

One of the first and most obvious is the effect that inflation has had on the program. That has come rather suddenly and I suppose somewhat unexpectedly. It has resulted in a reevaluation of the quotas that each State had set for the number of people it would be able to serve last fall.

It has also made it somewhat difficult to project the number of people that will be served in the future because there is no way of determining what the increase in prices of food will be.

For example, caterers now are reluctant to sign a contract for a year. They prefer to sign it instead for 6 months because they may have to raise the cost after a 6-month period. Of course the result of this, with the fixed amount of money available and the projection of the number of people that will be served, inflation may simply cause fewer people to be served or at the very least a lowering of the quality of the attendant services.

Somewhat related to this problem is the effect of the energy crisis. Of course we recognize this is not a problem faced only by those serving the elderly but the way in which it affects us I think is a point of information I would like to convey to the committee.

Many of the people who are brought to the food site, many of the people who are reached in an outreach way are done so through the use of volunteer drivers.

Now, because of the gas shortage itself, unless there is some consideration given to the people who are volunteering their time and their means of transportation, their cars, this may work a hardship on bringing the people to the meal sites.

This is going to be particularly true, I believe, in the rural areas.

Another point that was mentioned to me about the energy crisis was the possibility that the byproducts of petroleum, such as plastic utensils, and the paper shortage may also eventually have an effect on this program.

Another problem which is not severe but it is important has to do with the limitation of the number of home delivered meals.

We have found that the need for home delivered meals is rather great and we recognize that the intent of title VII is for people to be fed in a congregate setting because of the additional benefits provided by people getting together.

Nevertheless in the projects reported to me they feel there are people they would like to serve who are home bound and who they could serve but, because of the limitation that the regulations have on 10 percent home bound meals only, they feel that this possibly should be considered for change, perhaps to 15 percent.

I don't think such an increase would affect the intent of the act and certainly would provide needed services to a number of home-bound older people who would derive great benefit.

Another matter much talked about among the States, and perhaps it has come to the attention of the committee, is the manner of reporting that is required by the Federal Government. We all recognize, appreciate and support the need for a reporting system which will provide vital and important information about the program and which will enable us to evaluate it in a detailed and thorough way.

But there is a wide-spread feeling that more information is required than will really be used and perhaps more importantly the project directors are being required to do too much paper work possibly to the detriment of the service they are supposed to provide.

There has also been expressed some feeling that some of the statistics that are required may be inaccurate and not particularly relevant.

Another matter that has concerned some States, more particularly those serving rural populations, is that the 20-percent limitation on social services is inadequate.

This I am sure is a moot point because the program is essentially a food program and the social services are to be auxiliary. Nevertheless in rural areas where there are few, if any, social agencies, in order to establish social programs of any quality and when you don't have existing agencies to go through, it becomes somewhat more expensive to provide good quality social services programs.

Another fact we all recognize is the target population of this program far exceeds the resources that are available to serve them.

The extent to which this may present real problems at the project level, if there are more people showing up at a project site than the site is able to accommodate, is not yet known, but it is a potential problem and I might add that I believe, and I think the committee also feels this way, that it is up to the States to share in the increase of support of this program but at the same time we would urge again that Congress increase the amount of money that will be available for the nutrition program.

These, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, are some of the more common problems. There are others but I don't want to recite a list of all of them. I am sure as the testimony goes on this morning and you hear from project directors and consumers, some of the other problems will be brought up.

I would like, though, to take a different tack now and report to you just one or two things that were reported to me that I think are representative, of how this program is being received.

These are from people who are somewhat far removed from Washington.

In a letter from a project director in Minnesota, a woman in her late 70's wrote this:

I am so disturbed. I had some left overs so thought I would fix a snack. The beans were spoiled, cottage cheese sour, butter spilled all over the dish, all over the table.

Last but not least sour milk.

I can't have a refrigerator in this 10 by 10 room. What does one do when hot weather comes? It's an old hotel in a small Minnesota community, no stove, no other place available.

The writer of this letter was hospitalized for her failure to eat or drink during hot weather. She now participates daily in the nutrition program.

Again from Minnesota, another writer:

I am not one to go a lot but now with the meals I just get up and go visit many friends and come home well fed. It isn't just the eating that counts, but happiness once again. Living alone can be lonely.

A West Virginia project director writes:

We are reaching some older men and women who seem to have been waiting for a very long time for just such a program.

In one county there is an exceptional number of widows living alone on an isolated road eating makeshift meals. They come every day and eat with obvious enjoyment.

Another satisfaction we have is that the projects employ a large number of older women as cooks, kitchen aides, and drivers—project women who assist as though they were hostesses in their own homes.

That concludes the quotations from just a couple of the people that have written to me.

Most people who have worked with senior citizens clubs, senior citizens, or similar organizations, learned long before title VII that the covered-dish luncheon or other meal program was one of the favorite activities of the elderly.

The nutrition program provides that opportunity to more elderly persons than has ever been possible before.

We hope that Congress will continue this program, will increase the funding levels for it, and will increase these not merely to offset the inflation but to provide more of these meals to older persons.

Finally, if there was one single note sounded by every State that I talked with, that is the need for allowing a portion of the nutrition program funds to be used for State administration.

A project of this size you cannot realistically expect to be administered with the combination of State and Federal administrative funds available for title VII. We think that the original concept in title VII whereby up to 10 percent of that money could be used for administration was a very wise one.

We particularly like the idea that none of the money has to be used and, if less than 10 percent is used, that administrative money does not revert to Washington but can instead go into the communities to serve meals for the people.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my testimony. If you have any questions, either I or Mrs. Martin will try to answer them.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Walker, for a very helpful statement.

Let me ask you several questions.

Do you favor a 1-, 2-, or 3-year extension of this legislation?

Mr. WALKER. We would obviously favor a 3-year extension for two reasons: one, because we believe this is a good program and should be continued, and two, when its funded for only 1 year there is always that period of uncertainty about what is going to happen.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do I assume you are speaking for the National Association of State Directors on Aging or are you speaking in your own capacity as executive director of the Commission on Aging in Maryland?

Mr. WALKER. I am speaking for the State executives. I made a point of contacting key members of our board who represent the 10 districts of the country.

Mr. BRADEMAS. What level of authorization do you recommend?

Mr. WALKER. We haven't suggested a specific level of authorization. The figure that we have talked about is, for the next year, \$150 million.

Mr. BRADEMAs. You have spoken of administrative problems that you at the State level have been encountering in operating this program, and you were here, I think, when Mr. Pepper reported to us those rather astonishing figures on how very little money, according to the GAO study, had been made available for programs to benefit the elderly from revenue-sharing funds.

How much money is being made available in State moneys to administer the Federal funds for nutrition for the elderly?

Mr. WALKER. You are not referring just to revenue sharing?

Mr. BRADEMAs. No. I would be glad to hear that but—

Mr. WALKER. Yes, it obviously isn't. The amount of money they put up for administration in most cases I am sure is the 10-percent necessary to match whatever administration funds were used.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Just to be difficult for a minute, here Uncle Sam comes along and puts up \$100 million for these programs. Why don't we see some State responsibility, some State dollars, for at least the administration of these programs?

I remember being down in the State of Florida a couple of years ago conducting hearings on this legislation and practically announcing myself as a candidate for Governor since I would be for aid to the elderly, in whom the local politicians didn't seem interested. And to a reasonable person it might seem Florida State officials ought to be interested in older people, since such a high percentage of the population is elderly.

I notice States are happy to spend Federal dollars. I wish they would show some interest in spending State dollars. I make that as a hypothesis.

Mr. WALKER. This is a point of view that is a valid point of view, that the States need to begin sharing more in programs. I think this is happening. I know in some States the States have contributed considerable resources to programs for the elderly; whether in nutrition, I don't know.

We have not done this type of analysis. In my own particular State there was some suggestion that the new lottery funds might divert some moneys for the elderly programs.

We have requested that some of that be used for the nutrition program. I can't predict, but it would be my guess that because this is a program that produces measurable results—you are feeding people—that we can make a good case before the State legislatures for providing more money for these kinds of programs, and I would hope this would be a reality in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. BRADEMAs. That would be encouraging. I am moved to be somewhat more sympathetic to assisting State officials if there seems to be at least a modicum of interest on the part of State officials in confronting their own electorate to ask for some more tax moneys to help meet some of these needs.

I take it we are not in disagreement on this particular point?

Mr. WALKER. No, not. The reality of it is, though, in States there is so much competition for the tax dollar.

Mr. BRADEMAs. You mean there is not competition here in the Federal Government, Mr. Walker?

Mr. WALKER. I bow to the chairman on that point.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is, in all candor, a non sequitur you have offered, and, if you go talk to the mayor of any city in town and you make the speech I have just made, he will say in reality there is so much competition for the tax dollar in his town.

Mr. WALKER. But I think the Federal Government has taken the initiative in calling to the attention of the American public the needs and critical situations in which the elderly find themselves.

I think if it had not been for the initiative taken by the Federal Government, the States would have piecemeal recognized this, but it does take this Federal clout.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I agree as one of the sponsors and champions of this program, but in that we have taken the initiative, I would like to see a little bit of responsibility on the part of the States.

Before I leave that point, don't you think it would be a good idea, now that Mr. Pepper has given us his GAO study, to get a copy of that in the hands of all those in the country who have anything to do with decisions on revenue sharing—as well as all of our colleagues who are directors of State aging programs to say you better get busy and do some lobbying at the State and local level because that seems to me almost a scandalous situation.

Mr. WALKER. I would agree.

Mr. BRADEMAS. What about the question of the impact of energy shortages on the operation of the nutrition programs? You said that it is a problem but can you give us any more specific information from what your colleagues across the country have told you?

Mr. WALKER. There is a lot of concern right now, perhaps more than actual need, although the need does exist. The fact is that many of these programs count on volunteers. They count on volunteers to go and get people, volunteers to do outreach, find the older people and, when it is difficult to get gas, people are going to be more reluctant to offer services and provide their automobiles.

Mr. BRADEMAS. It might be helpful—I don't know if you are equipped to do this—but if we could get some brief report from State aging directors across the country on how they perceive the impact of energy shortness both on the situation of participants and the situation of volunteers in respect of the nutrition for the aging problem.

I realize that may be an enormously difficult question for you to try to respond to because it is difficult to know what the Federal Government's policy is at this time.

Mr. WALKER. I will attempt to get the information and pass it on to you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Walker. Your comments have been most helpful.

Mrs. Martin, did you have any comments you wish to make?

Mrs. MARTIN. The only comment I would make, in visiting the sites, if you have an opportunity to do so, I think you would see for yourself the success of the program.

Can I speak just a moment to the energy problem?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Of course.

Mrs. MARTIN. We have had two areas where we have had to close sites because gasoline was not available this last week.

One was Garrett County in western Maryland and one was Somerset County in southern Maryland.

As you know the National Guard did take gasoline to Garrett County and that has been relieved at the moment. Somerset had enough gas in their buses to drive over to another county for gas and that has kept the program open.

That does affect us from time to time.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you both.

Mr. Walker, I understand you are now going to present the panel of project directors and participants.

Mr. WALKER. At this time I would like to introduce three nutrition project directors who in turn will introduce consumers of projects they have brought with them.

The first is Mrs. Daphne Aaron, project director from Wilmington, Del. Miss Romaine Franklin from my State, project director Cumberland, Md., Patrick Muldoon, executive director of the Community Action program, Christianburg, Va.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We are pleased to have all of you with us.

Mr. WALKER. They will introduce the consumers they have brought.

STATEMENTS—PANEL OF NUTRITION PROJECT DIRECTORS AND PARTICIPANTS; DAPHNE AARON, WILMINGTON, DEL.; ROMAINE FRANKLIN, CUMBERLAND, MD.; DIANTHA LAVOIC, MORGANTOWN, W. VA.; PATRICIA MEEKER, NORFOLK, VA.; PATRICK MULDOON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, CHRISTIANBURG, VA.; SYLVIA BARG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SENIOR WHEELS EAST, PHILADELPHIA, PA.; AND JAMES CARR, NINA SEITZ, AND MRS. EDWARD BOWERS

Mr. WALKER. Mrs. Aaron first.

Mrs. AARON. My name is Daphne Aaron. I am project director of the nutrition program in Wilmington, Del.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide information to this committee about our program.

Our project was funded for \$115,000 per year. It is designed to provide 560 meals per day in the city of Wilmington.

The State of Delaware has three other projects in its three counties, New Castle, Kent and Sussex. But the comments I will make concern only the city of Wilmington.

SERVE—Seniors eating together and visiting regularly—began in November 1973. The project has eight nutrition sites. These sites are located in churches, senior centers and community agency buildings. They were carefully chosen for their proximity to concentrations of elderly people who are at or below poverty level and who are in the minority groups.

We are extremely pleased with the program to date. It has provided an extra dimension to the lives of older Delawarians. The improvement in their life styles, interests and attitudes have been noticeably discerned.

While we are aware of the vital needs of nutritious diet, we have attempted not to make it the most important factor in our delivery of human services to the elderly.

In addition to providing a nutritious meal, SERVE provides an opportunity for senior citizens to benefit from supportive services.

Our program includes a shopping bus that carries senior citizens to a local shopping mart each week. There is an employment service for older Delawarians to give them the opportunity to supplement their fixed incomes.

Our telephone reassurance program calls approximately 250 seniors daily.

Escort services are provided for medical, financial and legal assistance.

Our sites also have extensive arts and crafts programs, recreational opportunities of all types and social experiences.

In addition to all of that, numerous educational experiences are scheduled into the program such as nutrition education, health education, legal advice, financial advice, consumer protection assistance, fire protection aid, personal protection provided by the police department, preretirement programs and income tax preparation assistance.

These supportive services have been a part of Delaware's program for the elderly before the nutrition program began. They are funded entirely through title III funds of the Older Americans Act.

This enables us to use our title VII nutrition money for hot meals and, of course, staff costs. However, the beauty of the nutrition program is that more of our elderly residents have become more aware of the services mentioned above.

The hot meal was a drawing card and the inspiration for senior citizens to request additional assistance for their particular problems.

Because of the increased demand, the dollars are shrinking. Title III funds are not as plentiful as they once were, at least in the State of Delaware.

We feel, therefore, it is critical for Congress to approve more funding for title VII to provide for this increased need of services.

We have also experienced the inflationary spiral with regard to food costs in just 2½ months. Because of this our waiting list is increasing.

In addition, we have discovered, because of inadequate funding, staff members who should be out seeking elderly citizens to participate in the program must spend too much time in-house.

Our volunteer program is working well. We work diligently to find volunteers although they are not always as dependable as they might be.

We feel more staff would make the program more effective. We are working closely with the SSI people. We feel the nutrition program has been and will be an outstanding success. It is our belief that it should be a priority item for the Congress in its determination of fiscal expenditures.

We strongly urge that all the additional dollars that can be found should be channeled into this program.

It is our firm conviction that the title VII nutrition program has all the necessary ingredients to provide the needed services that will make life more meaningful for the elderly residents of America.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Miss Aaron.

The Chair would like to take advantage of this opportunity to say we are pleased to have with us today a distinguished visitor from abroad, the Honorable B. Kim, a member of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea and vice chairman of the Home Affairs Committee.

We are pleased to have you with us, Mr. Kim. I don't know if our procedures here are similar to those followed in your country but we are hopeful you will find them interesting.

Who is next, Mr. Walker?

Mrs. AARON. I have brought with me, Mrs. Greta Bowers, one of our participants.

Mr. WALKER. Mrs. Romaine Franklin from Cumberland.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Is Mrs. Bowers to be heard?

Mr. WALKER. We will have the project managers speak and then you may ask questions.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Fine.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. I am Romaine Franklin, program coordinator for the Aging of Allegany County and I have brought one of our participants with me, Mrs. Nina Seitz.

We are operating our title VII nutrition program which has been funded for \$80,447 to cover a 4-month period. This funding will permit us to serve a maximum of 300 meals a day.

A survey by the community action agency revealed that 15 percent of the total population of Allegany County is over 60, 35 percent of this group has less than an eighth grade education and 29 percent are low income. Consistent with the national trend, the major number of the elderly in the county are women.

Allegany County is located in the mountain and mining area of western Maryland. Living is basically rural in the county without the benefit of adequate transportation in the urban sector and virtually no transportation system in the rural area where a large number of the senior citizens live.

The subject of transportation has been our greatest problem.

In September of 1973, the Allegany County Community Action Agency contracted with the board of education to prepare meals for our older Americans under the title VII program.

These meals will be served, also during the holiday season and the summer vacation period, with only the holiday itself affecting the service.

The board of education is preparing these meals at 75 cents a meal as cost to the program.

Our project council has been organized and their officers elected. The role of the council and its membership is included in this report. The council has suggested a fee of 50 cents for the meal for the consumer.

We started to serve our first participants October 2, 1973, at the west side school in Cumberland. We started with 12 people being served per day. Since that time we have opened six more sites. Six are in school buildings and one is in a public housing for the elderly.

We are currently serving 194 meals per day. Our goal for the second quarter of operation is to serve 300 people per day, or 15,000 meals for the quarter.

In addition to the meal service, we try to help the older Americans with health and marketing transportation problems. We have a group of volunteer retired nurses who do health and welfare counseling.

There is a group of outreach workers who work very hard locating the hard to find persons and after finding them we assist with information and referral services.

We coordinate all of our outreach workers in the community action program. We have a nutritionist in our program who does a very good job with nutrition education.

We feel we have an excellent program but we would like to expand into the eastern part of our county and to be able to develop a transportation system but more funds would be needed.

We also would like to see a change in the Federal regulation which states only 10 percent of the meals can be home delivery.

We find that there is a great need to help more of the people who are complete shut-ins.

The Commission on Aging, the Community Action agency with the title VII program, can and does provide a significant contribution to the resources of the aged by providing direct assistance, help in finding assistance, and at least taking the role of the applicant, someone who cares.

I welcome the invitation to appear before you today, and I do urge the committee to continue with the title VII program.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mrs. Franklin. Who is next?

Mr. WALKER. I have just been told that the consumers would like to have a word before the committee, and so at this time, if I may, I would like to call on Mrs. Bowers who is from Wilmington, Del.

Mrs. BOWERS. My name is Mrs. Greta Bowers from Wilmington, Del. I have been a member of the Wilmington Center for about 3 years.

I joined the center shortly after the death of my husband. I was lonely and depressed and needed company.

Since being active at the center, I have had many opportunities that I would not have had. There are many programs, one of which is the nutrition program started on November 19, 1973.

At first there was much skepticism among the members. After the program started, it proved to be a real blessing to the senior citizens. The blessing has been because of the opportunity of being able to receive a nutritious meal once a day.

I would like to relate a few incidents I know of personally.

A blind lady who takes advantage of the program, she lives alone and does not bother to cook for herself. She feels that her health has been benefited by having a nutritious meal once a day.

An aged woman and her crippled son were having a problem. The mother is getting senile and too weak to prepare food for them. They are now getting the nutrition program and are very happy. Their problem was solved for them. They also feel their health has been benefited.

Speaking in behalf of the senior citizens of Wilmington, Del., we hope that the Congress will continue to appropriate money to this very necessary program. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mrs. Bowers.

Can we now hear from Mrs. Seitz?

Mrs. SEITZ. I am Nina Seitz of Cumberland, Md., and I feel that this nutritional program has been well advanced and can be taken care of. It gives a nutritional and well-balanced meal to the community people. It creates fellowship and also tends to have socialization, more togetherness which they would not have if they stayed in their homes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. WALKER. The third witness is Mr. Patrick Muldoon, executive director of the Community Action program in Christiansburg, Va.

Mr. MULDOON. I brought a participant, Mr. James Carr, 78 years old.

My name is Patrick Muldoon. I am the executive director of the New River Community Action, Inc.

Our agency is implementing the title VII nutrition program for the Fourth Planning District in southwest Virginia, which encompasses the counties of Floyd, Giles, Montgomery, and Pulaski; and the city of Radford.

The district has a land area of 1,486 square miles. It lies generally along the New River within the great valley bound by the Blue Ridge Escarpment and the Appalachian Plateau.

The area is characterized by long mountain ridges running east and west with the New River flowing in a northerly direction through its center.

Although less than 34 percent is urbanized, the district has centers of rapidly urbanizing population, but the largest portions of the district are rural and largely inaccessible.

According to the 1970 census, the district has a population of 114,833. Figures for those 60 years of age or older are not available, but there are 16,041 that are over 65 years of age.

Our title VII project is funded for \$81,000 for a 12-month period. We plan to serve at least 175 meals a day or 45,500 meals per year. This makes the total cost of the program \$1.78 per meal.

We received approval of our title VII grant on December 13, 1973, and opened our first sites on January 3, 1974. We have opened two sites each week until present at which time we have a total of 9 out of 10 sites open.

In our program, we have stressed decreasing isolation and increasing socialization, with the nutritious meal being secondary.

In each site, we have games available and various crafts available.

In addition, we have speakers on numerous subjects of interest to the elderly, such as medicare, food stamps, social security, and so forth.

Our participants could be characterized as being proud people who want to be useful citizens, with an average of 71, with 90 percent having an income below poverty level.

Last week, we served 681 meals; and our figures show that during the month of January, we served a total of 348 different individuals. The meals are prepared in four of our Head Start kitchens and transported to the sites.

We have six sites located in church halls, one in a Salvation Army Center, one in a community center, one in a banquet room of a restaurant, and one in an old school building.

We have been very pleased with the growth of our program and predict that we will have to be turning people away by the end of the month as this has already been necessary in a couple of centers.

Our agency made application for this program because no other agency in the community was interested. Many of the elected officials were opposed to the program, considering it another unnecessary Federal program, but after initiation of the sites and the feedback they received from participants, their attitudes totally changed and they are now supporting efforts to get a gerontology plan for the area.

The support the community now has for the program is indicated by a lengthy editorial which appeared in the Virginia Leader on January 16, 1974, parts of which are as follows:

Probably the two most basic needs of mankind is to have enough food for bodily sustenance and to engage in some kind of mental stimulation to break the boredom of loneliness.

Most of us achieve these ends without thought when we return home at night to the family dinner table or we lunch with friends. But what about our senior citizens—those 60 years or more older? How do they satisfy these basic needs? Some do very well, especially where husband and wife teams are still together. Some, however, lack funds and plain old physical strength to do for themselves other than to barely squeak by. Some stay by themselves and shun the fellowship of their peers because they do not have the means to do otherwise.

Recently these people—the physically needy and those needing the warmth of companionship have been rediscovered as a part of our society.

Through a nutritional program for the senior citizens, funded through federal grants to the New River Community Action Agency, Inc., people who need help are going to have the chance to receive it.

Besides strengthening the body and refreshing the outlook of our senior citizens, this nutritional program has yet a third benefit.

Since all participants are contacted daily, they may be more carefully accounted for. Those living alone can be contacted continuously so there is less likelihood that any of them will suffer from neglect or lack of medical treatment, if involved in a home mishap.

We believe this kind of program is beneficial to our county. It will provide hot meals five days a week for all senior citizens who choose to participate. It will provide a daily check on the health and well-being of participants and it will allow those involved to learn again the simple joy of mutually sharing their burdens and their pleasures.

Any reservations one might have about this program could easily be dispelled by visiting our sites and listening to the comments of the participants. Examples of these comments are as follows:

A widow at one of the sites said: "I haven't had so much fun in years."

A note was written by a daughter of an elderly person receiving a hot meal every day at her home stating: "This is the greatest thing that ever happened in this town. God bless you all."

A widower who pays a dollar for his meal each time had this to say: "I live by myself and I get lonesome. I never enjoyed such nice fellowship. I don't come for the meal, I come for the fellowship."

Another woman had this to say about the program: "My husband is getting a lot out of this program. It used to be so that I could hardly get him to go out. He seems to enjoy talking with others now."

A statement by one of the elderly participants which sums them all up says: "It's just too good to be true."

We agree with the participants that this is an excellent program. Considerations should be given, however, to increasing funding so more meals could be served and exploring alternative sources of funding for transportation and increasing home bound meals as there is a desperate need for these portions of the program.

I wish to express my thanks for the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee and urge you to vote to continue the title VII program to allow proud people an opportunity to be active and important in their communities.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Muldoon.

Mr. Carr, we would be pleased to hear from you now, sir.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen of this august body, permit me to bring to you in a concise manner an echo from the senior citizens of Christianburg, Va.

We stop and consider some of the pioneers of our generation. We have diverse opinions, whereas a number of our citizens have reached advanced age, therefore, some of our ambition has wained by the use of the cycle of time.

Nevertheless, the institution of this program has rejuvenated some of the initiative. Some of the advantages we are aware of.

They are relieved of planning and preparing a well-balanced meal. It also breaks the monotony of continually eating the meals they have prepared and they enjoy the no dishwashing part of the program.

We have a few citizens that are taking on a growing interest, like a snowball as it is rolled along and the fellowship deepens and widens.

Therefore we are aware of the awakening of a number of the talents of a number of our senior citizens. We feel this will dispel the gloom which may overshadow them when they are alone at home.

We have several speakers who have brought a number of ideas which are both logical and beneficial.

We the senior citizens of Christianburg Community Center wish to express our appreciation for the privilege of participating in such a benevolent program and we are making a request for its continuation. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Carr, for a very eloquent statement.

Mr. Walker, I think we have now heard from all the project directors and participants in the program, is there another person to be heard?

Mr. WALKER. We have three more project directors that have a statement to make.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Would they like to come forward at this time?

Thank you very much, all of you, for your very helpful statements.

Mr. WALKER. The first witness is project director from Norfolk, Va., Miss Patricia Meeker.

Miss MEEKER. I am the project director for the title VII programs in Norfolk, Va., and the adjacent area which comprises planning district 20 in Virginia.

Our project was funded for \$230,000 to serve 610 projected meals per day. Eventually we hope, with further funding to be serving approximately 2,300 meals daily in 18 nutrition sites.

The first meal was served October 1 at a site which is located in the elementary school of a housing authority park. In addition to this site we have 2 sites located in senior centers, 1 in church and 1 in a neighborhood center making a present total of 5 throughout the district where we serve approximately 200 meals daily.

Of participants currently in our program approximately 96 percent are minority and about 90 percent of these have incomes below the poverty level. Our project level is large, covering an estimated area of 3,000 square miles.

It includes the old cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth and a large, sparsely populated rural area where transportation is our greatest need.

In addition to meal service we provide supportive services in conjunction with other agencies.

For example, the nutrition education programs are provided by combined efforts of agriculture extension service, the dairy council and public health nutritionists.

Other supportive services include outreach, health and welfare counseling, crafts, recreation plus transportation and shopping assistance on a limited basis.

In our program many needs of the participants have been identified, their dental problems being one of the greatest and I am glad to say dental programs are underway in two areas of our projects.

Being the project director of a program in an area that is large, I have realized my site supervisors are crucial employees. They need to serve more as a center director so that they can plan and coordinate special programs and supportive services in addition to the meal services.

On behalf of the participants we serve, I would like to relay to the committee the gratitude they have expressed for the opportunity to be a part of this program and thank you for the invitation to appear before the committee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. WALKER. The next witness is Miss Diantha LaVoic, project director, Morgantown, W. Va.

Miss LAVOIC. I represent North Central Community Action as both the project director and nutritionist for our title VII program.

This program covers a six-county area in north-central West Virginia.

The project was founded for \$95,400 for a 12-month period. The target is to serve 200 meals per day in 9 different sites when fully operational.

At present we only have one site in operation. The first site was opened January 7, 1974. The meal was served in conjunction with a nutrition education program. The first day's attendance was 20. This site now serves between 30 and 50 people with an unduplicated count of over 100 different people.

Our project area is mostly rural and hilly with two urban areas. Approximately 44 percent of our 60-and-over population is below poverty guidelines in our area.

We are using the following types of sites: the senior citizen center, low-income housing project for the elderly, community building, school, church, and Head Start center.

Besides providing nutritious meals, we are trying to help the elderly Americans realize their abilities and skills and how to use them. We think the title VII program is excellent and has a lot of potential. Potentials we hope to use are ones of additional sites in helping the elderly become advocates for themselves. The project has been well supported in West Virginia by the commission on aging and in State and local social service agencies.

Our participants enjoy the socialization as much as the meals. We feel the need for the title VII program includes more staff to help coordinate title VII existing services and agencies for the elderly.

More money is needed for transportation. Many of our counties have no public transportation system and are in rural areas. More money is needed for job opportunities for the elderly, outreach, and education.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee and I urge the committee to vote to continue title VII programs.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. WALKER. The final witness is Mrs. Sylvia A. Barg, executive director of Senior Wheels East in Philadelphia which operates a title VII program.

Mrs. BARG. Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to appear before your committee. It's the first time I have and I don't think I could have come on a more important mission.

Your commitments and that of the committee in recommending and supporting a 3-year extension must be underlined and supported by all those who have an interest in whatever area of delivering services to the aged because nutrition is an important component that has been sadly lacking for many years.

There are certain things, certain needs that cannot be filled by tender loving care, by planning committees, by councils, and conventions.

You simply need dollars to fill stomachs and to buy shelter and so on.

So I do want to make our position very clear, that is that we support at least a 3-year extension and, as I think Dr. Fleming said informally, although not in his statement, as long as the Older American Act exists, he feels that the nutrition program should continue and I certainly support that part of his statement.

I feel that it should continue at an expanded rate and I think the case for that has been ably made this morning so I won't belabor the point.

I think the case has also been made for the value of the program, the way people are enjoying it, what it has contributed in terms of socialization, et cetera, et cetera.

I am coming to you not really as a project director for Philadelphia. I do have one site which I fitting in as a component into a program which I have been directing for 3½ years. That program, the combination of Model Cities money but now through the social security amendments, title VI, we have now expanded so that we can indeed deliver the social services that have been mandated but greatly overlooked because there have been some escape clauses in title VII.

The escape clauses I refer to, for instance, are States may ask for 90 days before they institute social services. Then they may ask for another 90 days. That is 6 months.

If you don't provide social services for 6 months and then you come around and evaluate a program, you can say this program is not complying with the intent of the legislation so we better not continue it, or we will continue it for another year and we will see.

There are ways of building in negative evaluations in order to have the desired outcome, so I would like to ask this committee to very carefully consider the kind of regulations which have often defeated the intent of the legislation that our Congress works so hard to pass.

The social security regulations are a case in point. If the Congress hadn't taken it upon itself, we would have been in very serious trouble in providing social services and neither this program nor any other can be supported without all the surrounding legislation.

There are ample funds in all these titles. We don't need new funds, we need to find where they exist and put them together.

I agree with—what was it, Congressman Pepper said, that two-tenths of 1 percent of revenue sharing to be committed to the elderly is disgraceful.

I am afraid we all suspected that that is what would happen. That is the kind of prophesy I don't care to support but now that he has brought this to our attention, I think there is something that can be done.

This is something I would like to recommend to all others who are here, that there is a constituency. If we have enough older people involved in nutrition programs, that would develop a constituency so that if the States don't do the planning, their constituencies will demand it and I would very much urge that the committee look at all the other regulatory conditions that are imposed which make it almost impossible to carry out the mandate of the legislation but which are held up to us during an evaluation period.

And just the one little comment that I can't help but make, everyone referred to the possible paper shortage and there is one contribution it really could make, it might help reduce the paperwork required for this program. It's so enormous that sometimes you have to make a choice of whether you will counsel a person for half an hour or sit down and make the reports that go, I don't know where to prove, I don't know what.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let the Chair take advantage of this opportunity to express his warm thanks to all of the witnesses who have just testified, both participants in the program and project directors because I sense certain common themes running through most of the statements. You felt that the programs have been effective, that you would like to see more money made available in order to be able to serve more people, that you would like to see an increase in the number of home delivered meals made possible and that you would like to see concern displayed for the problem of transportation as well as meeting the problem of services to accompany the nutrition program itself.

I can assure you that we will take very seriously into account the various points of view that you have expressed today and I am hopeful that we shall be able to speedily move to report a bill and that it will enjoy very strong support from both Democrats and Republicans on the subcommittee and then making its way through the House and the Senate and become law as quickly as possible.

So again, Mr. Walker, I want to thank you and all of your colleagues today for most thoughtful and instructive testimony.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m. the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[The following statement was submitted for the record:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and the appreciation of many older Americans in my Congressional District and across the land for the efforts this Subcommittee has made in the last few years in the field of nutritional care for the elderly. Today you are continuing this fine tradition by conducting public hearings on legislation sponsored by more than one quarter of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The bill before us today would extend and improve the Nutritional Program for the Elderly as it is incorporated under Title VII of the Older Americans Act of 1965. For fiscal year 1975 the program would be authorized to spend \$150 million, for fiscal year 1976, \$175 million, and for 1977, \$200 million. These are modest increased over the current authorization of \$150 million. We all know that the

program got off to a slow start, due in large part to the problems experienced in establishing an appropriation level for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. Yet in its limited existence, this program has shown tremendous progress and a great potential for meeting future needs of our senior citizens.

We are all too well aware of the problems faced by our older Americans in this time of rampant inflation. Certainly the cost of living has effected each of us. It is hard to imagine how much more difficult it is for those people who must rely on small pension incomes. The two basic needs of the human race are now almost beyond the reach of those on fixed incomes. Rents have more than doubled for many. Others are being forced out of moderately or low priced housing to make way for restorations or condominiums, to be inhabited by higher income tenants.

The same story is true for food. Any housewife, be she poor or not, knows how drastically the cost of food has risen in the last year. With increasing shortages of many commodities, the prices rise even higher.

Medical costs have been no different than housing or food. As we get older, our medical bills tend to grow larger. With the rising cost of supplies and labor, hospitals must also raise their charges for services. This results in taking an even larger proportion of our senior citizen's income.

These three things—housing, food, and medical care—are necessities for us all. Many senior citizens must spend most of their monthly income on just these three items. This allows no opportunity for other expenses such as clothing, entertainment, or travel. For some, their budgets are so tight that they must often cut down on one of these three necessities. The easiest to cut is food. Thus they develop, out of economic need, the bad habit of poor nutrition.

Each of us here today knows this story and has heard it from many of our constituents. The bright spot in all of this is a program which is now in existence. It has shown that it can serve an important purpose and contribute greatly to the well being of our senior citizens. It is the Nutrition Program for the Elderly.

Today it operates in senior citizen centers, churches, schools, and other non-profit institutions. Across this nation, meals are prepared for the elderly. For those who can and want to get out of the house, the meals are available at various centers. For those who are shut in, the meals are delivered to their homes by volunteers. The latter program is now well known as the "Meals on Wheels" program.

One of the great benefits of these programs is the additional contact afforded by the program. Those people who can attend the centers for their hot meals can share in the fellowship of others their own age. They also learn about the value of good nutrition and learn other skills and activities. For those who cannot leave their homes, the friendly face that accompanies the hot noontime meal provides one additional contact with the outside world. For many of these people it is their only visitor for days on end. Through this program, the Federal Government is providing a true service while at the same time bringing much joy to the hearts of the elderly. Through community participation in these programs, there has developed a catching spirit of togetherness.

Mr. Chairman, my comments but touch the surface of this story. I am confident that the members of this committee are well aware of its value and I urge you to take prompt action to authorize an extension of the nutrition programs and in the amount suggested in the bill. It is a pleasure to be with you today in support of the bill I have had the honor of co-sponsoring.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY GERALD A. BLOEDON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
GOVERNOR'S CITIZENS COUNCIL ON AGING ON TITLE VII NUTRITION PROGRAM

At this early stage, it is difficult to assess with any degree of precision or comprehensiveness the reaction to the Title VII Nutrition Program in Minnesota. A majority of the projects which have been established here were funded in November 1973. Hence, the operational experience on which to base a meaningful evaluation is somewhat limited. However, it is possible to indicate in general terms the reach and scope of the program and the basic patterns that are emerging.

Under Title VII, the Governor's Citizens Council on Aging awarded grants to 17 projects which are currently serving meals at 76 sites. The number of sites is expected to increase to 104 by the end of March. These grants amount to a total of \$1,833,385 in Title VII funds. Local matching funds in the amount of \$203,705 plus projected income from voluntary donations of \$239,108 bring the total funding of these projects to \$2,276,198.

As of February 1, 1974, these projects were serving more than 2,000 meals per day, 1,890 in congregate settings and 127 home-delivered meals. Nearly 1,500 of these meals, or approximately three-fourths, were served to people with incomes below the poverty level.

A concentrated effort is being made to bring the benefits of the nutrition program to American Indians in Minnesota, a minority group which has special needs since older Indians in most cases do have Social Security or pensions to rely on. A grant of \$100,000 in Title VII funds was awarded to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe to establish nutrition sites on the six Chippewa reservations in the State. According to the Chippewa Tribal Council: "Older Indians tend to have poor eating habits. Meals tend to be irregular and nutritionally deficient. Because of lack of cooking equipment and basic cooking ingredients, there is an over-dependence on pre-prepared foods."

The major proportion of the programs are sponsored by Community Action Programs, although three of the largest programs are sponsored by the Salvation Army, Lutheran Social Services and the Catholic Charities.

Food for the most part is prepared off-site and delivered to the meal sites. We are finding that nursing homes and hospitals are prime sources of good meals at competitive prices, since these institutions regard meal preparation as a community service and assign a portion of the cost to the creation of community good will.

While the projects are operating at full capacity and reaching a large number of low-income people, we suspect that some projects may not be reaching some people who because of loneliness, isolation and inadequate diet may be most in need of the benefits the program offers. Persons who are already active in senior centers and other programs are the most accessible and readily responsive group. Through intensified outreach efforts we intend to reach beyond these relatively well-served groups to find those whose need may be greater.

The plight of the isolated low-income older person we are seeking to reach is eloquently expressed in excerpts from a letter one of our project directors received from a woman in her late 70s:

"I'm so disturbed. Had some left-overs so thought I'd fix a snack. The beans were spoiled, cottage cheese sour, butter melted and spilled out over dish all over the table. Last but not least, more sour milk."

"I can't have a refrigerator in this 10 by 12 ft. one-window room. What does one do when the hot weather comes? Not allowed to have any electrical appliance due to fire insurance on the building (an old hotel in a small Minnesota town). No stove. There is no other place available."

The writer of this letter was hospitalized for severe dehydration due to her failure to eat or drink during a period of hot weather. She now participates daily in the nutrition program.

A passage from a letter from another participant makes a significant point in sincere and simple terms:

"I'm not one to go a lot . . . but now with the meals I just get up and go and see many friends—visit and come home well fed. It isn't just the eating part that counts—but happiness one gains. Living alone can be lonely."

The basic concept underlying the program is an excellent one and the potential for contributing to the independence and life satisfaction of Older Americans through the program is great. However, we feel deep concern at this time at the limitations imposed by the lack of administrative funds. The 10 percent allowable for administration during 1973 was barely adequate but currently we are completely without administrative funds. At this time recruitment of competent personnel and careful evaluation of program results are critical. It would be tragic indeed if the future of a program that promises to create rich values for our older people not only in terms of physical sustenance but personal and emotional sustenance were to be jeopardized by the lack of necessary funds.

We recommend that commitment of 1974 funds be extended beyond June 30.

NORTH DAKOTA AGING SERVICES,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 14, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: We wish to express our appreciation for your continued efforts towards ongoing implementation and development of the Title VII Nutrition Program for the Elderly. Your advocacy and sustained interest in the program are highly indicative of your understanding of the nationwide need for this Nutrition program to provide not only a hot nutritious meal daily but also the variety of much needed supportive services.

We are pleased to report that the six Title VII projects are showing definite progress towards local and AoA objectives. We have five urban projects, and one rural project which is serving the elderly on a countywide basis. All projects have all components operational. Five projects achieved their meals goal in less than the initial 90 day period. North Dakota surpassed both the November 30 and January 31 bi-monthly meals goal set by AoA. For the week ending March 9, 3,992 meals were served, an average of 798 per day. The percentage of low income participants served has varied from 65 to 75%. North Dakota has achieved 23% of the years goal within the first five months of operation, with nine sites not yet open.

Of major concern at this time is the already obvious need for a larger allocation of funds for fiscal year 1974 to allow for the expansion and continuance of the presently funded programs. Four of the six programs are jointly funded by Title VII and Title III. We have several applications pending, subject to release of additional monies, since the fiscal year 1973 allocation reached only six of the designated target area communities.

Ours is a rural state as you know. Our greatest need is an alternate nutrition program for the many rural towns. Approximately 50% of our elderly reside in towns with a population of less than 1,000. We are constantly approached by these small communities wanting to provide a nutritional program on a small scale to fit their particular needs. They cannot afford or staff a Title VII comprehensive program. Many of the supportive service resources are just not available. The nutritional and other needs of these rural elderly is just as acute as in the larger cities.

We are aware that Title III contains a provision for small meals programs; however, we are not at all certain that there will be funds usable or remaining to cover this area.

In no way can 20% be expected to fund the supportive services portion of a Title VII project. Again, in a rural state such as North Dakota, transportation alone can eat up that and more.

In terms of staffing, we can expect the projects to ask for more administrative monies, to retain and hire the quality of personnel necessary to maintain the ongoing success of serving the elderly.

Your latest bulletin indicates the overwhelming bi-partisan approval to a bill extending the nutrition program until 1977 with a 600 million funding projection. As I have already stated, we see an on-going expansion of our Title VII projects which will necessitate a higher allocation than the 1973 amount, \$493,000. We are just beginning to reach and find the hard-core isolated, low income, minority older American that Dr. Flemming has mandated as our target group.

We do not have in North Dakota many of the other resources local or Federal which are available to more urban areas to aid in community funding. Increased funding will be imperative to maintain our presently funded projects and implement new programs in the remaining target areas.

Sincerely,

EVELYN REMMICH,
Nutrition Specialist.