

The original documents are located in Box 120, folder “School Lunch” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

October 16, 1975

National School Lunch Program/Private Nonprofit Participating Schools

- 5,932 private nonprofit schools participating in the NSLP as of 10/1/74.
- About 90% are Catholic parish schools, many of which are in low income areas. (estimate)
- Listed below are some examples of private nonprofit schools with high tuition rates that participate in the National School Lunch program.

	<u>School</u>	<u>Tuition</u>
(1)	Hawaii Prep. Academy Kamuela, Hawaii	\$1,700/yr. - D \$3,700/yr. - B
(2)	St. Andrews Hawaii	\$ 100/mo. - D
(3)	Iolani Honolulu	\$ 175/mo. - D
(4)	Auburn Adventist Academy Auburn, Washington	\$ 152/mo. - D \$ 240/mo. - B
(5)	Mary Mount Military Academy Tacoma, Washington	\$ 300/mo. - B
(6)	Good Shepard Home* Spokane, Washington	\$ 400/mo. - B
(7)	Antonion Society* Cheney, Washington	\$ 440/mo. - B
(8)	Philip Exeter New Hampshire	\$3,900/yr. - B
(9)	St. Pauls Concord, New Hampshire	\$3,700/yr. - B
(10)	New Hampton New Hampshire	\$4,800/yr. - B

* School for mentally retarded or handicapped

NOTE: D = day students

B = boarding students

SOURCE: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA

	<u>School</u>	<u>Tuition</u>		
(11)	Phillips Academy Andover, Massachusetts	\$2,900/yr.	-	D
	enrollment 971			
	scholarship** (308)			
(12)	Brown-Nicholls Cambridge, Massachusetts	\$3,025/yr.	-	B
	enrollment 414			
	scholarship** (61)			
(13)	Northfield - Mount Herman Northfield, Massachusetts	\$1,950/yr.	-	D
	enrollment 950	\$4,500/yr.	-	B
	scholarship** (437)			
(14)	St. Sebastian Newton, Massachusetts	\$1,900/yr.	-	D
	enrollment 300			
	scholarship** (45)			
(15)	Austin Prep. Reading, Massachusetts	\$ 985/yr.	-	D
	enrollment 600			
	scholarship** (58)			

** Students receiving scholarships who are paying less than full tuition, included in the total enrollment.

March 25, 1975

SUBJECT:

HOUSE TO VOTE ON EXPANSION OF
FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED SCHOOL
LUNCH PROGRAM

The House is to vote today on a bill to greatly expand the Federally subsidized school lunch program to guarantee that hot meals will not cost the students more than 25¢. In some areas, because of the high cost of food and labor, school lunch prices have gone as high as 85¢.

Does the Administration favor the House bill guaranteeing that elementary and high school students will not be charged more than 25¢ per meal?

GUIDANCE: The Administration does not believe that taxpayers' money should be used to provide free or subsidized lunches for children from middle income and high income families.

The cost of this program would be more than \$3.7 billion per year, or over \$2 billion more than we have proposed in the fiscal '76 budget.

The Administration also opposes this bill because it would continue and expand existing fragmented and complex programs in the areas where taxpayer subsidies are not warranted.

The Administration urges instead, favorable Congressional action on its comprehensive block grant proposal which would consolidate and simplify the current program, while focusing its benefits on the more needy children. The Administration's proposal would more than double current benefits for needy children by providing substantial increases in reimbursement for meals served for a full year, rather than just during the school term. Furthermore, the grant would provide states the flexibility of designing a feeding program tailored to local situations.

JGC

March 12, 1975

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATION TO CUT SCHOOL
LUNCH PROGRAM

How can the Administration justify proposed cuts in the
school lunch program?

GUIDANCE: The decision to substitute a block grant for the current set of child nutrition programs was made to assure that States provide a free meal to every needy child. The difference in funding does not represent a decrease in benefits to the poor, but is the result of discontinued reimbursement for the non-poor. In fact, the Administration's proposal would more than double current benefits for needy children by providing substantial increases in reimbursements for meals served for a full year rather than just during the school term. Furthermore, the grant would provide States the flexibility of designing a feeding program tailored to local situations.

Estimates by the Department of Agriculture indicate almost 700,000 needy children receive no program benefits because present programs are not available to them. The cost to insure the needy an adequate diet is lower than projected estimates for the current programs if they were to continue.

JGC

April 29, 1975

SUBJECT: HOUSE VOTES INCREASE IN
SUBSIDIZED SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The House voted yesterday to increase the subsidy for hot lunches of every school child by 5¢, extended the free lunch program to children of the unemployed, and raise the eligible income for reduced price lunches.

Does the Administration support the House action in increasing the subsidy for hot lunches?

GUIDANCE: The Administration does not believe that taxpayers' money should be used to provide free or subsidized lunches for children from middle income and high income families. At the present time, under Section IV of the Child Nutrition Act, every lunch, no matter the income of that child's family, is subsidized by at least 11-1/2 cents. The legislation passed by the House would raise that subsidy to 16-1/2 cents for every child, regardless of family income. The Administration believes that Congressional action should be focused on increasing the benefits for the more needy children, and not those of middle and upper incomes.

FYI: People below the poverty level, for a family of four (\$5,000) would get a free lunch, but those persons making between that amount and \$10,000, get a reduced price lunch (a cost of about 20¢ per meal). The present law states that those 100% to 175% above the poverty level can receive a reduced price lunch. This legislation passed by the House raises the ceiling for reduced price lunches to 200% above the poverty level or \$10,022. END FYI

Attached is previous Guidance which has more detailed information on what the Administration favors.

JGC

March 25, 1975

SUBJECT:

HOUSE TO VOTE ON EXPANSION OF
FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED SCHOOL
LUNCH PROGRAM

The House is to vote today on a bill to greatly expand the Federally subsidized school lunch program to guarantee that hot meals will not cost the students more than 25¢. In some areas, because of the high cost of food and labor, school lunch prices have gone as high as 85¢.

Does the Administration favor the House bill guaranteeing that elementary and high school students will not be charged more than 25¢ per meal?

GUIDANCE: The Administration does not believe that taxpayers' money should be used to provide free or subsidized lunches for children from middle income and high income families.

The cost of this program would be more than \$3.7 billion per year, or over \$2 billion more than we have proposed in the fiscal '76 budget.

The Administration also opposes this bill because it would continue and expand existing fragmented and complex programs in the areas where taxpayer subsidies are not warranted.

The Administration urges instead, favorable Congressional action on its comprehensive block grant proposal which would consolidate and simplify the current program, while focusing its benefits on the more needy children. The Administration's proposal would more than double current benefits for needy children by providing substantial increases in reimbursement for meals served for a full year, rather than just during the school term. Furthermore, the grant would provide states the flexibility of designing a feeding program tailored to local situations.

JGC