

# INCREASING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

---

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT INCOMES OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING UNITED STATES SENATE EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

---

Part 3.—San Francisco, Calif.

---

JANUARY 13, 1964

---

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

29-589 O

WASHINGTON : 1964

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 20 cents

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida, *Chairman*

PAT McNAMARA, Michigan	EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
CLAIR ENGLE, California	BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey	FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Oregon	WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada	HIRAM I. FONG, Hawaii
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho	E. L. MECHEM, New Mexico
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah	
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Texas	

J. WILLIAM NORMAN, Jr., *Staff Director*

JOHN GUY MILLER, *Minority Staff Director*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT INCOMES

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia, *Chairman*

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho	WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada	HIRAM I. FONG, Hawaii
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	E. L. MECHEM, New Mexico
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah	

J. WILLIAM NORMAN, Jr., *Staff Director*

NOTE.—Three hearings on increasing employment opportunities were held and they are identified as follows:

Part 1—Washington, D.C., December 19, 1963.

Part 2—Los Angeles, Calif., January 10, 1964.

Part 3—San Francisco, Calif., January 13, 1964.

# CONTENTS

## CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Opening statement of the chairman.....	93
Hon. Phillip Burton, chairman, California Assembly Committee on Social Welfare.....	94
William Bechill, executive secretary, Citizens' Advisory Committee on Aging, California.....	99
Roy P. Newell, retired, San Francisco, Calif.....	103
Eleanor Fait, State supervisor, older worker program, California State Employment Service, Department of Employment, Sacramento, Calif.....	106
Mrs. Nello E. Kearney, coastal area coordinator, older worker program, California State Employment Service, Department of Employment, San Francisco, Calif.....	111
Charles Rosenthal, executive director, Careers Unlimited for Women.....	119
Emerson O. Midyett, member of the advisory board of the National Council of Senior Citizens.....	127
Mrs. Milton Schiffman, supervisor, Services for Older Adults, San Francisco Council of Churches.....	129
Leo J. Champagne, retired, senior citizen, San Francisco, Calif.....	131
Ellis Komsky, retired, senior citizen, Daly City, Calif.....	132
Grover C. Sanderson, retired carpenter, senior citizen, San Francisco, Calif.....	135
George McLain, chairman, California League of Senior Citizens.....	135

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Ad Hoc Committee on Employment, San Francisco, June 29, 1962-December 16, 1963.....	117
Employment records cases of State department of employment.....	131
Life Begins at Forty; Monday, December 23, 1963, newspaper article.....	110

## INCREASING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

---

MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1964

SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND  
RETIREMENT INCOMES,  
*San Francisco, Calif.*

The subcommittee met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to call, at Yerba Buena Senior Center, Golden Gate Avenue and Buchanan Street, Senator Jennings Randolph (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Staff present: Mr. J. William Norman, Jr., staff director; Mr. John Guy Miller, minority staff director; Mr. Frank Frantz, professional staff.

Senator RANDOLPH. A very pleasant good morning to all of you who are present for this hearing, which is conducted by the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes. This subcommittee is one of several which function within the framework of the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

We have held a number of hearings of this subcommittee, gathering information on employment opportunities for the elderly, with particular emphasis on part-time employment. Several weeks ago we initiated these specific hearings in Washington. We have had hearings during the current visit to the west coast in Los Angeles and now we are, of course, meeting with you at the San Francisco area. We realize there are those from other sections of California who are testifying and who are guests.

I will limit my opening statements to remarks which will give you some information concerning the efforts and problems in connection with employment and income of men and women, especially elderly folk here in California.

We are particularly interested, as I have indicated, in part-time employment. We feel that this is an area of gainful work where the older person can more actively participate than in a full-time employment schedule. There are strenuous obligations in full-time employment which some older folk cannot meet. But working part time many, many of these people can make a contribution to the sustaining and strengthening of the economic system. These men and women then can continue as productive members of society. They possess skills, they are patient and thorough, they do have the right attitude and good work habits. They are interested in solving their money problems. Working part time is beneficial both to the mental and to the physical well-being of people generally.

For many years the recipients of old-age survivors and disability insurance who are 72 and older have been permitted to earn unlimited

amounts without loss of these benefits. Under amendments more recently enacted in Congress, these people who are under 72 may earn up to \$1,200 annually without any reduction. They may also earn up to \$500 more a year with a loss of only \$1 for each \$2 earned.

I was privileged to cosponsor an amendment enacted in the 87th Congress which provides that the first \$10 of an old-age assistance recipient's earnings and half of the next \$40 of his earnings may be disregarded in fixing his grant. Thus, increasing part-time employment for America's senior citizens is a practical means of contributing to national economic stability without substantial cost to the public.

So we are going to listen with interest to those who testify today.

They will testify on what is being done in California by Federal and State Governments and by private organizations in providing jobs for senior citizens. There have been some experiences in California which, in measure, may be unique. Let's hear these experiences as we hold our hearing here today. I think we need to realize there is much yet to be done to advance opportunity for men and women of the older age brackets who desire to contribute in the mainstream of our American society rather than be shunted aside.

We will try to receive from you a cross-section of your thinking. I think constituent conviction is most important. I don't speak now as a Senator thinking in terms of those who vote for or against him. I am thinking of constituent conviction which comes from the local level. It isn't something that originates in Washington or Sacramento but it is something that originates within the individual man and woman. This is what we wish to have this morning to help the subcommittee in its work.

Phil, are you ready?

Mr. BURTON. Yes, Senator.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. PHILLIP BURTON, CHAIRMAN, CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL WELFARE**

Mr. BURTON. Senator, it's a pleasure to see you again. We shared the platform together 5 weeks ago down the street. I would like to commend you and also the other members of this important subcommittee for giving those who live in San Francisco the benefit of an opportunity to express a few ideas that we may have in the development of a meaningful program to assist the elderly of the Nation.

My name is Phillip Burton. I am the chairman of the California Assembly Committee on Social Welfare. My address is 995 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

I wish to address myself to a few points today in the area of employment opportunities. I think it is important that the various States be encouraged to enact legislation outlawing discrimination based on age. I am the author of legislation in this State suggesting that our Fair Employment Practices Commission be extended authority to include age as a basis on which discrimination would not be countenanced. I would hope the Federal Government, as far as placement, in various State departments of employment, would take every action that is necessary to guarantee that there will be no discrimination permitted against older workers.

Now, in the area of how we treat the earnings of those who are theoretically retired, as you pointed out, Senator, the present Federal law which has been implemented in the States permits those in the age bracket of 65 or over who are receiving public assistance to retain the first \$10 and a half of the next \$40 which they earn in a month. Only 870 of California's 266,000 OAS recipients are taking advantage of this restricted earnings provision.

Senator RANDOLPH. Why is that ratio so small? Don't you think that is a small percentage?

Mr. BURTON. We are all very surprised and I am sure the authors of the legislation expected more utilization than that.

Senator RANDOLPH. Could this be merely a matter of bookkeeping? Or is the person afraid; does he or she believe that they will become involved and have some tax problems?

Mr. BURTON. I think the biggest single problem is one of communication, informing these older persons of their rights. Communication is clouded by the fact that with only a \$10 free corridor, so to speak, I think these people are just afraid that they are liable to lose their pension. I think they are reluctant to experiment in the job market.

Senator RANDOLPH. You'd think the lawmakers in Washington and Sacramento would be taking a step in the right direction if they would be more explicit? In other words, not become involved in a complex formula and set up something that isn't involved in percentages and returns, and so forth?

Mr. BURTON. I would increase the amount clearly that can be earned before there would be any deduction from the public assistance grant. Now, I think we should make an effort to provide these older people the same income earnings permitted the blind, which is \$85 a month and half of the balance over that. Or putting it another way, in the long run it probably would be more meaningful if we permitted a flat annual \$1,200-a-year earning provision so that it would comply with the Social Security Act earning section. But, I believe that they should be at least able to earn at least \$85 a month.

I think there should be an effort made to permit these outside earnings without deduction in their grants.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Burton, I would like to ask you, do you believe the ceiling might be removed entirely?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you want to put limitations?

Mr. BURTON. I think there are problems involved; if I understand your question correctly, Senator, there are problems involved to permit earnings without a limitation and still be eligible for public assistance. I think permitting \$85 a month, or \$1,200 a year—\$85 a month is \$1,020 a year.

There are two problems right now with the earnings test in public assistance. The first problem is one of cost in readjusting the grant—monthly. Let us say someone earns \$20 a month; the first \$10 have to be ignored and half of the next \$10 to be taken into consideration for the grant in this State. Yet, in this State it costs \$10 a month to change a grant and of that \$10, \$5 is Federal administrative money, and \$5 is State administrative money. We spend more money administering the changing of grants from month to month

for casual income earning situations than it would cost if the exemptions were increased.

The cost of an increase in the amount of completely exempt earnings would be greatly offset by a reduction in administrative costs incurred by changes in the grant required under the current law.

The second aspect of the permitted earning section is this: When you have a monthly test rather than an annual test, there are many instances where unfairness results. An annual earnings test rather than a monthly test would be equitable throughout the aged population. For example, there are those who might be able to work for a month or two and then for whatever reason be incapable of working for the rest of the year. Though their annual income is no different than that of their neighbors, their month-by-month income, in the months that they have worked, would be higher. Therefore, at the end of a month or two of working, one finds himself at a disadvantage vis-a-vis the other.

My final point in this respect is, Senator, that the Federal law regulations do not permit any disabled person the same earnings exemption which blind persons receive. There are 400,000 disabled aid recipients in the country and some 40,000 or so in the State. If it is valid to encourage the blind person to become economically self-supporting, it is equally valid to permit disabled persons to become self-supporting.

There are some disabled persons in homes who might become self-supporting. We have postpolios who are entirely bedridden, who demonstrate a capacity to become economically self-supporting. If any of those persons have started on public assistance, they would find themselves in a position today that every dollar they earned would be immediately deducted from the grant. That does not make sense.

I imagine the points I would like to leave the subcommittee with are (1) effective legislative action to guarantee no discrimination against older persons; (2) increased exemptions permitted older workers, particularly those on public assistance to the amount of at least \$85 a month, the amount permitted the blind, and half the amount over that which is the blind formula. Let me say, the preferable system would be \$1,200 annually exempt with half of the earnings over that exempt, with the same exemptions for those on aid to the disabled.

One final thought on the record before I conclude this testimony. It is my opinion that while we view the earning structure permitted the older persons in our society, we realize we are dealing with income to older persons and we should see that these are sufficient incomes for them to live at some level of decency and adequacy. With that thought in mind, I would like to put on the record a suggestion as to income maintenance that I think makes some sense. I would think that the Federal Government should provide an income guarantee to these older persons. For the sake of spelling out an immediate formula, it would be the maximum payable to a single retired worker as a social security beneficiary. As I anticipate, the matter would work like this: The general fund would be allocated an amount coupled with the social security, railroad retirement, or other income, and it would be an amount no less than, in this instance, \$127 a month. Then the State government would have the right, if they saw fit, without benefit of Federal matching, to increase this amount. They would do this with their own money.

Now, the advantage for the Federal Government pension approach is this: We in the State spend \$62 million on administering the old-age security program. This money should be going into benefits and not be used in terms of administrative expenses. By having a uniform Federal base we would effectively eliminate the whole variety of expenses of the administrative aspect of providing income for these older persons. We would delegate to the States the right to supplement, out of State funds only, this maximum social security amount. I think this kind of approach would permit us to meaningfully meet many of the problems for income maintenance of the elderly.

This is a problem we face in our State public assistance. Those on public assistance are oftentimes better off than those on social security, for the simple reason that many people covered under the social security, although they may be in need of further financial assistance, are unwilling to be put to a means test or a poverty test in order to supplement their income.

The paradox of this is that those who have worked all their lives and retire on \$90 or \$100 a month will not run the gamut of public assistance tests. Yet, those who are so driven by poverty to apply for public assistance find themselves with a greater income than those covered by social security. I don't think this makes sense, and one of the ways to resolve this problem is the way that I have just advanced.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Burton, I am grateful for your testimony. It would help the subcommittee to know what methods have been used to inform the old-age assistance recipients of the exemptions that they can receive matched with earnings.

Mr. BURTON. Well, in effect, we have only one organized group of elderly in the State. We have a variety of other fine groups, but we have only one statewide group, the California League of Senior Citizens. The California League of Senior Citizens is George McLain's group, and they put out a newspaper. Here in San Francisco, we have very dedicated staffs at the various senior citizen centers, and I am sure they have brought this fact to the minds of those who participate in the centers, but, we don't have a coherent method of informing the citizens. I think the State should send out in the monthly checks an attached statement saying, "You have this additional right," and that would solve the problem. And this would only cost the State the money it would take to have these notices printed and inserted into the envelope and sent out in the checks. That should be done but it has not been done in this State.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Burton, do you realize that in California we have a period of transition which is beginning to have an impact not only on the older group of citizens but also on the younger citizens? I am speaking in reference to the possibility of the transition in defense contracts.

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Senator RANDOLPH. You are a member of the State legislative body, and I think it is important at this hearing just to see what your thinking is about the possibility of a heavy impact upon the State of California.

Mr. BURTON. I am the author of the resolution that requested that our State study the economic impact of disarmament. That was approved a year and a half ago and the responsible agency did not do



the job. I reintroduced the resolution, and it is currently being studied again. We are in a dilemma here in California. We receive a rather significant amount of defense expenditures, and we believe we receive this money because of a rather high level of trained personnel that we have attracted and retained in the State. However, whenever we view this problem publicly we run the risk, upon frank assessment, that our economy is unduly based upon the high level of defense spending which in turn might be a caveat to private industry that we are trying to encourage to enter into the State. Perhaps there is some practical limit as to how far, in my opinion, we can publicly admit to the high level of defense expenditures without discouraging other industries.

We are faced with the prospect of the naval shipyard being closed. We don't have any plans on the drawing board to convert these facilities in the event the Navy or the Department of Defense closes these facilities down.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Burton, what is the rate of unemployment in California?

Mr. BURTON. Six percent. That is slightly higher than the national average, and our rate of partial or underemployment is not reflected in those figures. I would suspect we have another  $3\frac{1}{2}$  percent of underemployed in the State. The Lord knows the number of people that we swept under the rug with the reduction of the retirement age from 64 to 62. Also, we don't know how many younger men are in the Armed Forces; these people don't show up on the unemployment rolls, they are not being absorbed into the economy in a normal way. In California we have more people that work today than did a year ago and we are increasing our jobs, but there are more people coming into the State. Even with the increase in jobs, the demand far exceeds the supply.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you see the possibility—I don't want to be negative—perhaps, that this unemployment figure of 6 percent may become 10 or 12 percent if this happens. By this I mean the failure to continue the defense contracts or the failure to orientate the State's employment to Federal commitment installations, and so forth.

Mr. BURTON. I think a combination of dependence on defense spending and the increasing impact of automation will certainly affect the increasing rate of unemployment. I heartily endorse President Johnson's war on poverty statement, and in principle the steps he is taking. I think if we don't take energetic Federal action the unemployment rate is going to increase in our State. I don't think any objective observer can possibly reach any conclusion but that if the President's program is not fully implemented there is no doubt that the percentage of unemployment is going to increase. I think the rate of unemployment is likely to increase even with the proposed tax cut. I think that will merely take the edge off the problem that we face. I would prefer that the lower income wage earning families would get a little bigger piece of that cut.

I feel with the idle plant capacity our problem is one of underconsumption rather than the necessity to develop greater capacity for production. If I had my "druthers" I would rather see increased exemption for dependents so that the low-middle and middle income earners would get a bigger increase.

I might say this: 20 percent don't earn enough to be in an earning situation where they pay taxes in the first instance. Therefore, our elderly don't get the benefit of this one very important aspect.

In addition to talking about giving our older people a right to work or the opportunity to work, frankly, Senator, it is equally important in this automated age that our youngsters obtain job skills in order to give them the ability to obtain work. Truly, what is available, as far as jobs are concerned, to those who do not have highly developed skill.

Now, we see the people who are trained many years ago and were at their peak earning years possibly 10 years ago and they are now 55, and they say, "We want the opportunity to be advanced," or they ask for unrealistic salaries, but you can see that the odds are against them. These people who are heads of families and also to a lesser extent than to our younger workers who are out of work should receive some assistance through social security and through public assistance which will at least put some money into the economic bloodstream of the State's economy. But, the overall picture, and I don't think our State is unique in this respect, I feel the overall picture is bad and points toward the fact that unemployment is going to increase in this State. I am sure of this despite the fact our State has attracted industry which provides more jobs than any other State in the country. Even then unemployment is going up because the population is going up, and we can't provide enough jobs either for people through the natural increase in age or for people coming into the State.

Senator RANDOLPH. We are very grateful for your testimony this morning, and I am sure the committee will give careful attention to what has been said. You are knowledgeable and that is appreciated. You have made recommendations and they shall be subject for consideration.

Mr. BURTON. One final footnote, Senator. On behalf of the older persons in this State, I would like to doff my hat as chairman of the Assembly Committee on Social Welfare to you for your magnificent effort on behalf of the older persons in the State and throughout the country. During your period of service in the Congress of the United States in the Senate, you have been a real champion and your efforts have brought forth many fruits to these people who have been forgotten in terms of legislative action. I would feel remiss if I didn't pay my compliments to you for championing the cause of the elderly in this country.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. William E. Bechill.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BECHILL, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,  
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. BECHILL. Mr. Chairman, my name is William Bechill. I am executive secretary of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Aging of the State of California. I am here to make a statement in behalf of the chairman and the members of the committee who are appointed by the Governor to advise him on the needs and problems of California's older citizens.

The members of the committee have asked me to cite for the record their very sincere appreciation for the past and present efforts of the U.S. Senate Committee on Aging in focusing attention and encouraging action on the foremost problems of America's older population. The excellent reports and studies of the Senate committee, Mr. Chairman, have done much to stimulate constructive legislative efforts in the Congress as well as efforts at the State and community level.

You have asked for our specific comments in what can be done to improve employment opportunities for older workers, particularly with emphasis on part-time employment, in the recognition of the continued desire of many older citizens to continue gainful work as long as possible as well as the need that arises for many to supplement their retirement incomes. These are areas of interest that the committee knows are of fundamental importance. We have never supported the practice of involuntary retirement to those who wish and are able to continue employment. We will never do so until there are far more intelligent policies of retirement in existence on a broad scale that guarantee both adequate income and continuing recognition and contributions by people during retirement.

ENDORSEMENT OF S. 1357, THE SENIOR CITIZENS COMMUNITY PLANNING  
AND FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Last February, in his special message on the needs of elderly citizens, the late and beloved President John F. Kennedy outlined a number of measures to improve the employment opportunities and prospects of older Americans. He called the denial of proper employment opportunities to older persons "a personal tragedy" and a "national extravagance." He said that "no economy can reach its maximum capacity while failing to use the skills, talents, and experience of willing workers."

Those clear statements of conviction, as well as others contained in the Presidential message, together with the committee's experiences on a statewide and community level in California, resulted in our official endorsement of the Senior Citizens' Community Planning and Facilities Act of 1963, S. 1357, introduced last year by Senator George Smathers of Florida as a major proposal of the national administration. We are happy to state that this endorsement of the Smathers bill has the full support of Governor Brown. When the contents of the bill were discussed with him by our chairman and vice chairman last spring, he indicated that the program outlined in the bill would do much to stimulate and establish needed programs of interest to older people.

Specifically, we urge that the subcommittee support the provisions of part V of S. 1357, which would provide grants to develop employment opportunities for older persons, with particular reference to the interest of persons 65 and over. Such grants, we believe, would lead to a clearer identification than now exists of the specific ways employment opportunities can be created for more people 65 and over who want to continue working, either on a full- or part-time basis, or in a second career, or in needed community services.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Bechill, may I interrupt?

What is the percent of the population in California that can be broken down, in the group 65 and older, that would be physically and mentally adjustable to part-time employment?

Mr. BECHILL. The best way to answer your question, Senator, is to refer to the total population of older people in California. As of 1960, there were 1,376,000 persons 65 and over, and we estimate that this number now exceeds 1,500,000. I have no estimates with me as to the actual number of older people in this group able to work, but I would feel that the figure would be quite substantial. I think the department of employment has figures to indicate that about one-third of persons 65 and over in California have some type of employment. However, I am unable to give you a more exact estimate at this time.

Regardless, we are aware that there is a strong interest on the part of many persons 65 and over to continue in their full-time employment, or, at the very least, part-time employment to supplement existing retirement benefits. As you will note, we have attached to this statement a brief listing of some of the types of part-time employment that are currently carried on by older people or members of various senior centers in the State. None of the jobs listed are necessarily competitive with those held by younger people and yet all are directed to activities which are most useful and in demand.

We think that the program outlined in part V of S. 1357 could help in the development of organized community efforts to go beyond the present level of developing occupations that can be filled by older citizens, and, at the same time, make available paid activities that have both status and respect.

#### JOINT EFFORTS WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

However, we do not wish to convey that the sole or primary interest as a State committee on aging is confined just to the employment of the 65-and-over group. We are vitally concerned as well with the employment opportunities and difficulties of older workers generally, and particularly the development of sound manpower policies and programs by the State of California in making the maximum use of the potentials of older workers in California's labor force.

Currently, under a resolution of the assembly of the 1963 legislature, the committee and the California Department of Employment are conducting a joint study as to how and where to improve employment opportunities for older workers in the State. The study grew out of the general recognition that greater efforts were needed to keep pace with the increase of older workers in need of employment; that we could not, despite having the most comprehensive program of special placement and training services in the Nation, be satisfied with our present efforts; that we need to know more about the specific impact of industrial change on employment of older workers; and we needed to have some expression from interested groups, particularly labor and management, as to how to improve job opportunities.

As part of the study, the department, the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California and CACA will sponsor eight workshops this spring in Bakersfield, Eureka, Long Beach, Oakland,

Pasadena, Sacramento, San Diego, and Van Nuys on employment of older workers. We are receiving excellent cooperation from interested community groups and feel quite strongly that there is considerable enthusiasm that the workshops will not only produce some worthwhile recommendations for us to submit in our report to the legislature, but more important, help stimulate and develop more employment opportunities for older people across the State. We are neither overly optimistic or unduly pessimistic about the final results of the study. The department and the committee are approaching this with the idea of taking a hard and realistic look at what can and should be done in this area, are open to any suggestions and ideas, and are committed to move ahead with the knowledge that there is support and interest in this vital public issue. Thank you.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Bechill, I believe California may be the first State to have made such a comprehensive survey. Mr. Norman, do you know of any State that has gone into the depth of this matter as has been proposed?

Mr. NORMAN. No, sir.

Senator RANDOLPH. I commend your organization's program of finding the facts and then attempting to be affirmative in securing employment for the older folk. You said your concern was with the older worker. Do you find there is a problem now in the State with the worker 45 or older rather than in just the 65 and older age group?

Mr. BECHILL. Senator Randolph, I think that your question will be discussed in more detail later today by representatives of the department of employment. However, I would say very real recognition should be given to the older worker generally since persons 40 and over constitute a significant proportion of the total labor force in California.

Senator, with your permission, I would like to make one further personal observation. Last summer, I was invited by the Brookings Institution to a meeting there, held to discuss the employment problems faced by older workers in this country. The meeting was called in cooperation with the President's Council on Aging and it was a very stimulating and interesting 3 days of discussion. One of the conclusions arrived at there is that we do not look at the present problems of employment and unemployment as competition between young and the old in terms of developing proper manpower policies. While I am not an expert in the area of employment or unemployment or their causes, I submit from what my impressions are that we face an entirely different set of circumstances in discussing the problems of the younger worker as against the problems of the older worker, and I would hope that whatever might be done on the part of Congress would represent a balanced approach. I am particularly concerned about proposals to drop the present social security retirement age to 55. I believe that this would be no solution whatsoever. It would result in actuarially reduced benefits and would deprive people of a satisfactory retirement income. Furthermore, there are many other gaps in the social security program which should be closed in preference to this type of step. In short, I hope that whatever is done can be done in a way that recognizes the needs for employment of people at various ages.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Bechill, before you leave the stand, I believe we have a question by Mr. Miller.

Mr. MELLER. I have a question that is related to some point made by both Mr. Burton and Mr. Bechill. Mr. Burton made the observation that many of the OASI beneficiaries are, for various reasons, receiving lower income than many covered under the standard income for old-age assistance beneficiaries, and he also commented on the lower number, as I understood him, of old-age assistance recipients who are employed. Now, relating that to something you said, I believe you made the observation that the average age of old-age assistance recipients is 76. This last point raised a question in my mind which I would like you to comment on, if you will, please. That is as to whether there is not a tendency on the part of persons presumably receiving OASI to delay going on old-age assistance until they reach an age where, presumably, physical condition and other factors make it more difficult for them to take care of themselves through their own efforts and through OASI.

Mr. BECHILL. Yes, I think that there is such a tendency. I have come into contact with many older people in California, receiving basic and minimal OASI benefits, who avoid applying for public assistance by doing everything they can until it is absolutely necessary. This reluctance is very much equated with the desire to maintain their independence for as long as possible before having to apply for financial aid.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Bechill; thank you for your testimony, and I believe the degree of effort that you have proposed is very forward.

Mr. BECHILL. Thank you, Senator.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you. Is Roy P. Newell present? Please state your name for the reporter.

**STATEMENT OF ROY P. NEWELL, RETIRED, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.**

Mr. NEWELL. My name is Roy P. Newell. I want to say thank you, Senator Randolph, for the opportunity to talk here today before my fellow citizens.

Now, in 1954, I retired prematurely from the Maritime Administration as an accountant, and ostensibly because the Government had insufficient funds to pay their employees. That was the only excuse they could find; so, promptly upon leaving the Maritime Administration in 1954, I went down to the State department of employment and told them I wanted a job. I am a person well qualified in accounting and political economy. In fact, I believe with conviction, that I am the greatest economist in the world today. That is my own belief, but I never have been able to convince anybody else. I believe it, and I say it for the purpose that I think I have skill, and that I have a fair amount of good health, and I have maintained my youth and enthusiasm.

Senator RANDOLPH. How old are you, Mr. Newell?

Mr. NEWELL. 73 years old. Now, it is my greatest desire, inasmuch as I came into this world in a good family in North Carolina—and they provided for me well, and they gave much to me and society has given much to me also—I have been desirous to give back to society something in return for what they have given me.

Now, for that reason, since 1954 I have been constantly trying to find gainful employment, but I can't find any. There is discrimination against people who are over 60 years of age. I enter an office and they say, "What is your age?" After I tell them, they say, "We can't do anything about you because we can't change our accounting system; we might have to take care of you when you retire, we might have to put you off on a pension." I almost had a job at Standard Oil Co. after I had spoken at one of the stockholders' meetings. I have gotten a job—almost gotten a job—at many places, but I have never gotten a job. I even applied with the Peace Corps, with Mr. Shriver when he was here. He was asking for people with no age limitation, or age would be no consideration, and I applied to him.

Now, I have been wondering why, if I make so many of these applications, they have all been turned down. The people that I have talked to have been quite frank about it; when they find out, they say, "Okay, you worked down at the Maritime Administration."

Senator RANDOLPH. What was your age at retirement from that position?

Mr. NEWELL. 62 years old.

Senator RANDOLPH. Why did you retire; why did you leave the Maritime Administration?

Mr. NEWELL. The story on that is: In 1926, I went to USC, and I majored in political economy and economics. Now, many people have confused political economy and knowledge of it, and thorough knowledge of it, with communism. So, when they call down to the Maritime Administration, they say, "Oh, yes; well, he was a Communist." Well, all I know about communism is what I read in the headlines of the Call and the Chronicle. That has been a handicap to me in trying to find employment. Many people here think: "This man is an intelligent economist and he is a Communist." People have been frank, and people have a way of telling me exactly what the situation is. Few people prevaricate to me, so I can always get the information that I am after. I am somewhat of an investigator. Also, research has been my field since 1936. I have studied theory and practiced in this field.

Senator RANDOLPH. You have mentioned two newspapers; you should mention another. You don't want to have discrimination against the other, do you?

Mr. NEWELL. The Examiner. I talk on KCBS. I just talked on KCBS last Thursday night. After I talk on the radio, people come up to me on the street and say, "Mr. Newell, we agree with you on this subject, or that subject."

Oh, for example, when you study economics you study all phases of life.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Newell, you are telling the committee that, for approximately 11 years, you have been attempting to secure full employment, or part-time employment, in California? We see you are mentally alert and physically strong, and yet you have been 11 years without any gainful employment?

Mr. NEWELL. The best job I have had is supervisor of election, and that gave me \$18 for 1 day.

Senator RANDOLPH. Is this situation that you are talking about widespread in California, Mr. Newell?

Mr. NEWELL. There is definitely discrimination against older people, and this exists regardless of their knowledge. Now, for instance, my knowledge in economics should be recognized. I have given you some papers here today that I have written to the new President, and I have gotten many commendations for my knowledge in economics. I don't think this should be confused with people in Communist countries, or with people engaged in communism. Just because you are struggling to try to improve the economic conditions, I don't think that should be held against you. Now, concerning the Maritime Commission—of course, these things are held against you, and that is a matter of the secret records that they have. These records say what a person is and isn't, but they have no record for great enthusiasm for country or patriotism. If he is just a little person, and does not belong to the favorite few, they decide they want to eliminate him.

Senator RANDOLPH. Let's forget the Maritime Commission. You have tried for 10 years or more to get employment in private industry in California?

Mr. NEWELL. Yes; and I have tried also, after I left the Maritime Administration, I tried to go to Matson but they said, "We can't change our accounting system over here. It would be too much trouble."

Senator RANDOLPH. Have you been specific as to the type of job, or certain level of job, that you want?

Mr. NEWELL. The job I wanted most of all is the job where I could make some contribution in the field of political economy; that is, the greatest ignorance in America today. There is ignorance in the field of political economy in the Federal Government, in the State government, and in the local government. The Government agencies do not take a responsibility for education in the field of political economy. Today school studies are largely academic, they have nothing to do with the practical side of life and of making a living, but this is what political economy deals with.

Senator RANDOLPH. I think it is a tragedy when a Mr. Newell or any American, aged 60 or 70, who is mentally and physically alert and vigorous, can't find, within the economic structure, gainful employment. I think this is a rather strong indictment of the failure in America to meet one of the most pressing problems and that is the problem to be able to have our people gainfully employed beyond the so-called cutoff point—points of 65 or 55 or 45 or whatever these are.

I thank you very much for coming in this morning. I wonder if you could just tie your concluding remarks together, because there are other witnesses.

Mr. NEWELL. It isn't so much—I don't want a job so much. That isn't the point. I want to give something in return for all the gifts showered upon me all during my lifetime. That is the only reason—I want to give something in return for that. I do have to fight for the opportunity to give something to society. Down at the Commonwealth Club, where I go, I have to fight to get my ideas over. Fortunately, I have a few friends there. They are not all friends, otherwise there would be no reason to be there.

But to conclude my remarks, I think the greatest need for this country today is to know the economic principle of service for service and all its implications, and that is as it should be. Each American should



know the motto of the country, the motto of the country is practically unknown. The meaning of the motto of the country is universal in all the myriad components—when these myriad components are properly arranged, we have order. When these myriad components are not arranged, we have disorder. I think the greatest needs in this country today are political. The academic should be secondary to the political economy and economics. That is my concluding remark.

Thank you, Senator.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much, Mr. Newell. [Applause.]

Senator RANDOLPH. Miss Fait, please? You may proceed in your own way, Miss Fait. We are very happy to have you come before us.

**STATEMENT OF ELEANOR FAIT, STATE SUPERVISOR, OLDER WORKER PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.**

Miss FAIT. Mr. Chairman, my name is Eleanor Fait. I am State supervisor of the older worker program of the California State Employment Service. You have invited us to describe our special programs for older workers and our use of older worker specialists and we appreciate this opportunity to do so.

Before I begin my prepared statement, I would like to express the appreciation of our agency to your committee for the report last year, "Developments in Aging, 1959 to 1963," and how you highlighted the problems of older workers. We are using this report as our basic document in training of older worker specialists now.

In a consideration of our older worker program, a review of the age composition of our worker population is helpful. California became the most populous State in December 1962, and is growing presently at the rate of approximately 600,000 persons a year. One-half of the population of California over 25 years of age is over 45 years of age and the older work force constitutes almost 40 percent of the total work force. The population over 60 years of age constitutes 12 percent of our population in contrast to the age group, 12-25 years, which represents 9 percent.

Each of our more than 100 local offices throughout the State has an older worker specialist. Older workers are served through the regular mainstream operation; however, it is the responsibility of the older worker specialist in each office to insure that any specialized services—job counseling, testing, job development and placement, are available to the older men and women who need them.

In our metropolitan offices, our older worker specialists spend their full time in assisting these workers with their job problems, both directly and through the development of community interest. A part of their responsibility is the study of the day-to-day operation and daily intake of new applications in order to plan special remedial action.

Our specialists in the small offices are responsible for providing a program suitable to the size and needs of their own community. In addition, each employment service interviewer is given training in the appreciation of the problems of the older worker.

Specialized services to old workers are partly financed through the allocation of special funds from the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor. We believe that the success of the program in California is, in large part, due to this earmarking of funds. Our job placements certainly support this conclusion. In the 4 years from 1959 through 1962, placements of workers 45 years of age and over in business and industry in California increased by 90 percent. These figures reflect the population increases, of course. But they also reflect the impact of the intensive efforts of the employment service to place these workers.

The barriers to employment for older workers are formidable even during periods of high employment—due to stereotyped thinking concerning older-worker performance on the job, and their ability to learn new tasks; and sometimes, on the fears of greater insurance costs.

There are indications that conditions for the older worker are growing more difficult—even in California, and that our present techniques and older worker specialist staff are not sufficient for the job ahead of us. Placement of workers 45 and over dropped 2 percent in 1963—the first drop in placements since the older worker program was initiated. We are not yet ready to suggest the reasons for this drop in placements. But we have two projects underway which we hope will yield new information. Mrs. Nello Kearney of our agency and Mr. William Bechill of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Aging will describe these projects in their testimony which follows mine.

Since this committee is concerned with the problem of retirement incomes, I am going to devote the remainder of my statement to the worker in the "retiree" category. I would like to comment here on the suggestion, heard with increasing frequency, that earlier forced retirement is a panacea for unemployment and other economic woes. Present-day conditions make a mockery of the word "retirement" for most workers—even when impaired health would make it desirable to withdraw from the labor market. Inadequate incomes and housing require that older Americans stay in the labor market.

In addition, in our modern, specialized, interdependent society, equal opportunity for employment is of particular importance because, for most people, a job is far more than a means of earning a livelihood. It is also the means of achieving whatever social status and recreational and educational objectives a person may desire for himself and his dependents; it engenders individual self-respect and a healthy feeling of contributing to and belonging to the community.

Senator RANDOLPH. That is what Mr. Newell was saying.

Miss FAIT. Of course, I agree with your comment about that. We believe that any artificial barrier to employment takes away from the individual far more than the ability to house and feed himself and his dependents.

There are approximately 250,000 workers 65 years of age and over in the civilian labor market in California. In our local offices our active file of job-seeking workers 65 years of age and over is currently averaging about 12,000. This means that at any give time there are about 12,000 active applications on file in our offices. Our placements of this group average about 600 a month and the placements for 1963 totaled 6,546. I am glad to report that the dip in older worker

placements mentioned previously is not reflected in the placements for the 65-plus worker. Actually for this group there was a 9.5 percent increase in 1963.

We feel that our agency has special responsibilities to applicants in the retiree category because of the additional problems they have in locating jobs. Their special difficulties become evident when we consider that

- (1) California's law on age discrimination protects workers between 40 and 64 years and does not prevent the worker 65 and over.

- (2) There tends to be a bias against members of this group because of the age-related inadequacies of some members of this group.

- (3) Many are retired from fields in which they have only one kind of experience. Thus, a change to another kind of work is indicated and training may be required. They may be unwilling to do this.

- (4) Many do not know how to seek work effectively.

- (5) Some impose restrictions which practically remove them from the possibility of employment.

- (6) Their actual interest in employment, whether part time or full time is sometimes hard to determine by our interviewers.

- (7) Older workers in their late fifties and early sixties sometimes invite retirement when they refuse necessary changes in job assignment and use of new equipment, resent younger foremen and supervisors, and make unrealistic salary demands.

- (8) The word "retirement" tends to take on a rosy glow for younger people and especially younger personnel people. Therefore, they are puzzled when a retiree applies for a job and they are difficult to convince that the applicant is serious in his desire to work.

We do know that there is a wide variety of full-time and part-time jobs for the 65-plus worker. For example, in the past 60 days, our placements have included an 83-year-old survey party chief on a flood control project, a 75-year-old trimmerman in a lumber mill, a 70-year-old clerk-typist, a 69-year-old hospital personnel director, an 86-year-old sewing machine operator in the apparel industry, a 74-year-old alteration woman in an exclusive dress shop, a 77-year-old picture framer, a 70-year-old business manager of a television dealers association, and a 65-year-old in a management control job in a major bakery.

Your committee has requested information on our special programs developed for older people.

Our senior home repairer program was developed to offer part-time jobs for men from the skilled trades over the age of 65. They are carpenters, painters, electricians, cement masons, and plumbers who are available to do minor repair jobs in their own trade. Our calls are from housewives. Actually many of our calls are from housewives after a do-it-yourself husband has had a try at the job. The jobs our senior home repairers do include window and door repairs, putting up shelves, touchup painting and plastering, leaky faucets, and fence and masonry repairs. Their work does not conflict with regular union and contract jobs nor with union pension requirements. These men are in good health, have their own car or pickup truck to use in their work, furnish the tools of their trade, and do not wish full-time work. Jobs do not last more than 2 or 3 hours. They are on call between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday and are dispatched by telephone. They are paid an hourly wage based on the prevailing

wages of their own community, plus mileage for their call. This program is operating in six offices at the present time. A prerequisite to the start of such a program is a supply of men from the skilled trades who meet the qualifications I have outlined above. This program originated in 1960 in our Sacramento local office and was developed because a large number of applicants in this category registered for work after retirement.

Our plan for homemaker service for the elderly stems from the tremendous need for such service and the number of requests received by our offices for persons to provide certain assistance to elderly people trying to maintain their independent living arrangements. Our plan for giving this service is based on the use of the almost untapped reservoir of womanpower not actively in the labor market because they no longer desire full-time work or they no longer wish to compete in their own labor market or because of age discrimination. From this group we have recruited women who have work experience in such fields as teaching, social work, merchandising, accounting, and so forth. Most of our homemakers are in their late fifties or up. The oldest is 78. We use women who have undergone the disciplines of the business and professional world and have demonstrated their ability to accept responsibility and make decisions. Our selection process also includes consideration of personality factors such as patience, kindness, tact, resourcefulness, and a sincere desire in helping the elderly.

Our homemakers are given special training in nutrition, first aid, community resources, psychology of aging, reading aloud, use, and care of gas and electrical appliances, and so forth, and the course is 35 to 40 hours. The American Red Cross has handled the major part of the training of these women, at our request, although we have been utilizing adult education facilities in some instances.

We insure high quality service to the elderly people we serve by our selection process and the expertness of our interviewers, and our homemakers' commonsense and the judgment that accrues from their years.

The service provides for meal planning and preparation, shopping, correspondence, business errands, transportation to doctors, dentists, hospitals, and recreational assistance. Our homemakers are not domestics, personal maids, or nurses. If the elderly person requires other than our service, arrangements are made through the regular community services channels. Calls are 1 to 3 hours and may be once a week or as often as twice a day. Our homemaker service is widely used by social welfare agencies but is not limited to them. Middle- and upper-income families also need and use our homemaker service.

The hourly wage for these women is based on the prevailing wages in their own community. We prefer to use women who are not completely dependent on their earnings. For instance, women wishing to supplement their social security income make ideal homemakers.

Another special program of the California Employment Service—maintenance gardeners—received nationwide publicity several weeks ago in Robert Peterson's excellent column, "Life Begins at Forty." I have included a copy of this story in my remarks to this committee. The maintenance gardeners program utilizes men over the age of 55 from other occupations who have been displaced by retirement or age

discrimination. As you see, they are given basic instruction in the adult education facilities of the San Francisco school system in pruning, planting, fertilizers, watering, weeding, seeding, use of modern tools, and orientation in the types of grasses, shrubs, and flowers. This program has been in operation since 1960.

(The article referred to follows:)

[Life Begins at 40, Dec. 23, 1963]

#### TRAINING MAKES \$ SPROUT FOR ELDERS

(By Robert Peterson)

San Francisco: Pessimists dourly conclude that there are no jobs for older people. Yet a bright new scheme for training elders in garden maintenance here is disclosing an abundance of work opportunities.

"Two years ago, it occurred to some of us that we might be able to find jobs for older people who knew something about gardening," said Mrs. Nello E. Kearney, area coordinator of older worker programs for the California Department of Employment.

"We consulted with local garden clubs, commercial nurseries, and the city park department and found there was indeed a shortage of persons with green thumbs who were willing to work part time caring for lawns of busy or inactive homeworkers.

"We talked with people at city college and got them to set up a course in garden maintenance in their adult education department. Then we asked Anita Day Hubbard, a popular local writer, to mention in her column that a free course in garden maintenance was being scheduled for older men—with job promises for those who completed the course.

"In no time at all we had plenty of applicants. We screened these applicants and selected 25 men for the first course.

"The course was just 20 hours in length—2 hours a day for 10 days—and students were given basic instruction and information about modern tools, pruning, planting, fertilizers, watering, weeding, and seeding. There was also orientation in the types of grasses, shrubs, and flowers.

"Since then we have held four additional classes, each with 15 to 35 men enrolled, and we've been able to help all these men find jobs at the current rate of \$2 per hour."

One who has taken this course and found a stimulating new retirement career is Roy A. Wells. He retired at 70, following more than four decades of work as a meteorologist for the U.S. Weather Bureau.

"When I finished the course they found me a job requiring about 3 hours a week tending the lawn for a schoolteacher a few blocks from my home," said Wells. "Then they found me another job and then another one. Soon I was turning down jobs.

"A very pleasant sidelight is that as a self-employed gardener I began gaining social security coverage for myself. As an ex-Government employee I did not have that coverage before. Although I've only been working as a part-time gardener for 2 years, I'm now drawing social security of \$59.80 a month for myself and wife—in addition to my Government pension and what I'm earning as a gardener."

Cities everywhere should awaken to the encouraging fact that despite the apparently bleak outlook in senior citizen employment, jobs do exist if we take the trouble to evaluate local needs and then offer training which permits older people to acquire marketable skills.

Miss FATT. Encouraged by the success of the maintenance gardener program, another new service was pioneered in San Francisco in 1960, the walking tour guides. Through this program, visitors, as well as residents, were provided with a personal guide having a knowledge of this city for interesting walking tours in this historic city. The California Historical Society employed these guides and the users of the service included convention, youth, and conservation groups. The training period was 32 hours, given with the cooperation of the Adult

Education Department of the San Francisco public school system. Guides included former teachers, librarians, artists, writers, and executives from the business and public service fields.

With the committee's permission, I would now like to ask Mrs. Nello Kearney, coastal area coordinator of the older worker program—who incidentally developed the last 2 programs I have described—to describe the San Francisco plan for a special study of the employment problems of the 60-plus workers registered in our offices here.

Thank you.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Miss Fait; I don't believe I have a question at the moment. Perhaps we can continue with Mrs. Kearney and you could stay at the witness stand with Mrs. Kearney. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. NELLO E. KEARNEY, COASTAL AREA COORDINATOR, OLDER WORKER PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.**

MRS. KEARNEY. Senator Randolph and members of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirements Incomes, I am Nello Elizabeth Kearney, coastal area coordinator of the older worker program of the California Department of Employment.

I am going to read the statement as rapidly as possible so that you will know as much as possible about this special project.

The department has asked me to describe to you San Francisco's community employment project for men and women aged 60 years and over.

This employment project was developed during 1962 and 1963 in the committee on employment, preretirement preparation, and income maintenance of the San Francisco program for the aging of the United Community Fund of San Francisco, a 3-year demonstration starting January 1, 1961, in coordination and improvement of existing private and public services for older people. The program for the aging was sponsored by the Social Planning Department of the United Community Fund of San Francisco and supported by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Junior League of San Francisco, Inc.

When Dr. Thomas H. Carroll, vice president of the Ford Foundation, announced the grant to the United Community Fund of San Francisco on August 4, 1960, for these purposes, as part of the foundation's experimental grant program dealing with problems and potentials of older people, he said:

"We are convinced that the problems of older persons must be solved primarily in the local community. Housing, employment opportunities, health facilities and services, and recreation programs are mainly the result of local initiative."

In San Francisco a local office of the State department of employment already had demonstrated in 1960 and 1961 that groups of older workers could be recruited, trained by adult education in short courses for occupations in which there were shortages of qualified applicants, and placed in fairly large numbers. These projects which Miss Eleanor Fait, State supervisor of the older worker program, has reported to you, predated training under the Manpower Develop-

ment and Training Act. They were organized exclusively for older applicants. The projects were aimed at part-time and seasonal work. These early experiments in job development, training, and placement of groups of older workers, such as maintenance gardeners and walking tour guides, influenced the Subcommittee on Employment of the San Francisco program for the aging in planning a major employment project for persons aged 60 and over which I will outline for you now. Success in these efforts to place older workers confirmed our conviction that projects for groups is a means of serving large numbers of applicants and that offering carefully selected and trained older workers for "demand occupations" is an effective way to open new employment opportunities for them.

The Subcommittee on Employment, of which I was chairman, developed a program of vigorous action coordinated with research. We started with several concepts regarding the public employment service needed by older persons:

- (1) The employment service furnished by this project should be applicant-oriented. We want to help every older applicant for work to obtain suitable employment, not merely a segment of the group, such as those best qualified for existing jobs, but all who are actually seeking work and who are employable.

- (2) The qualifications, limitations, and motivations of older applicants should be determined in depth in order to serve them properly.

- (3) Any applicants who are found to be currently unable to work or to be applying for work while their real need may be for another kind of activity, should be referred from the employment service to other community agencies.

- (4) New jobs must be developed by cooperative efforts of the employment service and the community, and all types of employment, including selfemployment, should be sought in order to assist all older applicants to find employment.

- (5) Short-time training should be initiated by the employment service to prepare older workers for jobs in selected occupations in which shortages of qualified applicants have been identified.

- (6) A sufficient number of experienced, creative personnel organized as a team to undertake experimental employment service should be assigned for an adequate period of time.

- (7) Evaluation of this project in experimental employment service, and research on its operations and the applicants eligible for its services, should be conducted by an independent agency. This agency should publish a report for the guidance of other communities concerned with employment service for older workers.

As a result of these views, San Francisco's employment project for older workers has the following features:

- (1) The unavoidable limitation of the group to be served in the project is fixed by age. Specialized employment service will be offered to all applicants aged 60 years and over who have active applications in San Francisco local offices of the department of employment on some future date. We believe that some of the most difficult employment problems may be found in this upper age group. On the basis of an inventory taken last year of applicants who were 60 years of age and over, we estimate that 1,800 persons will be eligible. They will be about equally divided between the age groups 60 to 64

and 65 and over. About two-thirds of the applicants will be men. These applicants will be the initial workload of the project. If we are successful in placing all of them in jobs, or in serving them otherwise before the end of the project, services could be offered to new applicants.

(2) Placement service will be based on the following phases of the project:

(a) Precise, thorough work histories, detailed information on other qualifications for work, and information regarding economic need, interests, and actual availability for employment will be obtained for both the action and research programs by intensive reinterviews of all applicants who wish to participate in the project.

(b) Physical and mental health examinations and evaluations will be made for all participants to determine their potentials and limitations.

(c) Individual and group counseling for employment will be arranged as needed. Emphasis will be placed on self-help, the responsibilities in job finding which only the applicant can carry out.

(d) Jobs will be sought from a variety of sources in addition to the regular flow of jobs placed by employers with local offices of the department of employment in San Francisco and other communities. The project will encourage employers, including households, to organize tasks into new jobs which older workers can perform. It will find employment for some applicants in sheltered workshops and in licensed industrial homework. It will aid others to undertake self-employment. Possibly, the project will be instrumental in having a nonprofit corporation formed to hire applicants qualified to render services needed in the community. Such special efforts in job development will be related to the qualifications and interests of the applicants in the project.

(3) Social casework service consisting of short-term supportive counseling or referral to appropriate health and welfare agencies for specialized service will be given if needed, either prior to or instead of employment.

(4) The research associated with the action program will go beyond descriptive statistics to such fundamental sociological questions as: What are the reasons for seeking work? How willing are applicants to accept suitable jobs and how serious are their efforts to seek work? What are the employment opportunities for older workers compared with their qualifications? How does the length and frequency of unemployment of older workers compare with that of younger workers? What health problems or handicapping conditions do older workers have which are related to their employment potentials? For those who are seeking work to attain a satisfactory standard of living, what percentage of this desired living standard is currently being met by income from the Federal social security program, from private pension plans, and from other sources?

(5) The demonstration will be organized as a community project. The principal agencies involved will be—

(a) The United Community Fund of San Francisco is the applicant for grants and the fiscal agent. It will allocate funds to other participants under contracts.



(b) The California Department of Employment will operate the specialized employment service closely coordinated with the research functions and health program of the project.

(c) The San Francisco State College will conduct the research, will evaluate the experimental employment service, and will write and publish the reports on the project.

(d) A medical facility will make the health examinations and evaluations.

(e) Educational institutions, primarily the adult and vocational division of the San Francisco public schools, will provide the training required to prepare selected applicants for available employment.

(f) A social agency will provide casework services.

(g) An advisory committee, whose membership will reflect organizations and groups which can improve and expand employment opportunities for older persons, will share responsibility for the project.

An overall administrator will coordinate and direct all phases of the project.

(6) The subcommittee on employment recognized that a project of this size and complexity requires detailed plans and designs for all of its components. Therefore, the first stage of the project will be conducted by a planner with a small staff who will design the project in detail within the framework of its aims and scope as proposed by the subcommittee and approved by responsible committees and the board of directors of the United Community Fund of San Francisco. The planner will work in consultation with the agencies that will participate in the project. His duties include the specification of the number, qualifications, and salary ranges of personnel involved in the project, the functions they are to perform, the duration of their employment, and supervisory, administrative, or consultative relationships among personnel. The planner also will determine standards for physical facilities and equipment. To assist the planner in designing the project, provision is made for the services of a special librarian to make an extensive search of the literature, including unpublished sources of information concerning employment problems of older workers, employment services for this age group, and related economic, health, and social problems. It is expected that a pilot operation dealing with about 100 applicants will be conducted as a guide to planning and designing the project.

(7) After the first stage, which will require from 4 to 6 months, the duration of the full-fledged project will be 2 years.

In a simple summary, what we hope to gain from operation of a full-scale experimental employment service for a selected age group among older workers, coordinated with a strong research program, is—

(a) Knowledge in depth concerning these applicants and their employment objectives and problems, especially their qualifications, needs, attitudes, motivations, and physical status.

(b) Tested techniques that are effective in finding employment for them, particularly group counseling, and job development and training for groups.

(c) Experience in how to staff and organize effective employment service for older people.

(d) Realistic data on the cost of providing the kind of employment service needed by older workers, and

(e) Finally, guidance for other agencies and communities on ways to solve the employment problems faced by persons in the upper age groups which may be useful also in services to younger groups.

We are grateful to you, Senator Randolph and members of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes, for this opportunity to outline San Francisco's employment project for persons aged 60 years and over.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mrs. Kearney and Miss Fait, we have been intensely interested in what both of you have said here today. I want to be very clear in my own mind as to just how this program is going to move forward in the San Francisco area. As I understand it, there are now 1,800 persons 60 years of age and older that are actively under consideration or desire job placement; is that true?

Mrs. KEARNEY. This is true. This is the level we have found by special inventories.

Senator RANDOLPH. Now, you will attempt, through this program, to place all of these people; is that correct?

Mrs. KEARNEY. Some of them probably will not wish to participate in the project; there will be a number of dropouts. What we want to do is learn how to serve the whole workload. We don't want just a little demonstration; we have done that. Our problem is how to serve a great many people.

Senator RANDOLPH. How much money would be involved in this 2 years of work—I think you said 2 years will be necessary?

Mrs. KEARNEY. At least 2 years for a demonstration of this kind. I am hesitating to tell you the truth. When we really faced and included all of the operating costs and health examination costs, we thought that it would be at a level of \$200,000 per year. We are in the process now of funding the project. We have nothing right now in writing, but there are some fine commitments from the right sources.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you mean private sources or governmental sources?

Mrs. KEARNEY. Governmental sources. I think we should say that the sources of funds are likely to be the U.S. Department of Labor, and we are hoping that the U.S. Public Health Service will be equally interested in the project.

Mr. NORMAN. Mrs. Kearney, when do you expect to have any results of this project to report?

Mrs. KEARNEY. Do you mean the pilot we would use to decide the total project?

Mr. NORMAN. Yes.

Mrs. KEARNEY. There is the possibility that we would be able to start in several months.

Mr. NORMAN. When would you expect to report the results of the findings?

Mrs. KEARNEY. I think that we might have the preliminary report in writing within 6 months.

Mr. NORMAN. Six months from today?

Mrs. KEARNEY. I think that would be the earliest we could promise it.

Mr. NORMAN. The final report 2 years from today?

Mrs. KEARNEY. We will issue progress reports all the time, and let's say that when the 2 years are over we would have a preliminary final report in 6 months.

Mr. NORMAN. Would you say the employment of these people, to some extent, is in jobs which do not now exist and to meet a need not now being met? For example, not displacing anybody who is now employed but, as I take it from your testimony and Miss Fait's testimony, you are finding employment opportunities in jobs which do not now exist to meet needs not now being met?

Mrs. KEARNEY. That is exactly it. I think this is a way to solve the problem. When I said we need creative people working as a team, that is what I meant.

Mr. NORMAN. Yes. Now, I presume you work quite actively with various private groups who also share an interest in finding employment for older people. Would you give an indication of what, if any, assistance by the Federal Government might be proper and helpful to the private groups? For example, would financial assistance be proper, or would it be better to leave the financing to the private groups themselves, to leave it to them to seek voluntary contributions and receive funds from other sources?

Mrs. KEARNEY. It is our hope that the project would possibly be instrumental in having a nonprofit corporation formed to hire applicants qualified to render services needed in the community. This corporation formed to hire older workers would be a unique experience in this country. This corporation would pay social security taxes on wages, provide industrial compensation insurance, and then promote these elder citizens' services in the community. The public employment service really cannot be substituted for an entrepreneur. If we could get the money from the Federal Government or any source for the capitalization of an experimental nonprofit organization for this purpose, I think that would be the biggest step forward. The basic idea is not original; you know there are corporations hiring people in the older age brackets to do part-time work and they sell their services in the community, but these are profitmaking organizations.

Mr. NORMAN. Would this corporation be a regular operating corporation, say in the field of personal services or in the field of manufacturing or something of that kind?

Mrs. KEARNEY. We thought when we discussed this that we should start this in the personal services occupations rather than in the productive.

Mr. NORMAN. In other words, you might take a number of retired secretaries and make a pool of them, a part-time pool. The corporation would be nonprofit, but it would hire these people to perform services on a day-to-day basis as businesses needed these people to fill in; is that the idea?

Mrs. KEARNEY. That would be the idea. It could also take over the project of maintenance gardening, and promote that beyond what the local office of the department of employment might be able to do. I think such a corporation should have very strong management.

Mr. NORMAN. One final question: Perhaps Miss Fait would be the individual to whom I should direct this. I would like to have some additional information on the walking tour guides here in San Francisco. This impresses me as a pioneering effort, in the pioneering

spirit of this great State. I believe this could be well used in other States with historical and tourist attractions. Who pays these people?

Miss FAIT. I wonder, since Mrs. Kearney is one of these creative people that she talked about, she organized this program and she has furnished me with a statement from the California Historical Society for the use of the committee, if they need it, but I think she is the best one to answer that.

Mrs. KEARNEY. The California Historical Society is the employer and they pay the guides, but the fees are collected from the small groups of people taken on the tours.

Mr. NORMAN. As I understand it, these tours are all within a fairly narrow radius or within walking distance?

Mrs. KEARNEY. That is right. They started in San Francisco, and there are a number of basic tours. For example, the Chinatown tour, the Golden Gate Park tour, the Land's End tour. We thought in the long run we could expand these to the whole bay area.

Mr. NORMAN. How much do these people make? How many hours do they work, and what is their rate of pay?

Mrs. KEARNEY. The tour would be not more than 2 hours. Actually, I have forgotten the elaborate scale of pay, but the minimum per hour paid by the society to the guides was \$3 an hour, and the larger group's rate is higher. In other words, the more they have in the tour, the more they are paid, but the maximum in the group is 10; we wanted to keep it very personal.

Mr. NORMAN. How many tours do these people work a day?

Mrs. KEARNEY. I think most of these women and several men in the project would take not more than one tour a day. Actually, the historical society has advised recently that they have not had enough staff to promote this extensively. So, at present, it is a very small project with great potential.

Mr. NORMAN. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Senator RANDOLPH. On behalf of the members of the subcommittee we are very grateful, Miss Fait and Mrs. Kearney, for your testimony. I find it especially encouraging to have such specific testimony brought to our attention, and we will watch this effort here in the San Francisco area. I believe it will be productive, and I have a feeling that you could place 1,800 workers. I really feel this way, and I have confidence in your ability to do this job. I commend you on your resourcefulness and your belief that it can be done.

Mrs. KEARNEY. I would like to add at this point the names of the other members of the committee which developed the employment project.

(The list referred to follows:)

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT WHICH DEVELOPED THE SAN FRANCISCO EMPLOYMENT PROJECT FOR PERSONS AGED 60 YEARS AND OVER, JUNE 29, 1962, TO DECEMBER 16, 1963

(A Subcommittee of the Committee on Employment, Preretirement Preparation, and Income Maintenance, San Francisco Program for the Aging, United Community Fund of San Francisco)

Mrs. Nello E. Kearney, chairman.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller.

Miss Jeanne Butcher.

Miss Fay Cameron.

Dr. Roberta Fenlon, M.D.

Mrs. Margaret Miller Rocq.

Ex officio members of Ad Hoc Committee on Employment :

Dr. Edward D. Goldman, chairman, Committee on Employment, Preretirement Preparation and Income Maintenance, San Francisco Program for the Aging.

Mrs. Mercia Kahn, chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on Preretirement Preparation.

Mrs. Beatrice Schiffman, chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on Counseling.

Miss Aleta Brownlee, director, San Francisco Program for the Aging, United Community Fund of San Francisco, 1962-63.

(See titles in list of general committee below.)

**FINAL MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, PRERETIREMENT PREPARATION, AND INCOME MAINTENANCE, SAN FRANCISCO PROGRAM FOR THE AGING, UNITED COMMUNITY FUND OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Dr. Edward D. Goldman, chairman, 1962 and 1963; assistant superintendent, adult education, San Francisco public schools.

Dr. Curtis C. Aller, chairman, Department of Economics, San Francisco State College. On leave 1963-64 to serve as director, Select Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Miss Jeanne Butcher, assistant chief, Division of Industrial Welfare, California Department of Industrial Relations.

Miss Fay Cameron, general personnel director, the Emporium.

Mr. John F. Crowley, assistant to secretary, San Francisco Labor Council.

Mrs. Betty Elerding, Retirement and Welfare Assistant, Office of Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service.

Dr. Roberta Fenlon, M.D., internist and associate clinical professor, University of California School of Medicine, Medical Center, San Francisco; vice chairman, Health Council, United Community Fund of San Francisco; past president, San Francisco Medical Society.

Mr. Frank P. Foisie, formerly executive director, Federated Employers of the Bay Area.

Miss Hester M. Hood, representative, regional office of vocational rehabilitation, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Dalton Howatt, coordinator, adult education, San Francisco public schools.

Mrs. Anita Day Hubbard, columnist and feature writer, San Francisco Examiner.

Mrs. Mercia Leton Kahn, district manager, Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mrs. Nello E. Kearney, area coordinator, older worker program, California Department of Employment.

Mr. Louis Kuplan, consultant and lecturer on problems of aging and retirement planning.

Mr. E. O. Midyett, retired; active in National, State, and local senior citizens' organizations.

Mr. J. O. Payne, assistant to manager, benefits division, personnel department, Standard Oil Co. of California.

Mrs. Margaret Miller Rocq, retired; chapter consultant on establishment and organization of special libraries, San Francisco Bay Region Chapter, Special Libraries Association; formerly chief librarian, Standard Oil Co. of California.

Mr. Frederick Schabel, supervisor, retirement benefits, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

Mrs. Beatrice Schiffman, supervisor, services for older adults, San Francisco Council of Churches.

Mr. Henry Schmidt, director, ILWU-PMA pension fund, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

Miss Jane Taylor, personnel officer, U.S. General Services Administration.

Mrs. KEARNEY. Senator Randolph, may I add one more point: We want the staff of the California Department of Employment to have a successful experience; we think they will all be enthusiastic when they see how easy it is to do this.

Mr. MILLER. I am going to do the like of which I have never done before. I would like to tell you ladies what I read written on Senator Randolph's copy of the testimony, "These women are especially fine witnesses."

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much.

I suggest we take a recess for 6, 7, or 8 minutes. If we stretch it to 10, why, we will still be back in time. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes for the Elderly was taken at 11:50 for 10 minutes.)

Senator RANDOLPH. We will resume our testimony. Charles Rosenthal is the next witness. Mr. Rosenthal, we are very glad that you have come today.

**STATEMENT OF CHARLES ROSENTHAL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
CAREERS UNLIMITED FOR WOMEN**

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you, Senator, and members of the committee.

Senator RANDOLPH. Tell us something about your organization.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have a very different statement to make. I have a going organization, up at the Fairmont Hotel. We have placed 7,000 women, in the last 9 years, in good jobs, without any aid from the Federal Government, or State government, or anybody else.

We have a small group of civic-minded people who contribute a small amount of money each year, and that pays for our operating expenses, which only consist of telephones and postage. Through the generosity of the San Francisco newspapers, we receive more publicity than money could ever buy for Careers Unlimited for Women.

Senator RANDOLPH. Why do you use the word "Unlimited"?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Because there is an unlimited amount of jobs we can get.

Senator RANDOLPH. You believe women can do most any job?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Women can do any job. We are the first organization of this kind in the United States and we are very proud of that fact. During our first 2 years we had a great deal of trouble trying to convince employers that the older women could do jobs as well, or better, than younger women. We have proved that these older women have less absenteeism, and that their former training was valuable.

At their age, these women have no time to be trained for 3 years.

We go for top salaries. We don't go in for cutrate salaries, because the older people, if they can fill the jobs, their age should be no handicap. As a matter of fact, in the last 15 years, according to medical authorities, women's span of life is 13½ years longer than it was 20 years ago. These women are not looking for charity; they want to be gainfully employed; they want to contribute something to the country. As our late great President, Mr. Kennedy, said, in his statement of acceptance, "Do not ask what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." I think this is a wonderful statement. I think we should give these people an opportunity to fill these jobs that they are so well fitted for.

One thing I would ask the committee—I am against the idea of social security. Say, if a person happens to maybe get \$80 or \$70, or whatever it may be, then he is able to earn only \$1,200 more. That, to me, is a terrible thing; in fact, this whole business is terrible. It should be that a person could earn \$150, together with the \$80 that they are getting from social security, and then they could live fairly

comfortably. I don't think they should be penalized for trying to earn their way in the world.

We have placed women in all types of jobs: secretaries, stenos, receptionists, sales people, nurses, et cetera. I don't want to take up too much time, but I would like to give you one example: We had a big manufacturer, here in town, of ladies' fashions. And we had this woman who came out here who was 60 years of age. She and her husband had come from New York, and her husband had a lingering illness which had depleted all their money. She had worked for Hattie Carnegie, and Adele Simmon, as a designer. And, believe it or not, this woman is earning \$400 a week right now. I won't go along with anyone who says women can't fill these jobs that are available, and I don't go along with the objection of some people that, if they hire these older people, too soon they will become eligible for pensions. On those occasions we just sign a waiver, because these people can put away more money from a decent salary than they ever could from their pension. In many cases, we have done the same thing in regard to pensions—I mean insurance. We have signed a similar waiver in these cases. We had to go out and break these things down. I believe there should be more organizations all over this country that do not ask the Government for huge sums of money.

First, I must say, this is a highly specialized type of work. When a woman reaches a certain age she is rather timid about making application for the job. So, we find out where the jobs are available, and we contact these employers and ask them to hire our women.

The State organization can't do that because there are too many people coming in all day long. When these people go down to the State office of employment—it closes at a certain time, and opens at a certain time, and these women have to stand in line and wait around; I feel this is wrong. Further, I believe we have a proven organization. I don't believe these people need 2 or 3 years of retraining. These people need to be gainfully employed, right now. They might not be alive in 3 years.

These people can't be retrained for cutrate salaries. I believe the more experience in a particular line of work makes them better qualified to fill a job in that line. To gain this experience, a person has got to have some years on his shoulders.

We have done a creditable job, and we wish you could see how our operation works. We have only one paid woman, and the rest of our operating expenses are merely telephones and stationery, as I have said before.

It costs us about 12 cents a job, and in the State employment office it costs \$12 to \$14 a job.

Senator RANDOLPH. What do you mean by "12 cents a job"?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It costs us 12 cents to place persons in jobs. We don't have any fancy overhead or administrative costs. I don't know how many people work at the unemployment office, but they seem to have more people working down there than people who are looking for employment.

Senator RANDOLPH. You think the overhead of the Government is excessive in this field?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do. In this case I am talking about the State, not the Federal Government. They seem to have more people work-

ing down in the unemployment office than applicants. They have a number of men who are called fieldmen, and this kind of men, and that kind of men. That is all right. They need to work, too. But, I feel there should be enough civic-minded people throughout the Nation who could duplicate these jobs on a voluntary basis.

We had Dr. Davis out here for a week, about 2 years ago, and then we had another crowd out here recently, and nothing has developed. Everybody just puts in a report. The report comes in and asks "How much money can we get from Uncle Sam?"—everybody kicks about taxes afterward. I think there should be enough civic-minded people to do these things, rather than always be asking Uncle Sam for a handout. I devote most of my time to this thing, and I get a great thrill out of seeing other people gainfully employed. I think these people should be gainfully employed.

Senator RANDOLPH. What is your age?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am 77 years old.

Senator RANDOLPH. You don't seem to be a man of that age.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I can still knock out somebody around 45.

It's a question of a challenge with me. I believe that people who are mentally OK, and have the ability, are important. For instance, I put a man in a job who was 90 years of age. He went down to one of the big bonding houses. He sits at a desk. He doesn't walk around a lot, but his brain is still active.

You just might as well kill off a person when they reach a certain age if they are just going to be put out to pasture. I don't think the Government can be forever making it more attractive for these people by taking care of them. I would have loved to draw the kind of money they draw today and do nothing for it. I don't think this is what the American people want. In fact, I know that 80 percent of the people come to us don't want charity. They want to be able to go out and buy what they want.

Purely from the standpoint of advancing our economy, the more people earn the more money is put in circulation, and this is good for our economy.

Nobody can keep body and soul together with \$65 a month. Some people in San Francisco will get only \$55 a year added to their pension rate, and if they live another 30 years, that is hardly enough even to buy a pack of cigarettes.

Senator RANDOLPH. Since this report has come out, you are going to stop smoking, aren't you?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No; I smoke cigars.

I think it is pathetic when you see a woman who has a lot of ability as a saleswoman and she can't find a job because of her age. I know this with Saks Fifth Avenue here in San Francisco. I went to see the personnel manager about a year ago and told him I had two saleswomen. He said to me, "Just a minute. How old are they?" I said, "60 years old," and he just threw his hands in the air. But I said, "Please talk to them and see what they can do." And I brought them down there. Now they have been there 2 years and they write the biggest book on the floor, and he is looking for more women like them all the time. The State can't do that; they can't go and take each individual case.



If you are sick you don't want to go to the county hospital—you want a specialist. You don't want a man to cut you the wrong way and say, "Well, I made a mistake." I believe these people should be gainfully employed, not only because it is humane, but also because it will strengthen our Government. What person is going to have great patriotism if he can't even get a job?

What happens on the newspapers? They say nobody over 35 need apply. Nobody without 2 years of college. We have got so damn many college people and nobody can do the work, they all want fancy salaries. I had a college education and I learned nothing until I went out into the world and had a few hard knocks. We must find room for these people; we must sit down in each of the cities and help these people. We must be free from the bond of the Government—Federal Government or State government—so that we don't have to ask anybody for anything or thank anybody for what they give us. Of course, this will be with the exception of a number of businessmen who would give us a small pittance so that we are able to take care of all of our expenses.

Senator RANDOLPH. I think that there is considerable agreement between you and the other witnesses. As chairman of this subcommittee I believe we have a responsibility to attempt, diligently, to break down the artificial barriers or cutoff points at which men and women can be employed. There is a red flag that goes up when a person announces his or her age; this is true. I hear that over and over again when I talk with men and women about personal employment problems. These people are well-balanced people. They are not people that cannot be employed; they should be employed. Your experience and that of your organization will be helpful to us.

Now, I noted there was some implied criticism, although not direct, of a program such as has been outlined here this morning. Would you say that program would not have a place, or would you say that perhaps it is unnecessary to have that program in view of an organization like the one of which you are a part?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, I feel our organization is so small that we are not and never will be in a position to take care of any big load. But, I do say in some cases there is too much extravagance. There should be more organizations like ours in various cities where people could raise the money and get a small subsidy and run it on their own. I think it would be much cheaper to do this than if you started to build up a big organization with elaborate plans for training, and nontraining, and God knows what all. In the first place, it takes too long. You can't take a person in need of employment and give them 40 or 60 days' training. How are they going to live? I think it is marvelous that these people take so much interest but everybody is drawing a big salary, everybody is making big money.

At my age I feel that I owe something to the community. I made my money and I have got some money. I feel my conscience is soothed by doing something good to make up for all the bad that I have done in the past.

I don't know why it takes so much money; I hear \$200,000, \$300,000, \$400,000. I don't know where it is going. On our small budget today there is only one thing that we miss, and that is a couple of women on a small salary to go around to the business houses every

day and be on the spot when there is a job open and ring back and say, "Send somebody down." You are not going to have people come to you.

Let's be honest. We haven't got a great number of people today. We must notice the lack of interest most people show when it comes to the political side of things. I apologize for this. They feel that you have to know somebody to get a job. They figure that they will be given the "Don't call us, we'll call you" treatment, and all that sort of stuff. That is something we don't do at our place. If a woman comes to us and says she is looking for a stenographer's job, and we notice that she has arthritis—we don't want to embarrass her, so we just say we have a governess job, and maybe she would like to be placed there. That is too big a job for the State. We try to help these people individually. All the credit goes to my staff. I do a lot of talking, but they do the work. They take the time when they do interview a woman to find out, by talking to them. And without hurting their feelings, they say, "We have got something else here for you." For instance, there are these two children, say, down the peninsula, and they need a governess. We have done things in that type of spirit. We have 12 or 14 highly intelligent women who, instead of playing cards, come up there, and also soothe their consciences for lack of what they should have done a long time ago.

Senator RANDOLPH. How many years has your operation been in existence?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Nine years.

Senator RANDOLPH. Whose idea was it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The original idea came from Marjorie King of KGO who had a daily radio program. She used to ask, "What can we do for San Francisco"? and people would ask different things, and a great number of people were saying that they couldn't get jobs. She contacted Mr. Swig and myself and said, "You fellows should be doing something along these lines." We had two or three meetings and we got a good board of directors from the bank, and so forth, and we started, and we met a terrific lot of reverses the first year or so. They didn't want old people, and I think the State—let me be corrected if I am wrong—and the Federal Governments were the worst offenders. They used to advertise for civil service with "nobody over a certain age need to apply." That used to be in the newspapers. In New York and Illinois there was a bill passed where you can't advertise in the newspapers: "Nobody under a certain age." Mr. Burton here and Mr. Meyers, at my suggestion, have a bill in the hopper now where you won't be able to do it here—but I don't think it will go over. The bad part about it is, gentlemen, when a woman of 45 or 55 or even 60 who may have great ability, looks in the want ads and sees this, she says to herself, "There is no use going down because of my age." Yet if she was allowed to go down she might be able to sell herself. I think that is important, gentlemen, that this type of thing be taken out of the newspapers and give everybody a chance to go down and sell themselves.

Senator RANDOLPH. Don't you think private industry is at fault also in regard to this?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They are at fault, but don't forget, a lot of big business is subsidized by the Government and a word from the Government can change all this.

I have been in the automobile business myself for a number of years. The best salesmen I had were 75, 80 years of age. The kids—for instance, the younger women, when they fight with their boy friends, they take it out on the customers the next day. And the young men are always going out and picking up their girl friends, but these older people, they are afraid of losing their jobs and they are the best help. For instance, you take a woman who has been turned down repeatedly and finally she gets a job; you can be sure she wants to hold onto that job. So you can see in this case the benefit goes to the employer.

I had never been in the employment agency business. I don't speak with authority, I speak with what we have accomplished. When we started, Mr. Swig and I knew nothing about the employment agency business. He was in the hotel business and I knew only about the theatrical business and the automobile business. I don't know everything yet, but I do know these women are employable.

I have an example of a doctor who wanted a receptionist. I told the doctor I had this woman who was 70 years old and the doctor looked at me like I was crazy. But after some talking—well, in any event, I can tell you right now that this woman is doing a wonderful job and the doctor is well pleased. I might add that we have many calls from the city of Paris for our women.

Mr. NORMAN. You just said a moment ago that one way these older ladies are superior is that they appreciate a job if they find one, they tend to do what it takes to succeed in the job. Can you tell us in what other way they are superior to younger ladies?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. From their past training they are more efficient, they don't jump from place to place. Some younger people quit if you look at them cockeyed. I feel that through prolonged training—say for instance if a woman has been a steno in a general office for 15 or 20 years, well, certainly she has learned something or she wouldn't have stayed on the old job for 20 years. Therefore, the new employer gets the benefit of her training. When you start a new person on the job and give him tools, they ruin most of the tools before they even learn how to use them. You wouldn't want to take your children and give them to some youngster who never had any training with children. These older women have had children of their own and they know what they are doing. After a woman has worked at selling for 20 years, you don't question her ability.

Mr. NORMAN. Are there any other particular types of occupations or jobs in which you believe older ladies excel?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I believe salesmanship. In the first place, they have more patience with people and are more considerate to the customers. I believe they excel at every job if you want the truth: Bookkeeping, stenographer, sales people, receptionists, practical nurses, they excel in all these positions. We have placed many practical nurses.

Everybody used to say, "Who wants to be a babysitter?" but today babysitters get \$2.25 an hour. They ring us up for older people because they don't want to leave their children with somebody who is unreliable and we have got reliable people. The people who call us realize that it will cost money to get reliable people; they used to think they could get our people for nothing.

Today we get more than the average union scale. We have watched this aspect particularly because we knew there would be criticism from the paid agencies if we got jobs for people below scale. Therefore, we have been watching this aspect and have kept up with the standard of wages and we have never had any trouble with the union at all. We work with the unions and we believe in the unions and we recognize them at all times. I am worried how the people can live on social security and old age pensions because the old age pension hasn't been raised in accordance with the cost of living. Everything else is going up but the pension rate remains the same as it has been for 10 or 15 years. Nobody has put a bill through to see that the social security goes up. In any event, I believe these people would much rather be paying taxes than to be living off the Government relief programs.

Different people from all over the country have written to us concerning our operation but the minute we say, "We don't charge for our services," they lose interest. It seems that everybody wants to get rich off the backs of these people. I still feel, though, that there are enough good people throughout the world who would be willing to set up organizations comparable to ours.

Mr. NORMAN. Do you have any suggestions for stimulating groups like yourselves throughout the Nation? As I understand it, this group just grew up in San Francisco; what can be done to cultivate groups like this throughout the Nation?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I think all the social organizations and all these fraternal organizations should start one of these things. Why do people always come to the Government for money? They think the Government should give it away. They are always looking for the Government to do something for them. I think Mr.—poor Mr. Kennedy told the truth when he said, "Let's have somebody do something for the Government instead of the Government doing it for them."

Mr. NORMAN. What is your budget?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. \$4,200 a year.

Mr. NORMAN. If you had more money, do you think you could find more jobs?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, if we had probably \$10,000 we could have women going around checking for jobs.

Mr. NORMAN. That would make a total of \$14,000 or \$15,000?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I believe we could double this thing with that amount.

Mr. NORMAN. Is there any assistance, financial or otherwise, which the Federal Government is not giving to your organization which you believe it might give? Or do you believe the Federal Government should stay out of assisting organizations like yours?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I don't think they should give us anything at all.

Mr. NORMAN. You prefer to get the money by private subscription?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, because that way we can make our own moves without worrying that we won't get this or that for our next budget.

I think it is wrong to build on that basis. If I was going to the Federal Government, I would ask for \$10 million, not for \$10,000; \$10,000 doesn't mean anything. It's like in the old days with Amos and Andy, \$50,000, \$50,000,000—I feel there should be agencies created, what we would call humane agencies. I believe these agencies

should be set up in such a manner that the Federal Government or the State government or whoever invests in these different things would give them a grant if they felt they were worth while, not a fantastic grant—in fact, I believe every State should have their own agency instead of wasting money for fancy trips and so forth. My God, that would mean nothing to the State to do a thing like this. We have never asked the State or anybody else for any money, we are small, but I feel we could double this operation. The only thing we are weak in is the fact that we don't have suitable people to go around to the big firms who do a lot of employing and inform us as soon as jobs become available. In that way we would be able to cover a lot of jobs that are now getting away from us.

Mr. NORMAN. Have you investigated the possibility of getting somebody on a voluntary basis to do that kind of work?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That can't be done because this person, or those persons, must be at your command and be paid for what they do. In other words, so that you will be able to tell them what you expect of them and if they don't work out, you don't keep them. You can't tell a voluntary worker what to do, but if a person is being paid it becomes necessary that they do good on the job. This is the only place in our organization where the job can't be done on a voluntary basis.

Mr. NORMAN. Why do you limit your services to women? Why don't you serve men also?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Because men can take care of themselves. I mean a man is not bashful about going in after a job. I think a man will take most any kind of a job if he is up against it, but you can't ask a woman to do that same kind of work. I don't see where any men need to be out of work. Today, all of the testimony that you have had here so far was mostly jobs—two-thirds of the jobs were for men and one-third for women. The last testimony made bears out what I have been saying. I believe women need certain types of jobs and need to be treated differently.

Mr. MILLER. In your staffing, you do rely largely on a volunteer staff?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Our staff is all volunteer with the exception of one woman at \$100 a month.

Mr. MILLER. Is there any particular organization where these volunteers come from?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. These are personal friends or somebody who has heard about our organization and has come down there. Some work 2 days a week and some work 5 days a week around the clock. My wife works 5 days a week around the clock.

Mr. MILLER. It appears to me one of the major ingredients in the success you have had is a very enlightened volunteer leadership in this program. From what you said earlier, I gather, publicity in the newspapers, radio, and television has also been important?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. We could never pay the newspapers for the publicity they have given us. The newspapers publicize our organization on the average of four times a month. The radio is the same way and the television also. The San Francisco Examiner has been particularly wonderful to us.

Mr. MILLER. I ask these questions because I feel they are important for the record so that anyone interested in doing something like this may take note.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. This may be unethical, but we do have a number of women who buy a lot of merchandise from these stores. They are pretty good customers and they have never gotten anything in return from the stores. So they get on the phone and say, "I see you have a position open and I am sending down a lady that I think you can use." And the store recognizes this lady as a pretty good customer, so they try their best to keep her happy. As I was saying before, no matter how big the State employment organization is, they can't afford to step out on an individual basis and place people. This is highly specialized work because when people say, "We don't want anybody over 45," they mean 45.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Rosenthal, your testimony is very refreshing and helpful. I am going to be interested in knowing more about your organization and we are going to do some corresponding with you. We will not take the time of the subcommittee this morning, but I am going to ask that we find out from you more details of what is being done here in San Francisco in this unique and apparently most successful program.

I thank you.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you for bearing with me because I am not in the class with the rest of these folks this morning.

Senator RANDOLPH. You did very well for yourself. [Applause.]

I will call the next witness. Would you please give your name and organization?

**STATEMENT OF EMERSON O. MIDYETT, MEMBER OF THE ADVISORY BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS**

Mr. MIDYETT. I am Emerson O. Midyett. I am 78 years of age; of San Francisco since 1906.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today. I realize the limitation of time today, and I am going to make a very short statement.

The problems of the aged and aging are such that when I realize that on Saturday, January 11, we had a hearing by the group headed by Senator Moss on housing, and today, the 13th, there are two hearings in San Francisco, one by Senator Williams on frauds and quackery, and this group on income maintenance and employment, I almost feel that the three hearings should have been combined into one larger hearing. All three of these subjects in fact, housing and income maintenance to a great degree, and frauds and quackery to perhaps a lesser degree, are a large part of the problems of the older group.

Income, of course, lies at the root of most of the worries and disturbances of the aged. With an adequate income many of our problems would disappear.

I am now speaking of California where we have approximately 1,500,000 persons over 65 years of age.

We have about one-sixth of these on old age security and medical aid to the aging. There is perhaps an upper group of 10 percent who, because of adequate income, have no worries. And perhaps 15 percent right below this group who are so situated that barring catastrophic illness manage to get by very comfortably. This leaves 55-plus percent who are in the position of having just enough income to get by

on if nothing happens and providing inflation does not continue to erode away the value of their few dollars. It is this segment that I have the most concern about. The one-sixth on OAS and MAA are fairly safe as to income, medical care, and so forth. The 53-plus percent are the people who worked and attempted to save a few dollars, and have perhaps \$5,000 in savings or saving bonds. Because of these savings they are not eligible for the programs of the Federal and the State governments and must use up these savings to a large degree in order to become eligible. I believe that rather than try to reduce these people to the status of welfare, all efforts should be made to encourage them to continue as they are. They do resent the thought of applying for assistance. I prefer that they be enabled to preserve their pride, dignity, and independence.

When we realize that the income of this group ranges from \$1,200 to \$2,000 per year, and that they must pay 50 percent or more for rent, little is left for utilities, food, medicine, and so forth, and even when they are forced to go to a clinic they must pay 50 percent or more of the cost of laboratory tests, drugs, X-rays, and so forth. The net result is that a large percentage of these people simply do not get even a minimum of medical care. This is a hard way to preserve pride and dignity. On employment of the aged, I am somewhat pessimistic. Perhaps too much so. On this subject I will defer to Mrs. Nello Kearney, of the State department of employment. I have served on several committees with Mrs. Kearney and know of the amount of study and effort which has been expended by her on this subject. I am very much interested in the matter of preparation for retirement. Efforts along this line should be encouraged.

Before closing I would like to say that I sincerely believe that medicare, based on social security, is an absolute must if we hope to remove from the minds of the older group one of the things that causes a large part of the worry and disturbance. The very knowledge that this is available as a matter of right and that in most cases has been secured through contributions to the fund and that means tests are not necessary, would do much to encourage millions of the aged and additional millions of the soon to be in the category of the aged.

The private insurance interests and the AMA have cried for years that the private carriers could and would solve the problem. They either cannot or will not do so. The present so-called golden or over-65 policies are certainly far from an answer. They in most instances will pay 20 to 25 percent of the cost of an average hospital illness and less for one of catastrophic proportions.

During the 1963 session of the California State Legislature, the lawmakers were prevailed upon to remove the antitrust provisions of the State as they might apply to insurance carriers and permit them to band together and offer over-65 hospital insurance to the aged.

On November 7, 1963, the San Francisco Chronicle presented this plan in an editorial. I am attaching a copy of this editorial to this statement. A quick look at the provisions of the plan as outlined should clearly show that this is not even a good start toward providing adequate coverage and that for this coverage the premiums are not in the reach of hundreds of thousands of the over 65.

I will quote from one paragraph in the editorial. [Reads:]

One plan would cover 80 percent of medical and hospital costs (up to \$10,000) after the policyholder paid the first \$500. The monthly premium would be \$14. A second plan, with an \$11 monthly premium, would pay minimum hospital costs—\$20 a day for room and board up to 31 days, plus \$200 for incidental expenses. A third plan would cover 80 percent of hospital room and board up to 180 days and 80 percent of major medical expenses; the premium would be \$23 a month.

I submit these figures: For plan No. 1 for a single person paying \$14 a month, it would cost \$168 per year. For plan No. 2 for a single person paying \$11 per month, it would cost \$132 per year. For plan No. 3, a single person paying \$23 per month would pay \$276 per year. Now, if a couple with a combined income of \$2,400 per year are paying a rent of \$70 per month, or \$840 per year, and utilities of \$10 per month, or \$120 per year, plus paying the cost of plan No. 3 for both of them, which would be \$552 per year, this would come to a total of \$1,512 per year. You can easily see this would leave them with less than \$900 per year for food, clothes, incidental expenses, and to pay the 20 percent of medical cost under this plan.

I submit to date that nobody has come up with any plan that offers any hope for people over 65 who have contributed to social security who are trying to get by and maintain some form of dignity.

I thank you for your time and appreciate being with you very much.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much for coming forward and appearing before the subcommittee.

Is Mrs. Schiffman here?

I believe you are from the San Francisco Council of Churches.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. MILTON (BEATRICE C.) SCHIFFMAN, SUPERVISOR, SERVICES FOR OLDER ADULTS, SAN FRANCISCO COUNCIL OF CHURCHES**

Mrs. SCHIFFMAN. There are two groups of older people whom we are talking about; there is the group that has always been economically and socially and physically deprived. This is the group we don't talk about very much. Then there is the other group who has always been able to cope with their employment problems. These people can be fairly easily placed. But, it's the economically and socially deprived group that I am interested in.

There is a step before the actual employment placement that is extremely important. This is one of the steps that we try to incorporate in our program which Nello Kearney has previously talked about. I wonder why we couldn't have this on a nationwide or statewide basis. By this I mean vocational testing for people at the point of retirement. They could begin vocational testing at 45 or 55 and then they could have vocational training for 5 or 10 years before they retire. They could begin to plan far in advance how they would use their time upon retiring.

There are a lot of myths about old age. There has been a beautiful study done by the Department of Labor to dispel these myths. Myth No. 1 is that older people are sick a lot. The fact is that they are steady and reliable on the job. Another myth is that older people are slow and don't produce as much. The fact is that they are slower but



they are so much steadier. They take less time for coffee breaks and smoking and gossiping. In the long run their production is better. Another myth is that older people aren't as fast and that they don't have some of the muscular strength that they formerly did. But they have learned an economy of motion. The Department study further states that the older person is the same person that he has always been. To reach the age of 60 or 65 or 70 he has developed a coping mechanism.

Some people may have been in the wrong job and they may not have known which way to go. We find we can actually talk with a person and determine what his past experience was. Using just a little bit of creativity, almost everybody can be placed.

The Council of Churches is helping churches to operate a number of senior citizen centers. It is my feeling that if we had more manpower we would be able to find many employment in some area. Perhaps we need to work with and help those who didn't do too well. We need to help these people in a constructive way similar to methods used by the Jewish counseling service in Chicago. I believe this approach could be very helpful for many people.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mrs. Schiffman, I wonder if you would tell us if the Council of Churches here in San Francisco has a definite program?

Mrs. SCHIFFMAN. Yes, we have a very extensive program, helping 10 different churches serve the older people in their neighborhood. Five different denominations have senior centers. These centers were not originated to have people come and have fun for the rest of their lives. They are the kind of facility in which we have occupational therapy and music therapy. Our goal is to help people make relationships and learn new things.

Senator RANDOLPH. You are really helping those people to hold jobs; is that true?

Mrs. SCHIFFMAN. We want to help people to develop hope and skill so that once they are placed they can retain their jobs. The minute we see a person is interested in working, we try to find employment for him. We have had good experience with the State employment department. When we were able to tell them some details about the person, they were able to go out and get a job that actually fit the individual. We were involved with the older worker placement service of the department.

Senator RANDOLPH. I think it is fine when the area of an industry, the civic organization, the religious group, working with the Government, can be brought together toward one end.

Mrs. SCHIFFMAN. I can tell you of half a dozen cases which are part of the State department of employment records where we had excellent placements.

Senator RANDOLPH. Why don't you take four or five of those cases and have them printed in a record form and give them to me because I think people throughout the country and Members of Congress will want to read of these actual placement successes?

I thank you very much, Mrs. Schiffman.

Mrs. SCHIFFMAN. Thank you. [Applause.]

(Cases referred to, subsequently submitted, follow:)

Mr. U, 72, had been unemployed for 15 years. He had become a recluse after his wife died 5 years before. He had left his job because, when his firm was swallowed up, he was asked to leave his supervisory job for a lesser one. He stayed home and pouted. After a period in our center, he began to reveal his need for funds. But primarily his contact with us had brought him back into the stream of life, had given him a feeling of personal worth. State department of employment older person specialist placed him in a job where he and his boss were both delighted.

Mr. R had broken his back after working 9 years, 9 months, and so received only railroad retirement income—no social security. Since a 3-month work experience was needed to secure social security for him, he was sent to the State department of employment. He was given a job which fulfilled his requirement and was within his strength. At our center he learned a skill through which he later received a fine temporary job with a fine craftsman, through the department of employment. This experience, plus his own development in the center, raised himself in his own estimation. He now has a very fine volunteer job, teaching, which brings him tremendous satisfaction.

Mr. Y had extensive training in a field in which he never functioned. At 66-plus, he came to us to learn a craft so he could support his wife. He never showed a real interest in the craft, but became involved in a discussion group. As he began to note his superior understanding of current events, and his ability to research areas of news, his estimate of himself rose. As we noted his better functioning, we referred him to the older worker placement person. He found a research job for this man which fitted his talents and his needs.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Champagne.

**STATEMENT OF LEO J. CHAMPAGNE, RETIRED, SENIOR CITIZEN,  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.**

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. Yes. Thank you.

Senator RANDOLPH. Give your correct name for the reporter.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. My name is Champagne. I was born here in San Francisco in 1890.

To expedite this thing, I will tell you a little bit about myself. I was in the class of 1913, and the Chief Justice was in one of my classes. I got an electrical engineering degree in 1913. I went to Los Angeles as a county civil service electrical engineer, and then went in the Navy. After the Navy, in which I served during World War I, I came back to San Francisco. I was with the city and county of San Francisco school department until my pension. Now, I find myself with no social security, and no other income. My only income is my pension. Based on income in 1924, I paid for my pension as time went on. I have to pay a large amount of taxes—it will be around \$1,200—next month to the U.S. income tax, and then I have to pay State income tax; home tax about \$2 a day, tax on gasoline \$11, and auto license. But, the worst part of it that my experience and knowledge and education are worthless; they are only worth so much to foreign countries. In other words, I am working for foreign countries. We have State laws that should not be. We have State laws, professional laws, contractors' laws, electrical and financiers' laws, where, after 65, you cannot become a member of that. I think that should not be; I think that should be unconstitutional.

A person with my knowledge, or experience, should be able to use it for the welfare of this country, and not for other countries. For instance, I designed the best radio set in the United States today, and I had to do it for a foreign country.

I think there should be a limit to the income taxes, where we should not be taxed when we earn under \$5,000, but above \$5,000 a person should, I think, pay income tax. I don't think a person should pay income taxes on his pension, because I almost had to mortgage my home in order to pay my State and U.S. taxes last year. Of course, we cannot get welfare or public assistance, and we have no social security. Now, what I am asking for is my right to be allowed to work. There is a large number of us who, upon retiring, have to go to foreign countries, and that is the only market for our experience and knowledge.

Senator RANDOLPH. I want to be quite sure. You spoke of a tax of \$1,200 that you are going to have to pay.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. That is 22 percent of what I get from my pension, but my pension is the only income that I have, and that's a large amount of money to be taxed. Then there will be the State income tax. The income taxes have gone up, but our pension was based on my entrance into the San Francisco school department in 1924.

Senator RANDOLPH. I want to be very clear about that statement you made. You say—as I understand it, you say you have to pay \$2,000?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. Not quite that much; but a very large amount, very near that.

Senator RANDOLPH. You have an income, then, at the present time?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. The only income I have I get from doing a little work designing and my pension.

I think I should do things legally; but I cannot do them legally because the State license says that I cannot do that. For instance, it requires you to make an estimate on the job before you do it. But, if you went to the doctor with bad breath, and asked the doctor to make an estimate of how much it would cost to cure you, the doctor would say a large amount in order to get by with it, you see.

(Whereupon, Mr. William Norman assumed the chair.)

Mr. NORMAN. Thank you very much. Mr. Ellis Komsky, would you like to say a few words?

#### **STATEMENT OF ELLIS KOMSKY, RETIRED, SENIOR CITIZEN, DALY CITY, CALIF.**

Mr. KOMSKY. Ellis Komsky. I am 76 years old and I live in Daly City, a suburb of San Francisco.

I am one of these people all this commotion is about. I have attended quite a few of these sessions, and I have never seen any one of us recipients of social security, or old-age pension, be given a chance to talk. I am receiving an old-age pension from the State, and I have here a list of what I figured out, from my experience, are my personal needs to live a halfway—not full-way—comfortable existence. I would like to submit, for the record, that a person over 60 years of age—certainly one of 65, and most certainly one of over 70—should be getting this amount of money from the State or Federal Government so that they be allowed to live out their lives in semi-comfort.

We should get \$105 a month for rooms. That makes only \$3.50 a day, at 30 days to the month. For food, we should be getting also

\$3.50 a day. That is for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. And here I figure on 31 days per month. I figure on 31 days per month because 1 month is 30 days and another month is 31 days. That totals to \$108.50 per month. For carfare in the city of San Francisco or any other city \$18.60 per month that would make two round trips daily. The San Francisco fare is not expensive. It is only 15 cents or a round trip for 30 cents. I consider this a necessity for a man of my age because when I come to San Francisco it costs me 30 cents. I eat two meals in San Francisco and one in Daly City in the evening. I am only allowed \$15 per month for lunches and breakfasts, and I am allowed only one fare per day because that is what my social worker insisted I am entitled to. She says, "You don't have to go any place," and that is like putting me in jail. I have trouble with my legs and I had a specially bad operation in order to make it possible for me to walk, but I still cannot walk after the operation. I think every old person should get two fares a day, and that would make \$18.50 per month. He should get for clothing—for buying new clothes, including hats, shoes, and underwear—this is a very reasonable figure—\$14 per month. And then he needs for cleaning, laundry, and repairs of those same clothes \$20 per month. I spend that much myself out of the money from the State.

Mr. MILLER. Does that include the \$14 or is that aside from the \$14?

Mr. KOMSKY. That is aside, from my personal experience. For movies he needs \$4 a month—\$1 a week. It so happens, in my particular case, and I know a lot of people who want to go to the legitimate theater, they wish to go to the opera. I haven't gone to the opera in 3 years, but I used to go to the opera. Legitimate theaters, operas, and lectures, he should be allowed \$8 a month, and that is only \$2 a week. And then for clubs and organizations—I used to belong to three lodges. I had to drop two of them because I didn't have enough money to pay dues. One should not have to drop out because he can't afford to pay \$18 a year. He should get that \$18. For haircuts and shaves he needs \$6 a month. For newspapers, books, and occasional lecture, \$9 a month, and \$9 a month for incidentals. Then a man should get \$12 a month for travel. I think that everyone should get that. He needs that so he could travel.<sup>1</sup> In my case, I spend quite a bit of money for travel. I am 76 and I am going to be 77 next March. I have a family back East and I would like to go to New York and say goodbye to them. This is probably going to be my last trip and I cannot do it, not so much because of my age but because of my inability to get money to go there. The sum total of what an old man needs is \$287 per month.

Now, to cover all that, I get only \$155.75. That is what I am getting. I submit this is inadequate to ask me to live on. I am not talking for myself alone, I am just taking myself as an example. There are 250,000 people in California who are getting old-age and social security benefits, and of all those, not one can decently live on such a small allowance. Now, there is an interesting situation. The

<sup>1</sup> If the 20,000,000 senior citizens could travel, the railroads could pay dividends to the stockholders out of their earnings instead of having to fire their help and adding them to the relief rolls.

legislature voted to allow the senior citizens \$172 per month. In fact, in some cases, it allows up to \$200 a month, and some people are getting it, but most of us do not get it because of a "manual" in the State welfare department. They—the welfare people—are guided by that "manual." Who put up that "manual" I don't know, but the "manual" says the recipient's aid is based on his needs. Nobody came to me and asked me how much I needed; nobody asked all the others how much they needed. Yet, they tell me that's all I need—\$155.75 per month. I even appealed to the district board of the welfare department, but it just so happened that last year when I made my appeal—the week that they gave me a hearing—

(Whereupon Senator Randolph reassumed the chair.)

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Komsky, I wonder if we might indicate to you the fact that we don't have too much time left and we wish that you could enumerate your points in 2 or 3 minutes and conclude your statement, not that we would not like to hear you more in length.

Mr. KOMSKY. What I am saying is this: During the hearing that they gave me, I was sure that the man who gave me the hearing was going to get me the allowance that I was asking for since my doctor told me I needed special food and extra transportation. I tried to get only an extra \$9 for carfare and they said I couldn't have it because at that time the San Francisco papers started a vicious campaign against the welfare department, accusing them of coddling the aged and needy and giving them too much. So, these people got scared, and that was the main reason I didn't get what I asked for. It is hard for people on relief to get a hearing from the newspapers of San Francisco. He just can't get it; neither can he get it from the authorities. I understand some of the radio people might give it to you, but you have to go after them and go after them, and you can't go because you haven't got the carfare or the strength. So you give up.

In conclusion, sir, in order not to take up much more of your time, I wish to say, since the Federal Government gives one-third, as I understand it, to the State for us old people, I think it should have the right to go to the State and inquire whether they are giving the recipients enough and if not, why not.

One more thing I would like to ask, Senator Randolph, is about House bill 8826. That bill, if passed, would give us old people a little more and make our lot a bit easier. I wish you, personally, and through some of your friends, could see to it that that bill passes. If that bill passes Congress, I think it would help me and the 250,000 other old people in California and all the others in the land.

Thank you very much for giving me this hearing.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much, sir. [Applause.]

There are presumably two or three other persons that desire to testify. I will ask you to give your name to a member or members of the staff, and we will include this testimony, I hope this will be satisfactory. If there is one person who would just like to stand and give his name, I believe I made a promise to this gentleman here.

**STATEMENT OF GROVER C. SANDERSON, RETIRED CARPENTER,  
SENIOR CITIZEN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.**

Mr. SANDERSON. I am Grover C. Sanderson, and I am a Karuk Indian. I worked here until I was retired. And I am the chairman of the Bay Area California Indian Council. I would like to make a statement, not a request.

I would just like to make the statement to sum it up, and this might be helpful to you. First, we go to school for 15 years, on an average. Second, we work for about 40 to 50 years in a man's lifetime. Third, about 15 years we have to live in freedom for ourselves. Fourth, each retired person should make something useful for folks on their own time. Fifth, we oldsters should let the younger folks take over. Sixth, we should have medical care and dental care through social security, and that is my statement.

Senator RANDOLPH. We are very glad to have you appear before the subcommittee.

I wish you would state your address, please.

Mr. SANDERSON. I have lived here for 40 years, and my address is 3155 San Jose Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much, Mr. Sanderson.

Now, would the others who indicated that they might possibly wish to be heard please stand? There was one lady, I believe, who has gone, who had requested to speak.

Before we conclude the hearing, I would like to indicate that I believe there are approximately 400,000 families in California where the head of that particular household is 65 years or over. Is that right, Mrs. Kearney, or Miss Fait? I believe someone has given me that figure.

Miss FAIT. 400,000 families in California.

Senator RANDOLPH. 400,000 families and the person who heads up that family, in some instances it could be one or more, the man or woman, that he or she is 65 years of age or older. This I think is a correct picture, and the median family income for those families in this State is about \$3,700 a year. The national average is \$3,100 a year. There is this fact that I wanted to place in the record.

Our final witness will be George McLain.

**STATEMENT OF GEORGE McLAIN, CHAIRMAN, CALIFORNIA LEAGUE  
OF SENIOR CITIZENS**

Mr. McLAIN. Senator, if I could have one word, I would like, for the benefit of the folks here, to tell about your hearings in Los Angeles that took place last Friday with an attendance of 400 people.

I would like to say that it seemed to be the consensus of the witnesses that appeared before your committee that there should be less redtape on the amount of earnings that those under social security could enjoy, as well as less redtape on earnings that the people on old-age assistance could enjoy. I didn't have the opportunity to be here today at the beginning of your hearing, but I am sure you discussed fully and in detail those two problems, like you did in Los Angeles.

Senator RANDOLPH. There was general agreement here as in Los Angeles.

Mr. McLAIN. I was curious to know whether you found that prevalent throughout other hearings this committee held in other parts of the country. The feeling that there should be less limitations on the amounts that individuals are allowed to earn under social security and not lose their social security benefits.

Senator RANDOLPH. There has been widespread interest on the subject matter, and I think in California we have had evidence of the particular interest in this aspect. I believe what has been said by you and others has been helpful to the subcommittee.

Mr. McLAIN. I would like to add that those people who had the privilege and honor to hear the statements of yourself and Senator Moss and Senator Williams would not have had that opportunity to appear before a committee 3,000 miles away in Washington because they couldn't afford to be there. I think that when the Senate saw the need of establishing, what shall we say, our committee, the Special Committee on Aging, I think they have done a tremendous service for the people of the United States to allow not only the Senate to come out to the country and appear in the different States—this has never been done before—but they also allowed the elderly people the privilege of listening to the hearings.

I want to thank the committee and Senator Randolph on behalf of California and the National League of Senior Citizens.

Senator RANDOLPH. I know Senator Moss and Senator Williams share my feelings that these hearings in California have been and are now still continuing this afternoon to be productive of information and of challenge. I feel that the Senate and the Congress, generally, is more cognizant now of the need to act affirmatively and intelligently in this field than ever before. I believe that the matter of employment for the American people, generally, is perhaps one of—if not the most—pressing problems that we are faced with. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. We have been meeting now for weeks, and I think we have had 56 hearings within the last year, trying to find the answers to these vexations, these deeply rooted problems which we face. Automation, of course, is a very major problem. This continuing high level of unemployment in our country is something we must face up to, we just can't ignore it in an enlightened society. We are a prosperous nation, our people are employed and our economy is strong, but I can see many problems that are facing us in connection with employment of our citizens, especially those older citizens of America. So, if Congress can be responsive, and it must be responsive to the needs of the people, we can perhaps find the best evidences of the people's thoughts by coming out to the citizens rather than expecting them to come to us. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. McLAIN. Thank you, Senator. [Applause.]

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you.

Mr. Norman, do you have any comment that you would like to make before we conclude the hearing?

Mr. NORMAN. I have no further comments, Senator, except to say that we have had a very fine group of witnesses this morning, and I think they have been very helpful to the subcommittee in formulating its recommendations.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you have any further comments, Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. I have no further comments, Senator.

Senator RANDOLPH. The hearing will conclude, and I wish to express for the subcommittee the appreciation of the U.S. Senate for the opportunity to join with you in a very frank, forthright, and in many instances, very helpful discussion of this subject of employment and retirement incomes for the elderly. I am personally not discouraged about the situation, but I do feel there is very real reason for the Congress of the United States to make an all-out effort and a frontal attack on the basic causes of unemployment of people in this country in the upper age brackets. I think we are not fulfilling our complete obligation without doing more than we have done to date. We must be more resourceful and we must find these answers. That is what this subcommittee and the Committee on Aging in the Senate will be doing, I hope, during these coming months.

This will conclude our hearing. If there are those here who want to confer with members of the staff, they should try and do so before we depart.

(Whereupon, at 1:15, the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes adjourned.)

