

Y4
.Ag 8/1
F73/25

1010

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

F73/25
Ag 8/1
90 Y4

AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

GOVERNMENT

Storage

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETIETH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON

H.R. 15896, H.R. 17721, H.R. 17722, H.R. 17723,
H.R. 17724, H.R. 17725, H.R. 17786, H.R. 17916,
and S. 3068

JUNE 11, 12, AND 13, 1968

Serial ZZ

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

KSU LIBRARIES
A barcode with a red checkmark above it.
AJJ1900 334368



1/8/51
FEB/52

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas,
Vice Chairman

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
Ranking Minority Member

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi

CATHERINE MAY, Washington

WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia

ROBERT DOLE, Kansas

PAUL C. JONES, Missouri

GEORGE V. HANSEN, Idaho

FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky

WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia

GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas

GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania

MASTON O'NEAL, Georgia

CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington

J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, New York

ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California

ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas

WILEY MAYNE, Iowa

JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania

JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina

THOMAS S. KLEPPE, North Dakota

JOHN G. DOW, New York

ROBERT PRICE, Texas

BILL NICHOLS, Alabama

JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana

G. V. MONTGOMERY, Mississippi

FRANK J. BRASCO, New York

JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Puerto Rico

CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*

WILLIAM C. BLACK, *General Counsel*

HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Counsel*

L. T. EASLEY, *Staff Consultant*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
H. R. 15896, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended	1
H. R. 17721, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the purposes of authorizing appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972, and for other purposes	1
S. 3068, an act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended	2

STATEMENTS

Annunzio, Hon. Frank, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois	118
Ashley, Hon. Thomas Ludlow, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio	118
Bevill, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of Alabama	50
Boland, Hon. Edward P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts	119
Fisher, Hon. O. C., a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas	2
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture	60
Gallagher, Cornelius E., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey	120
Gonzalez, Hon. Henry B., a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas	122
Johnson, Hon. Harold T., a Representative in Congress from the State of California	123
Lynn, John C., legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation	51
Martin, Hon. David T., a Representative in Congress from the State of Nebraska	103
Matsunaga, Hon. Spark M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii	125
Miller, Hon. George P., a Representative in Congress from the State of California	125
Moorhead, Hon. William S., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania	126
Pollock, Hon. Howard W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Alaska	126
Price, Hon. Melvin, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois	127
Reid, Hon. Ogden, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	128
Saylor, Hon. John P., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania	106
Sisk, Hon. B. F., a Representative in Congress from the State of California	53
Sullivan, Hon. Leonor K., a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri	13
Vanik, Hon. Charles A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio	128
Wolff, Hon. Lester L., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	129

CORRESPONDENCE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE:

Dow, Hon. John G., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, letter of June 17, 1968	9
---	---

Fairbanks, Lloyd J., legislative representative, National Farmers Organization, letter of June 10, 1968.....	Page 117
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture, letters to Dr. Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System: May 27, 1968.....	66
June 12, 1968.....	69
Hale County Food Stamp Office, Greensboro, Ala., letter of May 24, 1968..	89
Johnson, Reuben L., director of legislative services, National Farmers Union, letter of June 18, 1968.....	131
Martin, G. Merrit, general manager, Business-Government Relations Division, Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, letter of June 24, 1968..	130
Mississippi State Board of Health, Jackson, Miss., press release of June 7, 1968.....	82
Stanton, Frank, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, telegram of June 12, 1968, to Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture....	69

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Abbitt, Jones of Missouri, Stubblefield, Purcell, de la Garza, Vigorito, Jones of North Carolina, Dow, Nichols, Montgomery, Belcher, Teague of California, May, Dole, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Burke, Mathias, Kleppe, and Myers.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; William C. Black, general counsel; Hyde H. Murray, assistant counsel; L. T. Easley, staff consultant; and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

The committee is met this morning to consider any legislation relating to the Food Stamp Act and any modifications thereof.

(H.R. 15896, introduced by Mr. Poage, follows:)

[H.R. 15896. 90th Cong., second sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended

Be it enacted by Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

(MRS. SULLIVAN, for herself, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KEE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. SISK, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, introduced the following bill:)

[H.R. 17721, 90th Cong., second sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the purposes of authorizing appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the

phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972;" and (B) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: "On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year."

(In addition to H.R. 17721, Mrs. Sullivan introduced 6 identical bills, with a total of 105 cosponsors, H.R. 17722, H.R. 17723, H.R. 17724, H.R. 17725, H.R. 17786, and H.R. 17916.)

(The Senate-passed bill referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, S. 3068, follows:)

[S. 3068, 90th Cong., second sess.]

AN ACT To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "not in excess of \$255,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

Passed the Senate May 17, 1968.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. We have scheduled Congressman Gonzalez as the first witness.

Congressman Gonzalez is not present.

We have next scheduled Congressman O. C. Fisher, who is with us, and we are delighted to have you and will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Fisher.

STATEMENT OF HON. O. C. FISHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this privilege.

I certainly do not want to impose upon the time of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is delighted to have you with us. We appreciate your coming.

Mr. FISHER. I do appreciate the privilege of speaking to you and addressing myself very briefly to some features of the welfare program in general that I think need to be discussed.

I do not appear here in either the role of an advocate or as a critic, with respect to pending legislation. But rather to express my own views regarding the need for adequate guidelines, care and prudence in the application of the rapidly expanding fields of public welfare in this country.

As I see it, the various welfare programs, including food stamps, free direct food distribution, and the many others which have zoomed skyward in recent years, may prove to be a blessing or a curse, depending upon the ability of the Congress and those who administer these programs to see that the benefits are applied only to needy recipients.

Very clearly, every person in his right mind supports the concept of having society provide food and other assistance to the sick, the weak, and other unfortunates who are handicapped because of conditions beyond their control.

So, it is not so much a matter of helping the needy. It is rather a matter of confining such assistance to the deserving needy.

To contribute to the able-bodied—those able to work and who have employment available for them but who of their own volition do not choose to become occupied as wage earners—is in my opinion a definite disservice to such people. To do so tends to encourage a cancerous growth in our society. To do so is to reward idleness and loafing. When that happens we are definitely going in the wrong direction.

So far as I know, the food stamp program has worked fairly well. Among the various welfare programs, it seems to be well administered and rather easily administered. There are more than 2½ million people now participating in it, and I understand another 3½ million receive help from the direct food distribution programs. I am told that more than a billion pounds of surplus food is being distributed during this fiscal year. It goes without saying that if any of these 6 million who benefit from these generous programs are able bodied and because of job opportunities available to them could be wage earners and provide for themselves and their families, but who refuse to work, then the guidelines for eligibility should be clarified and tightened. I am sure the committee will want to explore that phase of the programs very carefully.

The Congress has been extremely generous in ministering to the needs of poor people in recent years. Chairman Mahon of the Appropriations Committee recently inserted in the record a breakdown of outlays for the benefits of the low income and the poor. It totaled more than \$27 billion per year.

As this welfare program has rapidly expanded, there are increasing signs of ingratitude and an acceleration of demands. Many of these people have come to treat welfare as a way of life. Their spokesmen belittle the bountiful outlays for the poor people. These people, who spend much of their time plugging for more welfare, have become known as the poverty cult. They seem to have made many converts. Many of them are prone to look upon the right to be paid for idleness as a civil right. That is the philosophy which permeates the poverty cult.

One of these organized welfare groups is known as the National Welfare Rights Organization, with headquarters here in Washington. It held its first national convention last August, with delegates from 26 States. Dr. George A. Willey, formerly a professor at Syracuse University, has been the director of that outfit. He was quoted in the press as saying:

Not much of the public has grasped the potential of this movement. It could have much greater power than the civil rights movement. There are 8½ million welfare recipients with very strong common interest. Welfare is a right * * * .

One of Willey's cohorts is Prof. Richard A. Cloward of the School of Social Work at Columbia University, who is also spearheading a drive to organize the welfare recipients. While here in Washington a little more than a year ago, the professor called for more welfare funds, and said this:

Congress will have to act. It's acting badly now because not enough pressure has been built up.

Mr. Chairman, those people are not interested in jobs for the needy. Their announced objectives do not mention jobs. They are interested in welfare, and more welfare, and yet more welfare. They are professionals in that demand. They are organizing for a massive raid on the Federal Treasury.

This does not relate to the unfortunate who cannot help themselves. Nor to the self-reliant who strive to make the most of their talents and opportunities. I am speaking of the lazy and trifling, many of whom are organizing in order to be able to extract from society higher rewards for being professional beggars.

Now, this poverty cult has been aided and abetted by certain confused and misdirected ministers and others who seem to honestly believe the many false reports they read in the papers and see on television which proclaim that as many as 30 million people are virtually on starvation in this country.

The Poor People's March on Washington is an offshoot of this group of promoters. You may recall that it was Professor Willey who led the marchers which recently stormed the Way and Means Committee room, demanding to see Wilbur Mills. These people, as you know, employ strong-arm tactics in a crude and brazen attempt to gain by threats and intimidation that which they know cannot be justified by reason and commonsense.

You are all familiar with the April 22 report by the "Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States." Entitled "Hunger, U.S.A.," this much ballyhooed report listed 256 counties in 20 States as hunger areas involving "desperate situations." Mr. Poage, distinguished chairman of this committee, has been able to confirm the gross inaccuracies contained in that report. The phony claims contained in the report seems to dovetail with the grand design of the poverty cult.

Then came the CBS program entitled "Hunger in America." It was preceded by the public Broadcast Laboratory's "Hunger—American Style." You can see the similarity of titles—a whole series of them, coming one after the other. Each of these has followed the same propaganda line and the implications in each have been thoroughly refuted by the chairman of this committee and by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman.

The technique of each of these propaganda efforts seems to have been to locate isolated instances of poverty and malnutrition, then exaggerate their prevalence and then proceed to imply the presence of callous neglect on the part of the Congress and the people in the communities where these situations are found.

Now, we know there is considerable malnutrition—too much of it. But we are told by knowledgeable people that much of it is due to the fact that good many people insist upon an intake of diets which cause a lack of adequate nutrition—a matter of choice. I am sure you on this committee are better informed on that than I am.

I do know that not long ago a nationally known authority, John B. Parrish, professor of economics, University of Illinois, following a study of the facts, concluded that 96 percent of all American families have an adequate intake of nutrients. In 1920 he said only 50 percent were so fortunate. So far as I know, no one in authority has disputed the correctness of those figures.

Mr. Chairman, a strange paradox exists in America today. An editorial writer speaks of the emphasis on poverty, "ghettos" and jobless people, and then points out that there are at present probably more jobs available in this country that remain unfilled than ever before in our history—and he proceeds to document that fact with reliable reports and statistics.

Although billions of dollars have been expended in the fight on poverty, and although the President in advancing that effort envisioned the time—just around the corner—when all able-bodied taxpayers would become taxpayers, the relief rolls continue to grow at a rate faster than that of population. That was a beautiful dream but it is not working out that way.

Now, what can the Congress do about all this? First, there is the need for appropriate guidelines designed to prevent the undeserving from becoming wards of the State by getting their names on the welfare rolls. And, then, of course, there is the opportunity that Congress has—which it has used extensively—of providing job training for those who want to work but are unable to do so, because of their lack of knowledge of the particular work that they may otherwise be able to take.

Second, to be completely practical about it, there is only one real and meaningful answer to this problem, if we want to project ourselves into the future. That is birth control. If these welfare agitators and propagandists, instead of going whole-hog for more and bigger doles, would spend just half of that time, effort, and money in promoting sensible birth control, particularly among those on relief and in the low-income brackets, they would be doing something really useful and constructive for these people and for the country.

We will never have any semblance of a solution to the problem of poverty in this country until we face up to this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Fisher.

Did you read the Star the other evening?

Mr. FISHER. I read the Star.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you observe the article by the contractor, the plumber, Mr. Clark?

Mr. FISHER. I read it yesterday afternoon. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that that was the kind of thing that you are talking about? That article does not indicate that a great deal of self-help exists down there, does it?

Mr. FISHER. I think that is certainly a very pertinent indicator of the type of professional welfare-ism manifested by a lot of people who are demanding more all of the time and not willing to work.

The CHAIRMAN. So that all of the members of the committee may know what we are talking about, the Star reported this incident, that a plumber here in the District by the name of James H. Clark volunteered his labor and his equipment to go down there and to lay a drainage line for the Resurrection City. A storm was coming up, and it looked like he was going to be rained out any moment. He was trying to get the line covered up. A bunch of big fellows were standing around there and he called to them and asked them to pitch in and help to cover up the drainline. None of them assisted him. One of them, apparently, just told him, when he looked directly at this man

who seemed to be a leader and asked him to get a shovel and help, the man just said: "I came down here to get away from shovels."

Now, when people move around on public charity to get away from shovels, there is something wrong, is there not?

Mr. FISHER. In my judgment, we are certainly moving in the wrong direction when we see those things occurring right here before our own eyes.

The CHAIRMAN. I certainly agree with you that the problem really is how you eliminate the deadbeats who won't work as against people who are really deserving, who require assistance from the public. The American public, I am sure, is not going to continue to support able-bodied men who simply want to get rid of a shovel.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the chairman is precisely correct. I think that certainly reflects the viewpoint of the majority of the American people, and I think that these sort of abuses to which you have referred might very well endanger the good that can otherwise come out of these efforts to help the deserving needy people.

The CHAIRMAN. The needy people, those who cannot work and who cannot get work, and there are not many able-bodied individuals who cannot get work today, but there are those who do not have the capacity to work, who need help, and nine out of 10 of us will agree should have help. Those people are the ones that are going to suffer as the result of the handouts to people who do not need help, because, when the program breaks down, the needy are going to lose any opportunity to get help. Of course, the fellow who would not handle a shovel—he could go back to using a shovel and he could feed himself. He has probably long since left his family, but he could feed himself, and if we keep on feeding that kind of people we will soon quit feeding anybody and a lot of very deserving people are going to suffer a great deal, as I see it.

Mr. FISHER. I fully agree.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree thoroughly with you that we ought to help those that need help.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I am reminded that 32 years ago, I ran for Congress and times were pretty hard then, it was during the depression, and I had a slogan: "Help for those who need help, work for those who will work, and hell for those who won't work" and I still think it is good.

Mr. MYERS. What is that last word?

The CHAIRMAN. "Hell," for those who will not work.

Mr. MYERS. I was not sure what it was.

The CHAIRMAN. And there are a great many people who say today that they do not believe in that.

Mr. FISHER. I think the poverty cult, to which I referred a moment ago and which has risen in this country in considerable numbers, are those who do not believe they should be required to work unless they want to. They subscribe to a program of having the right to be paid for idleness as a civil right, and there is much evidence to confirm that attitude on the part of those to whom I have referred.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings?

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to commend the gentleman for a very fine statement. We need more statements like the gentleman has just presented to us.

I think that the folks back home will reflect by their vote this attitude. They will support the people who speak out, regardless of how they might feel otherwise. You might lose a few votes here and there by virtue of making your convictions known but the great majority will approve.

I received a good response to a letter that I sent out to every physician in three counties in my district which had been listed as chronic hunger counties by the "Hunger-U.S.A." committee which came out with a report a few days ago. Every one of the physicians in those three counties were written. I have received replies from about eight out of 10. One of them said, "In your home county, there is no excess hunger there." He stated that he was in a country store a few days ago, and a school bus drove up and stopped, and on that bus were supposedly poor children. He said, "You should have seen those youngsters get off the bus and tear into that store. Two clerks were busy selling candy bars and soda pop," this doctor stated.

There are people who are demanding that we guarantee an income to them from the Federal Government. They are the ones who fail to respond to the newspaper advertisements for job openings. The jobs are plentiful, but the takers are few, apparently.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to add a note or two on this subject of the availability of jobs.

In my two counties in California, we grow more than one-half of the citrus grown in the West, and we are having a difficult time getting sufficient harvesting labor to pick the crops. We have had recruiting efforts in Los Angeles and in other areas in many States.

The average hourly picking rate is \$2.05 for picking oranges and lemons. It does not require highly skilled labor. It is much easier than some other work, and some pickers earn more than that rate.

California has probably the toughest building code of any State in the Nation. These dwellings that these people rent for \$20, \$30, and \$40 come up fully to the California standards.

The companies pay accident and health insurance for all of their employees. They give the family employees an opportunity to buy food at the company stores, if they want to do so. The companies pay workmen's compensation and unemployment insurance. Furthermore, they pay tuition for people who want to go to night school and improve their education.

They have paid vacations, including the hourly wage people. In spite of this, they have a great deal of difficulty in getting a sufficient number of people to work. The jobs are there—not necessarily highly skilled jobs, if people really want to work.

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman certainly cites a very good example. The availability of work at a time when these propaganda reports are being put out would lead the average American who does not know about the situation there and other situations to believe that people cannot work because there is no work available.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to add one other point that I overlooked. This is not true all over the country, of course. These citrus harvesting jobs are available most months of the year in California.

The CHAIRMAN. Before I recognize anyone else, the Chair wants to make a statement. I will let Mr. Gathings take over the chair, because the Chairman has to go to the Rules Committee. He will be back as soon as he can. You never have any idea when you can get away from there. I will come back as soon as I can. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS (presiding). Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Mr. Fisher, as I understand it, the rate of employables in this country is about 95 percent; that is to say, our unemployment is about 3 percent or less.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. Dow. This has led me to believe that most everybody who can work is working and that perhaps there are a certain number of loafers in the country but not as many as we might expect from some of the observations made here this morning.

I would like to ask you this: I understand that the Labor Department or the Welfare Department figures indicate that perhaps less than 6 percent of the families on relief or receiving welfare contain members who are employable. Another way of putting it—and this is only from recollection—there are only about 60,000 able-bodied men able to handle jobs who are unemployed and are receiving or belong in families which are receiving welfare. I do not think that is a very high number. I wish that you would comment on the number of able-bodied people in this country who you might say are taking advantage of public relief.

Mr. FISHER. I regret that I have no statistics on this subject. Certainly, the welfare rolls have been increasing steadily, as you know, in the last 10 years we will say, and it is up to 9½ million now on direct relief. The question of how many of those are physically able to work, I simply do not know. I have read many reports by authorities who insist that a substantial number of them are physically able to work. That, indeed, is one of the purposes of the job-training program that we have, to get them off of the relief rolls and to get them on gainful employment rolls, a very lofty and laudable objective, and I am all for it. But it has not worked as well, so the reports indicate, as had been expected, because, it seems, too many of them are simply not willing to give up relief and the security of welfare as it is in order to actually go to work.

I suppose that the committee can obtain fairly reliable information regarding that. I think it is a very appropriate subject for further inquiry.

Mr. Dow. Do you happen to recall from the recent report made by the President's Commission on Civil Disorder that out of all the families at the poverty level—we will say, roughly at the level of \$3,000 a year annual income—that only one-third of those are on relief? Out of the 21 million people—putting it another way—below the poverty level, about 7 million are on some form of welfare and the other 14 million are in what you might call the self-respecting American group who are not taking advantage of these public programs. Would you not think that that would reflect very well on the attitudes and the self-respect of a great number of American families?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, indeed. I certainly commend any person for undertaking to make his own way and undertaking to make the best possible use of his talent and his opportunity in this great land of opportunity,

and to take advantage of job opportunities. I am afraid not enough of them do it, but I would hope that we can see more of that in the future.

Mr. Dow. I go back to this figure of 60,000 which is an infinitesimal fraction of able-bodied men in this country who cannot go out and hold jobs. I would suppose that even in the best times, you would always have a small fraction in, you might say, the turnover of labor.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. Dow. And in the intervals between jobs, and so on, who would not have jobs. I am a little mistrustful of these stories that get around, people seeing somebody who appears to be loafing or did not hop in and take a job under a certain set of circumstances and who generalize from these things, these individual cases, just because they have seen one man who is supposed to be a loafer, that, therefore, millions of Americans are loafing and sponging on welfare. I think that we generalize too broadly, going from the particular to the general.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure that may be.

Mr. Dow. I would rather see some figures here. I did not hear a great many figures in your testimony.

I think, by a lack of that, I have to go back to the Welfare Department figures, because I expect that they are compiled systematically. I think we ought to look at those which show a very small proportion of able-bodied wage earners in the relief category.

Mr. KLEPPE. Will you yield for a question?

Mr. Dow. Yes.

Mr. KLEPPE. Will you explain where you get the 60,000 figure from?

Mr. Dow. As I said before, it is a figure that I recall not too clearly, as an impression—I will check it and send word to you, because I believe it is a figure that—

Mr. KLEPPE. I understand this is a national figure you are talking about?

Mr. Dow. That is right.

Mr. KLEPPE. I would be glad to have that information.

Mr. Dow. If I find that the figure I have given has been understated too much, I will make a clean breast of it here in the committee. (Mr. Dow submitted the following information:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1968.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR BOB: As I have contracted, I checked out the figure about numbers of employable men in welfare families. As you recall I stated that the figure of 60,000 lingered in my mind. In checking with HEW I find that they give a figure of 78,500 families for February 1968 receiving aid for dependent children where there are unemployed fathers. This would probably embrace most all welfare families where there might be an employable male. This total is extracted from 22 States only because the "man in the house" rule evidently eliminates the other 28 States in so far as welfare is concerned.

Considering that there are 22 million non-aged persons in the country below the "poverty line" according to the Social Security classification, I would not think that the figure of "welfare loafers" as such a scandal.

Along this line, I quote from the recent Report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders. In chapter 17, III, the following breakdown is given of the 7.5 million persons presently receiving welfare:

2.7 million are over 65, blind or otherwise severely handicapped.

3.6 million are children in the Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC), whose parents do not or cannot provide financial support.

1.2 million are the parents of children on AFDC. Of these, over one million are mothers and less than 200,000 are fathers; about two-thirds of the fathers are incapacitated. Only 60,000 fathers are in the special program called "Aid to Families with Dependent Children (Unemployed Parents)" (AFDC-UP) operating in 22 states.

You can see from this where I got the figure of 60,000 that I mentioned in the Committee. There is a discrepancy between this and the 78,500 just supplied by HEW, but I expect this is technical, due to divergent dates of the two figures.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure that you agree with me that in administering welfare programs, whatever they are, it is quite appropriate that we have guidelines and definitions which would prevent able-bodied people who can obtain gainful employment from being recipients of public welfare.

Will the gentleman agree that that is a proper objective of the Congress?

Mr. Dow. Would you restate that, please?

I am afraid that I did not get that.

Mr. FISHER. Would you agree with me that it is in the public interest that we establish guidelines which would prohibit any man from becoming a ward of the State by receiving public welfare if he is physically able to work and a job opportunity is presented to him where he could gain employment and provide for himself and his family?

Mr. Dow. Oh, yes, I heartily agree with you, Mr. Fisher, but I would like to say that the thrust of this legislation that you are suggesting here is to take care of people who need this help, and that would include aged people, infirm people, mothers with little children.

Mr. FISHER. We all understand that.

Mr. Dow. And others. It has not been very evident from the testimony so far. Instead of that, it seems to me that instead of taking this perspective of it, we focus here this morning on a very small percentage of people who, presumably, are loafers, a few able-bodied men who may constitute about $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 percent of the picture, and we have been belaboring this, whereas, it does seem to me that we ought to recognize the broad needs of the millions of people in this country who are handicapped, who do not have the opportunity, or the training or the physical ability or the brains to work, who need help in this situation. I think that is where we ought to focus our attention. And the thrust of this legislation, it does not seem to me should have the purpose of correcting a few loafers—the thrust of this legislation is to take care of poor American people who need some help in the wealthiest Nation in the world that claims to have the best political and social system. We are trying to reform a tiny group of people that we think are taking advantage of the Government, and there is no great evidence that they are.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the gentleman certainly is to be commended for agreeing with me that we should, in administering any of these programs, undertake to see to it that able-bodied people who can find jobs that are available to them be not allowed to draw relief from the taxpayers of America simply because they choose not to work. I am very skeptical about the accuracy of any figures contained in the riot report.

Mr. Dow. Mr. Fisher, you are focusing only on one part of this problem.

Mr. FISHER. We can just talk about one thing at a time. I think everybody is in favor of charity—everybody is in favor of helping the deserving. That is not a subject for argument, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will you yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DOW. I have extended my time.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Jones of Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was going to ask the gentleman a question. I think that one of the difficulties that we have is trying to get on the same wavelength when we are discussing this program. Here, a few years ago, I think this administration came out and said that anyone who is not earning \$1,500 a year was in the poverty class. We have raised that today up to \$3,000 or \$3,500 a year—I forget which. We keep putting it up. But the trouble with so much of this is that in the part of the country where I live a fellow who has \$3,000 income a year is not on the poverty list at all. There are a lot of people who are living pretty well on that, and they are paying taxes, and they resent paying taxes to be used for people who, because of their refusal to accept certain types of employment, are putting themselves on charity. I think there is one of your troubles.

I just read in the paper this morning where the Department of Agriculture has capitulated to some of these demands. And we have now increased, I think it is about 40 percent that the paper said—I do not have the paper before me at the moment, and we have included such delicacies as canned chicken and a few things like that which were added to this list of food stamp items.

The food stamp program was planned to, at least, distribute the items that were in surplus, and now we are paying subsidies by buying things that are not necessarily in surplus from people who are not participating or cooperating in the program, to try to level this out.

The thing is, as Mr. Poage said this morning, there are people like the big buck down at the so-called resurrection city who said that he went to the poverty camp to get away from that shovel. Well, I am getting tired of that, myself.

The thing about it is that I heard this gentleman, Mr. Abernathy, talk about this and stated:

Before we leave here, we will be eating filet mignon, and they are going to give it to us, and if they do not, you know what we are going to do.

Threats like that just make me boil. To think that we are participating in stuff like that.

I want to help any people who need help, but I am becoming tired of paying any of my tax money to feed those who can work but who will not work, because they never seem to be offered the right kind of a job and they can not find a hoe or shovel handle to fit their hands. I give up.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Rarick.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you.

Mr. RARICK. A word that annoys me is what is meant by an able-bodied person? How do you define able bodied?

Mr. FISHER. I think the average person knows when a person is physically able to do a job, depending on what it is. Some kinds of work, a person is not able to do. Other kinds of jobs, they are not able to do. It is difficult to define it in terms.

Mr. RARICK. The Social Security System uses words to define disability. A man who lost both arms and both legs, may be fit to do something and not entitled to disability payments.

Mr. FISHER. It depends on the job opportunity and the physical condition. As a general rule, it also involves motivation on the part of the individual. There are a lot of them who look for excuses and not, therefore, able to work, who discount their physical fitness for a particular task, while others go kind of in the other direction in order to be able to earn and to provide for themselves and their families.

Mr. RARICK. Well, we sit here and talk about able-bodied people, meaning people we feel qualified physically to work?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. RARICK. A play on definitions, because some people feel they are not able bodied.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose the best test on that would be if a man had any doubt whether he could do a particular job, because it might upset his life or his health, would be to consult with his physician and have a physical examination in an effort to find out whether he should undertake a particular job or not.

Mr. RARICK. Then, we see boys coming back from Vietnam and from other wars who have lost arms and who have been disabled. The veteran may be on a pension. They would possibly say they are disabled and not able-bodied, and yet they work. We have a program of pride for the disabled, that of hiring the handicapped. It is amazing that some of our boys returning from overseas, carrying lead in their bodies, work. Yet there are people in this country who say they are not able to work but are able-bodied enough to march, blackmail the workers. We have had them march right here in this city, organized welfare recipient unions. They say they are not qualified to work; yet they are physically qualified to march.

Mr. FISHER. As I say, I think it is a matter largely of motivation.

Mr. RARICK. Or demotivation, if they rely on something for nothing as a new field of employment.

Mr. FISHER. Then, they adjust themselves to a situation where they can make the most of such capacity as they have to produce, rather than to become a burden on society. It is a matter of motivation.

Thank you very much.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions?

If not, thank you so much, Mr. Fisher.

We are glad to have had your statement.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Our next witness is Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan.

We are proud to have you here, Mrs. Sullivan.

We will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been sitting here 20 minutes, and I have not heard the two bills on food stamps mentioned, and I thought that was what the hearing was about.

From my name, most people assume I am Irish, but in St. Louis, where I grew up as Leonor Kretzer, they refer to my ethnic origin as Southside Stubborn Dutch—and I guess I must be pretty stubborn to keep coming before this committee on the food stamp issue.

As I recall, we had battles here over the issue in 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1964 and 1967. Since 1964, however, we have been talking about a going program—and, generally, a very successful if not by any means perfect program—rather than about theoretical concepts of feeding the hungry. We are doing it in more than 1,000 counties; we can do it in all of the rest, if you will only unbend and help us.

When I say “you,” I refer, of course, to the attitude which has prevailed among more than half of the members of this committee for many years. The food stamp program originated in legislation handled by this committee, but you have always treated it like a stepchild, or worse.

I am here today not to plead, but to state very simply that a vast number of the Members of the House of Representatives believe, with me, that this program must be allowed to expand and not just a little bit but a lot. The \$20 million authorization increase, voted by the Senate, is not enough to make a dent in the need. You placed a ceiling on this program for the 1968 and 1969 fiscal years which is much too low, and while it is too late now to do anything about what could have been done during the fiscal year ending this month, it is not too late to do something about the authorization for the new fiscal year, and for subsequent ones.

I asked last year for an open end authorization, as I did also in 1964. Both times, you tried instead to kill the program, then reluctantly let it continue on a short string, after the House overruled your efforts to kill it.

If we have to have another fight, let's have it. But let's make it clear now what the issue is going to be: If you won't let us use this method to assure adequate diets for all needy Americans, wherever they live, then many of us from urban areas are simply going to withhold our votes on farm legislation until we again make another “deal,” as we had to do in 1964.

There are 107 cosponsors of the five bills I introduced last Thursday, in anticipation of these hearings, to open up the food stamp appropriation authorization to whatever amounts Congress sees fit to appropriate in the 4 coming fiscal years. Not all of the cosponsors are from urban areas; not all of them would oppose farm legislation in

order to force this legislation through. I do not profess to speak for all of them on that point.

But I do speak for all 108 of us—and for 10 other prominent Members of the House from both parties who will be on the sixth bill I plan to introduce today—in saying we want Congress to be able to appropriate sufficient funds for 1969 and subsequent years to expand the food stamp program to all of the areas which want it.

I listed in last Thursday's Record the 107 cosponsors of the five bills introduced that day, including nine chairmen of standing committees and three ranking minority members of standing committees. In the sixth bill, there will be an additional chairman, Mr. Garmatz of Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and an additional ranking minority member, Mr. Widnall of Banking and Currency. In addition, there are Mr. Neal Smith of Iowa, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Hicks of Washington, Mr. McDade of Pennsylvania, Mr. Waldie of California, Mr. Hawkins of California, Mr. Culver of Iowa, and Mr. Conyers of Michigan.

So we now have 118 Members from 31 States who, so far, have introduced this legislation to take off the arbitrary ceiling you have imposed on this effective program to combat malnutrition. If it takes more Members to sway you, I will see what I can do about getting more. Most of us, as a general rule, are reluctant to become cosponsors of bills which do not come before our own committees and which we are not thus in a position personally to influence, except through our votes on the floor, but in this instance, the cosponsorship list is an amazing one. And it is bipartisan, urban and rural, liberal and conservative, and includes many who have the food stamp plan now operating in their districts—and many who do not have it but want it for their districts.

We are tired of having the United States pictured as a nation which worries about hunger in India but closes its eyes to malnutrition at home. In kicking at Secretary Freeman, the critics of our food programs have picked on the wrong person. He has done more than any Secretary of Agriculture in our history to combat malnutrition. He believes in this program, and he had the courage 7 years ago to start it and the strength ever since to make it work. I resent attacks upon him which rightfully should be directed to this committee.

I know all of the things said to be wrong with the food stamp program. But I also know that none of its shortcomings or deficiencies can be corrected as long as this committee continues to write, or continues to accept in conference the amendments of the Senate committee, to write crippling amendments to the act, and unrealistic ceilings on appropriations.

The irony of the whole thing is that most of us who have been trying so hard to expand this program into additional areas already have it in our own districts while most of you who opposed it in the past did not have it, and apparently did not want it for your own areas.

Now, a majority of you do have it, although in many instances just recently. In other instances, your districts are having to wait in line for funds to start scheduled projects. So, we are trying to get you to agree to let us help you to help your own needy through this excellent program. I believe, however, that there are still 15 of the members of this committee without a single food stamp project in their districts—almost half of this committee.

It is never useful for any member to try to lecture a committee of the House on its duty, and if I have sounded as if I am attempting to do so, I apologize. I do not mean to lecture you on your duty; instead, I just mean to point out that it would be good strategy for you to see our side of this issue if you want us to see your side of the agricultural issues.

Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you so much, Mrs. Sullivan.

I think we have appropriated some \$185 million overall for the food stamp program. Is that not right?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. And now there is a \$20-million increase in the authorization which would be a small percentage increase—\$20 million as against \$185 million. What areas would you say do not have the program?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the moment?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There are 1,027 projects in operation. That means that about 2,000 counties do not have it. There are 239 counties which have been certified but for which there are no funds available at this time. There are 145 additional requests from counties also pending.

Mr. GATHINGS. 145 pending at this time?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. And 239 who may be interested, overall?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Those have already been certified. They have been waiting since last December for funds in order to put the projects into being.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are the 145 included in the 239?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No. This is additional—there are 145 requests pending that have not been acted upon yet.

Mr. GATHINGS. So, there are 484 overall, then, who would like to be included?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the present time.

Mr. GATHINGS. At this time?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right. I have the list here, if you wish it put in the record, from all of the States and the counties in the States, with requests that are pending.

Mr. GATHINGS. Without objection, the information will be included in the record at this point.

(The information follows:)

TABLE I.—REQUEST FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AS OF JUNE 5, 1968

<i>Alabama</i>	<i>Louisiana</i>
Barbour County	Sabine Parish
*Elmore County	Lafourche Parish
Tuscaloosa County	*St. Bernard Parish
<i>Arkansas</i>	Jackson Parish
*Scott County	Lincoln Parish
<i>California</i>	Bienville Parish
Monterey County	Tangipahoa Parish
*Sacramento County	*Webster Parish
<i>Colorado</i>	<i>Michigan</i>
Ouray County	*Baraga County
San Miguel County	*Mecosta County
<i>Connecticut</i>	*Cass County
City of Bridgeport	*Livingston County
City of Norwich	*Montcalm County
*City of Torrington	*Ionia County
City of Middletown	*Menominee County
City of Stamford	<i>Minnesota</i>
<i>Georgia</i>	Lincoln County
Jenkins County	*Meeker County
Jones County	Steele County
Laurens County	Norman County
Jasper County	<i>Mississippi</i>
Johnson County	*Rankin County
Lincoln County	*Tippah County
*Newton County	*Pearl River County
Oconee County	*Sharkey County
Ben Hill County	<i>Montana</i>
Warren County	Missoula County
Wilkes County	Richland County
*Dooly County	*Hill County
Decatur County	Musselshell County
<i>Indiana</i>	<i>Nebraska</i>
*Brown County	Madison County
*Sullivan County	McPherson County
<i>Iowa</i>	Lincoln County
*Fremont County	Logan County
Delaware County	Webster County
Worth County	Hayes County
Bremer County	Frontier County
*Muscatine County	Furnas County
*Monroe County	Thayer County
*Polk County	Sherman County
*Boone County	Hitchcock County
*Webster County	Valley County
Adair County	Pawnee County
Page County	Richardson County
<i>Kansas</i>	Johnson County
Leavenworth County	Adams County
Johnson County	<i>New Jersey</i>
<i>Kentucky</i>	Hunterdon County
*Bracken County	*Essex County
*Christian County	<i>North Carolina</i>
*Edmonson County	*Richmond County
*Fulton County	*McDowell County
*Hart County	*Davie County
*Lewis County	Anson County
*McLean County	*Pitt County
*Metcalfe County	<i>North Dakota</i>
*Owen County	*Divide County
*Boone County	*Sioux County

*Has surplus distribution program as of April 1968.

North Dakota—Con.

- *Mercer County
- Renville County
- Adams County
- Griggs County
- *Nelson County
- Stutsman County
- *Benson County
- *Pembina County

Pennsylvania

- *Forest County
- *Warren County
- *Lancaster County

South Dakota

- *Hanson County
- *Hutchinson County
- *Miner County
- *Hyde County
- *McCook County
- *Perkins County
- *Dewey County
- *Charles Mix County

South Dakota—Con.

- Douglas County
- *Edmunds County
- *Aurora County
- *Corson County
- Lincoln County
- Lake County
- *Walworth County

Tennessee

- *Henderson County
- Bradley County
- *White County
- *Carter County
- *Rhea County

Virginia

- City of Hampton
- Washington County
- Dinwiddie County
- Grayson County
- City of Hampton

Wisconsin

- *Buffalo County

ADDENDUM TO REQUESTS FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AS OF JUNE 18, 1968

Georgia

- *Wilcox County

Louisiana

- East Feliciana Parish

New Jersey

- Morris County

North Carolina

- Catawba County
- Nash County

North Dakota

- Burke County
- Grant County

South Dakota

- Jackson County
- Washabaugh County

Tennessee

- Lewis County

Virginia

- Charles City County
- Essex County
- Goochland County
- Madison County
- Mecklenburg County
- Southampton County
- Tazewell County
- Wythe County
- Westmoreland County
- Carolina County

Grand total of areas not designated but requesting food stamp program as of June 18, 1968 : 160.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Then, I have also a list of the 239 counties which were certified last December but are still waiting for the money to start the operation.

Mr. GATHINGS. They are ready to move?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right, they are by States and by counties. (The information follows):

*Has surplus distribution program as of April 1968.

TABLE II.—AREAS DESIGNATED IN DECEMBER 1967 FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AND AWAITING FUNDS—WITH TENTATIVE STARTING DATES AS INDICATED

SCHEDULED JULY 1968 OPENINGS (194)

<i>Alabama</i>	<i>Illinois</i>
Clarke County	Boone County, July 2
Mobile County	Bureau County, July 3
Montgomery County	*Carroll County, July 3
<i>Alaska</i>	De Kalb County, July 5
Anchorage Area	Du Page County, July 8
Bethel Area	*Ford County, July 9
Dillingham Area	*Fulton County, July 9
Fairbanks Area	*Grundy County, July 9
Juneau Area	*Henderson County, July 11
Ketchikan Area	*Henry County, July 11
Kotzebue Area	*Jo Daviess County, July 11
Nome Area (Balance)	*Kane County, July 11
Seward Area	*Kankakee County, July 12
<i>Arkansas</i>	Kendall County, July 12
*Columbia County, July 2	*Knox County, July 15
*Crawford County, July 3	Lake County, July 15
*Garland County, July 11	*La Salle County, July 15
*Little River County, July 10	*Lee County, July 15
*Miller County, July 8	*Livingston County, July 15
*Polk County, July 9	*Marshall County, July 17
*Randolph County, July 2	*McHenry County, July 17
*Union County	McLean County, July 18
<i>California</i>	*Mercer County, July 19
Alameda County	*Ogle County, July 19
<i>Colorado</i>	*Peoria County, July 19
*Chaffee County, July 8	Putnam County, July 23
*Fremont County	*Rock Island County, July 23
*Grand County, July 11	Stark County, July 25
*Lake County, July 9	Stephenson County, July 25
*Routt County, July 12	*Tazewell County, July 25
*Saguache County, July 5	*Warren County, July 29
*Telluride County, July 2	*Whiteside County, July 29
<i>Georgia</i>	*Will County, July 29
Baldwin County	*Winnebago County, July 29
Chatham County	*Woodford County, July 30
*Crisp County	<i>Louisiana</i>
Dodge County	Caddo Parish, July 8
Elbert County	East Carroll Parish, July 10
Forsyth County	Rapides Parish, July 9
Gilmer County	<i>Maryland</i>
Gordon County	Wicomico County, July 16
Hart County	Worcester County, July 11
Lee County	<i>Massachusetts</i>
Madison County	City of Revere (Tentative)
McDuffie County	<i>Michigan</i>
Morgan County	*Alger County
Oglethorpe County	*Allegan County
Peach County	*Barry County
Pickens County	*Benzie County
Pike County	*Branch County
Polk County	*Clare County
Toombs County	*Clinton County
Towns County	*Delta County
Upson County	*Eaton County
Walton County	*Grand Traverse County
White County	*Hillsdale County

*Has surplus distribution program as of April 1968.

Michigan—Con.

- *Isabella County
- *Luce County
- *Mason County
- *Muskegon County
- *Ogemaw County
- *St. Joseph County
- Saginaw County
- *Shiawassee County
- *Wexford County

Minnesota

- *Cook County, July 3
- *Lake of the Woods County, July 3
- *Le Sueur County, July 3
- *Mille Lacs County, July 3
- *Redwood County, July 3
- *Sibley County, July 3
- *Wadena County, July 3

Mississippi

- *Humphreys County
- *Itawamba County
- *Jasper County
- *Montgomery County
- *Prentiss County
- *Simpson County
- *Union County

Montana

- *Glacier County

New Jersey

- *Cumberland County
- *Hudson County

New Mexico

- *Bernalillo County

North Carolina

- *Guilford County
- *Rockingham County
- *Warren County

Ohio

- *Ashtabula County
- Greene County
- Medina County
- Ross County
- Sandusky County
- *Shelby County

Pennsylvania

- *Butler County
- *Cameron County
- *Centre County
- *Elk County
- *York County

South Carolina

- Aiken County
- Allendale County
- Anderson County
- Bamberg County

South Carolina—Con.

- Barnwell County
- Berkeley County
- Calhoun County
- Charleston County
- Cherokee County
- Chester County
- Clarendon County
- Colleton County
- Dorchester County
- Fairfield County
- Georgetown County
- Greenville County
- Greenwood County
- Hampton County
- Horry County
- Kershaw County
- Lancaster County
- Lexington County
- Newberry County
- Oconee County
- Orangeburg County
- Pickens County
- Richland County
- Saluda County
- Spartanburg County
- Sumter County

South Dakota

- *Beadle County
- *Brown County
- *Codington County
- *Davison County

Texas

- *Bexar County

Utah

- *San Juan County

Vermont

- *Bennington Welfare Dist.
- Brattleboro Welfare Dist.
- Burlington Welfare Dist.
- Hartford Welfare Dist.
- Middlebury Welfare Dist.
- Montpelier Welfare Dist.
- Morrisville Welfare Dist.
- *Rutland Welfare Dist.
- Springfield Welfare Dist.

Virginia

- Fairfax County including Cities of Falls Church and Fairfax

Washington

- *King County
- *Pierce County

Wisconsin

- Baron County
- *Eau Claire County

*Has surplus distribution program as of April 1968.

SCHEDULED AUGUST 1968 OPENINGS (20)

Arkansas

- *Calhoun County
- *Fulton County, Aug. 7
- *Hempstead County, Aug. 2
- *Logan County, Aug. 16
- *Pope County, Aug. 12
- *Sharp County, Aug. 6
- *Stone County, Aug. 5
- *Washington County, Aug. 8
- *Yell County, Aug. 15

Louisiana

- De Soto Parish, Aug. 6
- *Madison Parish, Aug. 8
- St. Tammany Par., Aug. 7

Ohio

- Fulton County
- Huron County
- Vinton County

Pennsylvania

- *Berks County
- *Delaware County
- *Monroe County
- *Northampton County

Utah

- *Salt Lake County

SCHEDULED SEPTEMBER 1968 OPENINGS (9)

Louisiana

- Orleans Parish, Sept. 6
- Ouachita Parish, Sept. 9

Maryland

- Kent County
- St. Mary's County

Ohio

- Delaware County
- Gallia County
- *Licking County
- *Perry County
- *Van Wert County

NO DATES SCHEDULED (16)

Massachusetts

- *City of Boston
- *City of Cambridge
- City of Dracut
- City of Pittsfield
- *City of Quincy
- *City of Springfield

Michigan

- *Antrim County
- *Dickinson County
- *Genesee County
- *Schoolcraft County

Mississippi

- *Alcorn County

Montana

- Valley County

New York

- *Schoharie County

North Dakota

- Foster County
- McIntosh County

Ohio

- Noble County

Grand total of designated projects awaiting funds as of June 5, 1968: 239.

Mr. GATHINGS. Could you give us a little résumé of whether they are in one particular area, the larger part of them? If you will abstract that by just glancing at it, please? Could you do that, or are they pretty well overall?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They are from all over. I am just glancing at the list and not counting all of them, but the ones with the largest number of counties—the States with the most counties waiting—are: Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Pennsylvania. Other States have six or seven counties on the waiting list—Alaska, Arkansas, South Carolina. They are the ones with the most counties certified and waiting. In addition, among the States with requests in for the 145 areas which have not yet been certified are: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia—the city of Virginia Beach—and Wisconsin.

Mr. GATHINGS. The biggest part of those areas at the present time do have direct food distribution available, do they not?

*Has surplus distribution program as of April 1968.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That, I am not certain of. I do not have that information handy.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wonder if anyone from the Department is here who can answer that question?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think we can get this information for you and put it in the record for you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Very well.

(The information follows:)

Areas marked by asterisks in Tables I and II had commodity distribution programs in effect in April 1968.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I come from a State where every county has the food stamp or the food distribution programs.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I say that, from the information we have, direct distribution is costing the Federal Government a great deal more than the food stamp program, and they are the people, as was pointed out this morning, who may or may not actually be needy, there was a lot of cheating in the direct food distribution program. This program is being enlarged to include many more items today than have been given out in the past years, as has been stated here this morning. So that will increase its cost, as more free food items are added. The controls in the food stamp program are more strict.

Mr. GATHINGS. I know that in my district, the counties that have gone off the direct food distribution program have gone into the food stamp program and they like it better because they do get a more balanced diet. It is an improvement in that way.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is very true. May I say, too, Mr. Chairman—and I have said it time and again before this committee—that many of the people who are getting free food under a direct distribution program sometimes are reluctant to come under the food stamp program when it is put into effect in their district because their first reaction is: "Why should I pay my own money for the food when I have been getting it free?"

Under the food stamp program they have to pay out their own money, and I, frankly—and I have talked with Secretary Freeman about this—am against any proposal for giving the food stamps free. I think there is a responsibility on the part of the people who are getting this valuable food assistance to spend some of their own money—I do not care how small the amount is—for the stamp plan. And that is now required.

Mr. GATHINGS. And do you not find, Mrs. Sullivan, that they are doing that willingly?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. And they do have the money available, and if they choose they will buy the stamps.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Once they understand what this program means to their families, and what they are getting for their money, and if it is explained properly—and in the beginning it was not explained properly—but once these people are given a chance to learn how to spend their food money, and given a chance to be shown how to manage money—regardless of how little it is—and that a certain amount that should be spent for food actually goes for food, they are glad to participate. They know that they could not have an adequate diet if they only spent that small amount of their own money for food. But

this way they get enough bonus stamps under the food stamp program to have a balanced and adequate diet. It means a great deal to them. The people in my district are very grateful for this help.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will you place in the record just how these bonus stamps are made available to different sized families?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not know that we could place all of that information for every State in the record, and for every community, Mr. Chairman, but I will give typical illustrations. The regulations vary somewhat from State to State. We have worked to make it flexible enough so that people in my city of St. Louis, for instance, would have a different set of requirements than they would down in Mr. Jones' district, where living costs are much lower. He said, \$3,000 is not really a poverty figure for his area, but \$3,000 in the city of St. Louis, is indeed, a poverty figure. Special allowances are made for higher rents, for example.

Mr. GATHINGS. But you could supply that information by particular areas?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think that I can give it generally.

Mr. GATHINGS. Give us an indication of similar sized communities.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will provide some typical information of that nature for the record, including the eligibility standards by States and some typical purchase requirements.

(The information follows:)

TABLE III.—FOOD STAMP PROGRAM
ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR NONASSISTANCE HOUSEHOLDS (STANDARDS IN STATE PLANS APPROVED UNDER THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964)

State	Monthly allowable income by household size										Additional for each person	Resources—allowable liquid assets ¹
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Alaska ²	\$135	\$200	\$255	\$325	\$390	\$445	\$495	\$550	\$600	\$650	\$50	Same as for public assistance.
Alabama ³	100	120	145	175	205	235	265	295	325	350	\$30	4 X monthly scale.
Arkansas ³	85	170	180	190	200	210	220	235	250	265	\$15 to maximum of \$325.	\$200; 2 or more—\$400; 1
California ³	165	200	225	285	340	395	440	485	525	565	\$40	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500
Colorado ³	124	174	209	244	279	314	349	384	419	452	None	1, 2, 3—\$1,000. Add \$250 for each additional person to maximum of \$2,000. ¹
Connecticut	140	185	230	280	335	365	395	420	445	470	\$25	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
District of Columbia ³	120	180	220	250	285	320	350	375	400	425	\$25	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Georgia ³	90	140	195	215	245	270	290	305	320	335	\$11 or more, \$355	\$800; 2 or more—\$1,600.
Hawaii ³	120	180	210	250	285	325	370	415	455	495	\$40	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Illinois	150	200	230	280	325	365	410	430	460	495	\$30	\$400; 2—\$600. Add \$100 for each additional person.
Indiana	130	185	230	275	315	355	395	435	470	500	\$30	\$600; 2—\$800; 3—\$900; 4 and over—\$1,000.
Iowa	130	200	250	295	330	370	405	455	490	540	\$35	\$750; 2—\$900; 3—\$1,000; 4—\$1,000; 5—\$1,200; 6—\$1,300; 7—\$1,400; 8—\$1,500; 9 and over—\$1,550.
Kansas	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	\$750; 2 or more—\$1,250. ¹
Kentucky ³	110	140	170	200	230	255	280	305	330	350	\$15	4 X monthly scale.
Louisiana ³	110	130	150	165	185	220	240	275	295	315	\$20	\$500; 2 or more—\$1,000; 1
Maine	132	190	230	271	320	363	404	445	485	527	\$41	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,200.
Maryland ³	100	140	165	185	220	240	265	290	315	340	\$75	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Massachusetts	148	190	240	286	330	380	430	480	520	560	\$40	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Michigan	125	185	225	265	295	330	365	400	435	470	\$35	\$750; 2 through 5—\$1,000. Add \$100 for each additional person.
Minnesota	135	205	250	290	335	370	390	425	460	495	\$30	\$750; 2 or more—\$1,000. Add \$250 for each person over 65 years.
Mississippi	90	130	155	180	210	230	250	270	290	310	\$15	\$500; 2 or more—\$800.
Missouri	140	190	230	270	310	350	390	430	470	510	\$40	\$750; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Montana ³	125	183	212	253	290	318	353	388	413	438	\$25	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Nebraska	120	180	230	279	305	335	360	385	410	435	\$25	\$750; 2 or more—\$1,500.
New Jersey	160	220	265	310	355	390	425	470	510	550	\$40	\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500. If head of household is age 65 or over, add \$500.
New Mexico	110	150	180	215	245	275	305	345	375	405	\$30	\$250; 2 or more—\$500.
New York	150	210	290	325	365	405	445	485	525	565	\$40	3 X maximum allowable income. ¹
North Carolina ³	110	140	170	195	215	230	240	255	270	280	\$15	\$500; 2—\$700; 3—\$750; 4 or more—\$800.

See footnotes on p. 24.

State	Monthly allowable income by household size										Additional for each person	Resources—allowable liquid assets ¹
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
North Dakota.....	140	185	260	295	330	365	385	415	440	460	\$25	\$1,000 per household.
Ohio.....	130	200	225	260	295	330	365	400	435	470	\$35	—\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Oregon.....	128	193	221	258	288	328	357	386	411	426	\$75	—adult—\$500; 2 or more—\$1,000.
Pennsylvania.....	110	170	205	245	280	315	350	390	425	460	\$30	—\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Rhode Island.....	130	175	205	245	285	325	365	400	435	470	\$35	—\$1,000; 2, 3 and 4—\$1,500. Add \$250 for each additional person.
South Carolina ³	100	130	140	160	180	200	225	250	275	300	None	—\$750; 2 or more—\$1,000.
South Dakota.....	125	175	215	250	285	320	355	390	425	455	\$50	—\$1,000; 2—\$2,000. Add \$300 for each additional person.
Tennessee.....	95	130	165	200	240	275	315	350	385	420	\$35	—\$500; 2 or 3—\$1,000; 4 or more—\$1,250.
Texas.....	106	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	\$15	—\$300; 2—\$450. Add \$50 per person to maximum of \$600. ¹
Utah.....	104	154	184	205	235	255	284	298	316	329	11—\$343; 12—\$357; 13—\$370; 14—\$384; 15—\$397.	—\$400; 2 or more—\$800. ¹
Vermont.....	145	205	250	285	325	365	400	435	470	505	\$35	—\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Virginia ²	90	115	135	150	165	180	195	210	225	240	\$5	—\$500; 2—\$600; 3 or more—Add \$50 each to maximum of \$1,000. ¹
Washington.....	170	215	255	290	325	360	395	430	465	500	\$35	—\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
West Virginia.....	130	170	215	250	290	315	360	395	440	475	None	—\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500.
Wisconsin.....	135	185	215	260	295	350	385	420	445	460	\$30	—\$750; 2—\$1,500. Add \$100 for each additional person.
Wyoming.....	130	180	225	280	310	340	370	415	460	500	None	—\$1,000; 2 or more—\$1,500. ¹

¹ The States indicated also have limitations on other resources such as real estate, automobiles, etc.

² Rent up to maximum of \$75 is also allowed.

³ For households containing both public assistance recipients and nonrecipients, eligibility is based

on the income and resources of the nonassistance members only. Other States base eligibility on the total income and resources of all members.

⁴ Household eligible if a budget deficit exists.

⁵ Scale will be at local option and will be applicable throughout the political subdivision involved.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The preceding table listed the differing eligibility standards by family size and income in the various States. In Missouri, the maximum net income a family of four could have and be eligible is \$270, but in several States, that figure could go as high as \$325 for a family of four. Nevertheless, I think the St. Louis requirements are rather typical; and this is the table for a family of four in St. Louis, showing, according to income, how much it would pay for the food stamps each month or twice a month, the value of the bonus coupons it would receive, and then the total amount of food purchasing power such a family would have for that period of time.

(The information referred to above follows:)

TABLE IV.—MISSOURI FOOD STAMP PROGRAM, NET INCOME BASIS OF COUPON ISSUANCE
4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
\$0 to \$19.99	\$2	\$50	\$52	\$1	\$25	\$26
\$20 to \$29.99	8	44	52	4	22	26
\$30 to \$39.99	14	42	56	7	21	28
\$40 to \$49.99	20	40	60	10	20	30
\$50 to \$59.99	24	40	64	12	20	32
\$60 to \$69.99	28	38	66	14	19	33
\$70 to \$79.99	32	38	70	16	19	35
\$80 to \$89.99	36	36	72	18	18	36
\$90 to \$99.99	40	36	76	20	18	38
\$100 to \$109.99	44	34	78	22	17	39
\$110 to \$119.99	48	34	82	24	17	41
\$120 to \$139.99	52	32	84	26	16	42
\$140 to \$159.99	56	30	86	28	15	43
\$160 to \$179.99	60	28	88	30	14	44
\$180 to \$199.99	64	26	90	32	13	45
\$200 to \$219.99	68	24	92	34	12	46
\$220 to \$239.99	72	24	96	36	12	48
\$240 to \$269.99	76	24	100	38	12	50

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There is a separate set of tables in use in the Southeastern States to reflect the somewhat lower food costs in the South. This is in use in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Using the portion of that table which is comparable to the information in table IV for St. Louis, the following would be the purchase requirements for families of four persons, by income levels, in the 10 Southeastern States—with provisions for adjustment in "hardship" situations, which is also true in other States, such as when shelter costs exceed 30 percent of income, etc.:

TABLE V.—SOUTHEASTERN STATES FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS, NET INCOME
BASIS OF COUPON ISSUANCE 4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

Monthly net income	Monthly			Semimonthly		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
0 to \$29.99	\$2	\$46	\$48	\$1	\$23	\$24
\$30 to \$39.99	10	42	52	5	21	26
\$40 to \$49.99	16	40	56	8	20	28
\$50 to \$59.99	22	36	58	11	18	29
\$60 to \$69.99	26	34	60	13	17	30
\$70 to \$79.99	30	34	64	15	17	32
\$80 to \$89.99	36	32	68	18	16	34
\$90 to \$109.99	40	30	70	20	15	35
\$110 to \$129.99	44	26	70	22	13	35
\$130 to \$149.99	48	24	72	24	12	36
\$150 to \$169.99	52	22	74	26	11	37
\$170 to \$189.99	56	22	78	28	11	39
\$190 to \$209.99	60	20	80	30	10	40
\$210 to \$229.99	64	18	82	32	9	41

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. de la Garza?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Are you acquainted with the article entitled "Hunger in the U.S.A."?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes. I have seen that report.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. A board of inquiry on malnutrition, et cetera?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, when a group of House Members formed a group to sponsor a study into the charges made in that report I purposely joined the move to establish a commission to investigate, because I cannot feel that people in the United States are actually starving to death because of any lack of available assistance. I said, when I joined the group at the first press conference that we had, that I thought many people were suffering from malnutrition—some through a lack of income and ability to buy—but many through ignorance on the part of the parents who care for the children. I have said time and again—and I have heard it mentioned here today—that when you give a child a piece of candy or a bottle of carbonated water, soda pop, it satisfies the taste, but it certainly does little or nothing for the nutrition of the individual.

I think that some of the rural areas have not always been doing their job. I cannot speak about how good a job has been done by the extension services of the State universities in those areas, in going around trying to train the people responsible for bringing up children on what an average diet is and what they need to live on. We are doing some of that in St. Louis, but there is much more needed in the education of people on this subject.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I did not know that it was that feeling expressed in this report by the citizens committee. I'm afraid we are not speaking of the same group.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I was not referring to that, I am sorry. When a group of House Members promoted the proposed Commission on Nutrition—

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It was reported by the citizens board of inquiry into the hunger and malnutrition in the United States. It is so signed.

Mr. Reuther was a member of this committee. I believe he was a cochairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have seen it, but I am not familiar with the details of the report. I have not studied it. But this report was cited as the reason for establishing a Federal Commission which I cosponsored.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You come before us with legislation to increase the amount authorized for the food stamps. I am somewhat concerned in reading this, as to the conclusions in the food stamp section where they conclude that the food stamp program has failed, and then throughout the food stamp section they have a resumé of facts and quotations from individuals, and they make mention of the failures which they say are in the program and they show a switchover from the direct commodity distribution program to the food stamp program, for example. And I understand, if I remember correctly, one county in Mississippi, the recipients dropped 70 percent. Now, my concern is this: In your statement you chastise us a little bit. You ask for more funds, but yet you say nothing in the way of recommendation. Any program is not perfect. I doubt if any legislation is perfect. Up here is one group that has studied the problem and says that it is far from a good program, and that it has failures 1, 2, 3, and 4; yet

you do not come before us with any added recommendations, except to say "We want more funds."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I answer that?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Surely.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I believe that the study you mentioned advocated and is advocating free food stamps. This is what they have been pushing for, saying that many of these people have no income. My answer to that is that if a person or a family has no income at all from any source, then there is far more of a basic problem about what to do with that family than just to give it some free food stamps. The Secretary has the authority under this act to set the regulations as to what a family has to pay out of its own money to buy the stamps. Down in the very poor sections of this country, he set the minimum at 50 cents per person per month, and no higher than \$3 for the entire family. So, if there are six people in the family it would be \$3; if there are 12 people in the family it would still be \$3, and they would get a bonus in stamps according to the number of people in that family, to enable it to enjoy an adequate diet. True, they would have to get the \$3 from somewhere, so that that family could get enough stamps to be able to purchase an adequate diet. This is why I say I do not agree with the people who wrote that report, that the food stamps should be free. If you want to give out free food it can be done under the free distribution program. But if we start now and give free stamps in various areas of the country, I think that we will break down the whole plan that has been set up under the food stamp plan.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Am I to understand then that what you speak of is a dual system?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the same time and in the same counties? No. Because, then, these people would say "Why should I pay for food? I can get it free."

Mr. DE LA GARZA. This is what concerns me, Mrs. Sullivan. How do we help the one and discriminate against the others?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If they do not have \$3 for the family to buy enough stamps to feed a family adequately for an entire month, is there no Salvation Army, or Red Cross, or any private charity that will not come up with \$3 per family for food? I do not know of a family today under any welfare system—as bad as it is in some areas or as good as it is in some areas—I do not know of a family today that is not able to get some money somewhere from some group in order to buy a month's food for only 50 cents a person or \$3 a family.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Then, your food stamp system, as I understand your interest in it is that it would be supplemental assistance for any family that is not adequately getting a proper diet for the family, and that it is not a program to help the indigent?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It is a program to help all people in an area acquire adequate diets when they are low-income people. For these with some income, they pay for the stamps only what they are considered able to spend for food. I want to go back to one statement that you made when you said that there was a 70 percent drop in participation among those who were receiving the free distribution of food, when their areas went to the food stamp program instead. I can give you a worse example than that.

Right in my own city, we had some 50,000 persons receiving free food under the direct distribution program. But when the stamp plan went into effect, we had very few—not over 1,000 people—who got into the new program the first month. Then, as they began to go into the qualifications of the families, they found that many of those 50,000 people who were getting free food should not have gotten it at all, but because it was free and was given to anyone who came in and said “I need it,” they were happy to get it. Much of it was wasted. But when they had to spend some of their own money, under the food stamp program, and had to be investigated as to what their actual income was, what their expenses were, and so on, it turned out that many who could not qualify for free food on a need basis had been getting it anyway. This does not happen very often under the food stamp program. The eligibility requirements are strict and every applicant is investigated.

MR. DE LA GARZA. May I ask you this question, Mrs. Sullivan: Where should the money go, to those who have nothing to eat or to those who have something but need it supplemented?

MRS. SULLIVAN. I think that it should go to both, but not to chiselers. It should go to all who need help in order to eat properly.

The other argument that has been brought up in some of the criticisms of the food stamp program is that some of the States will not act. My State is one. They will not pass the legislation in Missouri to put up the little money that is needed to certify the people who need supplemental food assistance. The only place in Missouri that has the food stamp plan is the city of St. Louis. All the rest of the poor in the State do not come under it, because our State legislature has refused to act. The Secretary of Agriculture cannot bring food stamps into an area unless the local area will participate through its State welfare agency. He can put in free distribution, and he has done that. That is not under the food stamp program; that is the free distribution of food—direct distribution—and he did that in numerous areas where local authorities refused to act.

MR. DE LA GARZA. I am sorry that you are not acquainted with the “Hunger in U.S.A.” report, aside from the general statement that they wanted free distribution of food. It has some things in it that I would consider deficiencies in the program, which I thought you may be interested in, rather than just saying that you want more funds for the food stamp program.

I want to ask you this: You mentioned some States that were waiting in line, and you mentioned Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan—to name four—which the “Hunger in U.S.A.” report shows are areas where there are no problems; it shows a clear white area for them. How do we distribute the funds? That is the question. I do not know how authoritative it is. It shows that in some of the areas where you want to put a lot of these funds, you have no problem.

MRS. SULLIVAN. The reason that there is no problem in some of these places you mentioned, such as in Pennsylvania, is that they already have the food stamp plan in most of the State. Pittsburgh was one of the first ones that went under it. Also, most of the mining areas where there was large-scale unemployment. The first pilot projects were put in those areas of great need, and they were given the food stamp program first.

In these others—for instance, I mentioned Pennsylvania as one of the States that has a large waiting list, but they also have a large number of their counties already under it, but no county can be on the list until the State director of welfare makes his request to the Secretary of Agriculture. It is not thrust upon them. They have to request it. The areas of greatest need received it first. But other areas also want it and should have it—wherever there are poor people who need this help in order to eat properly.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank you very much. You have been here quite a while. It has been my privilege to serve on this committee only a very short time. Nevertheless, I think you have chastised us too much. And when I ask you how can we make better the program, you come in with no recommendation except to say "More money." This puts me in a quandary.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am sorry, but I think that I have made some recommendations. The law does not need any extensive revision. The regulations can be changed. I am not recommending that you give out free food stamps, however, to meet the criticisms of the people who wrote this report. If the purchase requirements in any area are too high, they can be modified.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Well, I do not know any of these people. I do not know that anything will be done to meet what these people say, but, apparently, there is a problem. And this I have tried to straighten out very respectfully to satisfy my own mind, to get some sort of priority, because I know that there is a problem. I know my area has a problem, but yet there must be some sort of priority, and there must be some sense of value given to this thing. And when you are arguing whether you are going to be for the farmer or the committee or for the program, we tend to forget the people we are trying to help.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I ask this? Do you know whether or not your State welfare director has requested either the direct food distribution or the food stamp program in your area?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Well, we have direct food distribution program. In one of my counties the Secretary of Agriculture has come in and said, "I am going to give it whether you want it or not."

I have one county that I cannot tell you if they have already asked or not, but I know that they were interested in the food stamp program, and they are either on the waiting list or otherwise.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. From the information given me, none of your counties have applied for the food stamp program, and, as I said, it cannot be thrust upon any community, any county, that does not make the request. Until recently, neither was the direct food distribution program thrust upon a county until this group went out to look at the hungry around the country. Then I think that Secretary Freeman did go in and install some free distribution programs, but if I recall correctly from what I read, the county sheriff or someone said "We will now take over the program." But he does have the power to put in the direct distribution of free food where the State or local area did not want to do anything about it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I have only one thing else to say, and that is that I know this is a problem and I am interested in doing everything I can in helping the people, and I think you are, too, and I think that we should perhaps use the word "charity," to work together, in trying to see how we can work out differences. It may be that we can do it

among ourselves. All of us who are on the committee are trying to help, I believe, and I believe that somehow we might make a renewed effort—a little more charity and a little more patience—to work out this problem so that we have a program, to see that these people are helped.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think that we have to remember that the food stamp program is not an emergency feeding program. This is not being done simply because there is a group of people demanding that something be done. This program began in 1961 as an experiment in helping low-income families to eat properly. It is not an emergency plan.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You are putting it on an emergency basis.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am not putting it on that basis at all.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You are treating it as an emergency, by saying that unless you appropriate x millions of dollars—

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am not. When you talk about that—let me tell you what this committee has done over the years on this legislation—I have been here since 1954, before this committee year after year, discussing this as a nutrition program, and the older members of the committee know it. I think they are tired of seeing me. And, as I said, if I was not stubborn and if I did not believe so deeply in this idea of assuring adequate diets, believe me I would not come here and fight for it. I have fought for it; I have fought for it all of these 15 years, because I think it is an honorable way for anyone who has to take any kind of help, to be able to go into a store, like you and me, and buy what they need to eat. As I say, this is not an emergency feeding program. It is a long-range solution to assure an adequate diet to every family in a nation which can produce such a great abundance of food. I should not have to argue before this committee that when people buy food it is helping the farmer, because the more food low-income families can buy, and the more food the farmer can grow and sell. That is why this legislation comes before this committee. I just think that the faults and the deficiencies of these programs are there, but we cannot correct any of the faults without sufficient funds to expand and liberalize the program.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mrs. May?

Mrs. MAY. Mrs. Sullivan, I should like to put a question to you, with a little background before I put the question, if I may. You have made criticism of this committee in your statement. I would not deny that probably a great deal of it is based on what actually has happened here. I have been on this committee for 10 years, and I have always assumed that our main responsibility, that of the committee and the Department of Agriculture was that they were charged with responsibility for American agriculture, its production and the marketing of its products. Our job is to make decisions when problems come before us on how best to keep the farmer on the farm to grow the food that is needed by everyone, including the economically disadvantaged.

Since the time that the food stamp program came out of this committee, it has developed into a \$200 million program with some 1,000 employees in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to administer it. And now USDA is requesting some 600 more employees. So when you and other sponsors of the food stamp program have criticized the ac-

tions of this committee, I have wondered if a lot of the fault did not lie, not with a lack of understanding and good will of the members of this committee but with the fact that it was in the wrong committee?

Should not the food stamp plan be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and administered by it as an important part of their welfare program?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There are ways that I can answer that. I am not the parliamentarian who sends bills to committees. This is what the problem is when a bill is introduced. As we introduce bills, we do not say to which committee it goes.

Secondly, I can ask why Public Law 480 is under this committee. Public Law 480 is really a foreign aid program. Why should it not be under the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mrs. MAY. I think the answer to that is that we are dealing with surplus foods, very much as we are dealing with them in the direct distribution program—with surplus foods and section 32 funds both directly agriculturally oriented programs.

However, I have long supported closer cooperation between this committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee on Public Law 480. You have made a good point there. It became an important diplomatic weapon when it became a food for peace program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I say this to you?

When I first introduced food stamp legislation 15 years ago we were plowing under fields of tomatoes and potatoes and fields of everything, instead of giving these foods to hungry people. The more food people can buy and eat the more food farmers can grow and sell, and will grow.

The whole program was based on the idea that this would not only help people to have better diets, but also help the farmers to grow and sell more food. In distributing it through the regular channels of trade, under the food stamp program, you are making possible an orderly distribution of the food that is grown and processed, so less of it goes into surplus stocks, that is the basic idea.

Apparently, we can probably have a lot less trouble from a committee standpoint if it were under welfare, but this is not my decision, and the welfare people generally favor giving people more money to spend as they see fit.

Mrs. MAY. You said in your statement that the food stamp program has broken down in some instances, that it is not perfect. So, why not administer it under HEW? As I understand it they are the ones who screen the people who are eligible. They use the local public assistance officers in the food stamp programs. It is oriented to the welfare program.

We, in this committee, talk about everything from sheep scrapie to hog cholera to agriculture production—we deal with all of that—our background is such that we deal with situations which are very important to the future of agriculture production. This background has perhaps not given us the expertise to judge a welfare program, whether or not it is being administered in the right way. Very frankly, I do not think that is a responsibility of the USDA either. I would like to see the USDA spend more time with our very serious problem of keeping enough farmers on the land to grow the food. You know as

well as I do that in your own State, as in my State, farmers are facing severe price and income problems.

I feel that it is high time that we made a very realistic decision in helping the food stamp program to be administered correctly, to put it in the hands of those people who have the expertise with welfare programs.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I say that when I first wrote up the bill, I did everything I could to get the legislative counsel to get it to come before the Banking and Currency Committee of which I am a member, and to put it under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mrs. MAY. Frankly, I do not think it would have had any better success there.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We deal with everything in the world in the Banking and Currency Committee, from currency—and these coupons are just like money in the banking system—to gold, to defense production, and credit unions—and anything else. It probably does not belong under the Banking and Currency Committee any more than it belongs under welfare. The reason that I say that it does not belong under welfare is because the food stamp program is not wholly a welfare project. These people must put up their own money. It is not counted as part of any welfare they get.

Mrs. MAY. But a great deal of that money comes to these people from OEO funds and welfare funds, public assistance funds, and they use that money to buy the food stamps, so that, again, is taxpayers' money.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. So is social security money.

Mrs. MAY. Yes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But the whole basic reason for this committee having it is because the more the people eat the more the farmer can grow and sell. It is just as simple as that.

Mrs. MAY. But the perplexing question before us now is that even with two USDA food programs in effect, we still have people who need food. All I am interested in is in the proper administration of these welfare programs, and think it is high time that we studied the advisability of transferring the authority for the program and the authorization to a committee that is oriented to this subject.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mrs. May, would you also, then, since this committee is having some hearings now and another committee is having hearings on the problem of malnutrition, is this committee ready to turn over to welfare the school lunch program and all these other programs which Agriculture administers?

Mrs. MAY. No. The school lunch program benefits a great many children who are not on welfare. For many, many years its administration has been set up under the Department of Agriculture. But I think that we should give serious study to the determination on any feeding program, where we are appropriating much money, to be sure that it is under the right agency of Government.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I just feel that with all the people who are participating in the food stamp program who are not on any form of welfare, where there are those on social security, those who are working but not earning enough to feed their families properly, it is not much different from the school lunch program. In any food distribution

program, can welfare distribute the food better than Agriculture? If they can, I do not care where it is channeled.

Mrs. MAY. In the food stamp program, there is no distribution of food except through the commercial pipeline; that is, through the grocery store. It is simply a matter of using stamps for money. The direct distribution program is based on surplus foods purchased because the farmer has a surplus, so the commodity is bought to stabilize farm income and then channeled to institutions or direct commodity distribution. I do think that we will have to face up to a question one of these days—if every county in the United States goes on the food stamp program, then what happens to the section 32 funds which we have used as an income stabilizer for our farmers? Where will we channel that food when there is no longer any outlet in direct distribution?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The section 32 funds were created in the depths of the depression when times were entirely different, and yet the section 32 funds are still going to Agriculture. Maybe that should be looked into; maybe that program should be taken away or changed.

Another thing: Maybe the Banking and Currency Committee should have this after all, because, under the food stamp program, there is no food distributed as such. It is true it comes from the stores, in the regular marketplace, and they handle money in the form of coupons. So, I suggest to the chairman, Mr. Gathings, that maybe the thing for you people to do is to introduce a resolution asking the leadership and the Parliamentarian, or whoever you ask, to transfer this whole thing to the Banking and Currency Committee since the Federal aid is in the form of a coupon which is just like money, and is handled through the banking system as money.

Mrs. MAY. I do not think that would be wise. The exchange of the money at the bank for coupons is a very small part of the program.

The main thing is: Are we getting the proper screening of applicants so that everybody who is in need of the food stamp program and should be on the program is on it? That is strictly a welfare type of decision by the State or local people, by people who have been trained in public assistance. As you know, I would be willing to transfer it to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I see no argument for transferring it out of USDA unless it goes to HEW.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. You say that it is a welfare program, and you say that it should not involve your committee because this program does not really handle food because the food goes through the regular marketplace. But they do handle money. These coupons are treated as money. But unlike any form of Federal assistance, this money is earmarked only for food. We have rent supplements in our committee. That is not welfare, either.

Mrs. MAY. I said that I wanted the program administered correctly. I think where the breakdown has been, according to these reports, is that not enough of the right people are getting to take advantage of these food stamp programs. This becomes a decision to be made on the basis of family need.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. And the States.

Mrs. MAY. And the States.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Because they are the ones who administer it.

Mrs. MAY. Health, Education, and Welfare public assistance programs are tied in with State programs, then on to the local level programs. I have done a great deal of thinking on this. It seems to me that it is something we should give very serious consideration.

I yield my time. Thank you very much.

Mr. GATHINGS. I just want to say to the gentle lady from Washington that I take it that it is your view that as long as we are dealing with food distribution, why, then, it is a separate matter of moving agricultural commodities into the hands of the people who need the food?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. And when it goes out of the distribution of food and goes into the food stamp program, then, in that event—

Mrs. MAY. It becomes a part of our national welfare program. And I do not think it is proper, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, and with my high regard for every member on this committee, I just do not think that comes within our purview, considering that the primary responsibility of our committee is in the area of agriculture.

Mr. GATHINGS. I will say to the gentle lady from Washington, that I commend you for the splendid work you have done as a member of this Special Select Committee on Foods.

Now, Mr. Dole.

Mr. DOLE. I want to ask Mrs. Sullivan a question. You are not requesting or suggesting any change in eligibility requirements?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, not in the law. The law says these people are eligible whose incomes prevent them from purchasing an adequate diet. The regulations spell out the standards for those who use the stamps and how the grocer or the recipient are to use them. I am not proposing changing eligibility requirements. The law is flexible enough so that the Secretary has that authority to use when he has to use it, as he did when he cut the minimum purchase requirement to 50 cents per person from \$2 per person, last year. The law gives him the responsibility to make sure that those who need this food help can get it regardless of how poor they are.

Mr. DOLE. Then, you, personally, believe that people who strike should be eligible for food stamps?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This happens to be one of those happenstances in which some people temporarily meet the requirements. If they have no resources, and "resources" is money in the bank, stocks, bonds, and other assets other than equity in a home. If they meet the requirements of need when they are on strike or when they are out of work, as other people do, and they have no money, then they just come under it. It was not written into the law to cover strikers specifically.

Mr. DOLE. Do you think it should be changed?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, I do not. I don't think that it would be used to any great extent. Most workers have savings bonds, bank accounts, and so on. I think the only time it happened to any significant extent was in the copper strike. I have no idea how many of those out on strike took advantage of it, or were able to do so.

Mr. DOLE. I understand that in the Ford strike in Detroit, probably \$270,000 worth of food stamps were used by the strikers—in fact, the program was used to subsidize the strike. This is taking away money for food stamps from the very people you are concerned about and that many of us are concerned about.

I doubt the program was ever intended for the able-bodied man if he voluntarily goes out on strike, and he certainly has the right to do so. Do you think we should change this?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am not going to advocate doing that, because I do not think we can foresee where a striker is going to need this help. Just remember that some strikes have led to findings that the company violated the law in refusing to bargain.

I do not think that in those cases where strikers have received food stamps there was any misuse. There are penalties for misuse of this program.

Mr. DOLE. What about the allegation that certain college students and hippies have been provided with food stamps? Their resources are inadequate. They do not want to work. Many able-bodied people do not want to work in America today, and they are eligible for food stamps. Do you think that is right?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, I think there was some case of that kind in Colorado. I am not aware of the details. I wish that I could tell you what I would like to do with the hippies, but I will not. I do not think it is our duty to support them. But in any social legislation intended to meet a social problem, you have extreme cases. I cannot solve the problem of those who prefer to loaf, and what to do about them. I would not say to change the law because the law sets down only broad guidelines. The regulations must cover specific problems.

Mr. DOLE. My point is: If the committee will not act, perhaps we ought to look into the administration of this program and perhaps make more money available by better administration of the program, rather than to castigate the committee for something that we do, so far as money is concerned. Hippies and people on a strike should not be receiving food stamps. We can appropriate billions of dollars and have it wasted and thrown away on people who do not need it. I do not know that that is any solution at all.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I certainly would say that there is certainly a basis for continuing investigation into the use of the program. I strongly believe in firm enforcement.

Mr. DOLE. You are not saying that money alone will solve the problem?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Money alone can never solve any social problem, as I think we have seen with our welfare problem. You will never be able to give a mother enough money to rear a child if she does not have the good sense and ability to use the money carefully and to teach that child something. It is not a question only of money. She has never gotten enough money to live well but I would not say to give her more money merely because she needs more money; teach her how to use that money intelligently.

We tried, with legislation we passed in the Ways and Means Committee last year, to make a start in providing training to those who are trainable. But if we do not get the people early enough to train them how to live—and we have gotten to the point where this is often necessary—then, there is not enough money in the world to cure all of their ills.

Mr. DOLE. This is where, probably, there is a very honest difference of opinion. I do not know of a single member of this committee wanting people to go hungry, regardless of party, regardless of geography,

or whether we have the food stamp program in our district or not. Frankly, I feel if the State were paying part of the cost we would have better administration. We tried to amend the law last year, but were not successful. It appears that perhaps we need more local control of the program. What I am concerned about and what 34 other members of this committee are concerned about is that those not entitled to stamps should not be included in the program. I recognize that any program has abuses. You cannot vote against every program because of possible abuses, one abuse or a dozen abuses, but we have some honest differences of opinion in this area, hence it is unfair to suggest that those who may vote against it are suggesting people should starve to death.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have never suggested that. I just know that in all of these 12 or 14 years that I have worked for and fought for this program—you know how the vote has been. I do not have to tell you this. I do not accuse anybody of wanting anyone to starve. This is a way to help people to help themselves.

Now, in all of these 16 years that I have been in the Congress, I have voted for farm bills, and I have had to go back to my district in the city to explain why I voted for farm programs. I voted for them because I think we have got to help the farmer make an honest living. It has not been easy for city people to understand why we should vote these things for the farmers.

A bill is coming up shortly to continue payments to farmers not to grow more food. It is one of the most difficult things to explain to city people. I think that with the way the city people are feeling today, it is so easy for urban members just to vote against farm bills if we do not look to see what the other fellow needs, including the farmer. I am familiar with the farm problems; not all city members are.

Mr. DOLE. I might say the same thing.

Not all farmers feel that the programs are the answer. Would you say that your statement today is a "ransom note" for the farm bill now pending in the Rules Committee?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would not say that. I think that you all know that in 1964, when we got this food stamp law passed, we could not have had it passed unless we had tied it in with one of the farm bills that was up at the time. Everybody knows this. And legislation should not have to be enacted in this way.

Mr. DOLE. I do not believe so, either.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (presiding). Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. I first want to associate myself with the remarks made by Paul Jones. I want to help everybody who actually needs help, but I am getting fed up to the ears in helping people, able-bodied people, who just refuse to work.

Your statement, Mrs. Sullivan, indicates that you have a rather low regard for the members of this committee. But I do not think that any of us will lose any sleep over it.

I think you made one unfortunate statement when you said, "Many of us from urban areas are simply going to withhold our votes on farm legislation until we again make another 'deal' as we had to in 1964."

When the Congress of the United States tries to legislate by making deals, I think that we are skating on very, very thin ice. I recall what you referred to in 1964. At least, I think I do. You needed five or six votes to pass a certain program. A shipyard was held over the heads of certain representatives. They changed their vote, and the legislation was passed. And, in my opinion, that is the wrong way to legislate.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not know anything about that, but I—

Mr. GOODLING. You were not part of the deal—I am certain of it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not remember it as being a matter of five or six votes. The bill passed 229 to 189.

Mr. GOODLING. We are told over and over again that our economy is at an all-time high.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am sure it is.

Mr. GOODLING. Do you agree?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODLING. How would you justify expanding the welfare programs at this time?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, I still say that this is not a welfare program, as such.

Mr. GOODLING. What is that?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I still say it is not a welfare program as such. It is to assure adequate nutrition for low-income families. They can't use this for anything but food.

Mr. GOODLING. Three or 4 or 5 months ago, a national publication had an article in it about hippies in California receiving food stamps? I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture. I have a letter from him in my files. I do not have it with me. It said that under certain conditions this was possible.

Last week, before the House, one of our colleagues made a statement that college students are in this program. He promised to have more information on my desk this morning.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This, Mr. Goodling, is in the administering of a program that was conceived for people of low income who have inadequate diets. What the administration does in carrying it out, how they spend the funds, how they do it, is not for me to try to supervise on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. GOODLING. You can hardly cover college students, you will probably agree.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We have college students—many of them—from low-income families. We assist them in many ways. Going to college is no longer a sign of wealth. But if I were a college president, I would have expelled everyone who participated in the shambles that we have seen in the last few months, but I am not a college president.

Mr. GOODLING. This whole thing becomes an emotional issue. The play-up about it, emotionally, amuses me. This committee, 2 or 3 or 4 months ago, had a bill before it when suddenly we discovered a lot of malnutrition and pockets of poverty. The chairman asked people to testify on the bill. As I recall, two departments came in—no individuals, no organizations—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and USDA who knew nothing about these pockets of poverty. They said that they had the finances and the authority to go ahead and correct them if they existed. I do not know if you are fami-

liar with the letter that the chairman of this committee has written or not. This same emotional thing came up several weeks ago. He has written—and perhaps I should let him tell you about it, but I will mention it briefly. I understand he has written some 250 letters to where these pockets of poverty are supposed to exist. He wrote these to the secretaries of health of the States, and from what I understand they are amazed that this condition existed in their own districts. That is, the information, I understand will be available by the end of this week. It is being summarized. That is the sort of thing that I think we should look into.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think you are entirely right, Mr. Goodling that we should look into these things. Certainly, we have enough of people in the Department administering this program in conjunction with HEW and the State departments of welfare to find out where these places are, and not just let it be somebody's imagination.

I would like to ask you this: Adams and York counties are in your District, are they not?

Mr. GOODLING. They are, yes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They are supposed to be among the richest farming counties in the country—the best farming land—and yet they have requested to be on the stamp program. That means, certainly, that there are some people in that area that are not getting enough food or do not have the income to buy enough food.

Mr. GOODLING. I think that our unemployment rate in York County, my home county, is about 1.5. I say to you that any county that has that rate of unemployment does not need a food stamp program. Sure, they can get the handout from the Government and, if they can, they will take it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It is not that much of a handout. This is what I have tried to emphasize over the years. These people have to take a substantial portion of their money—out of their own income, regardless of how little or how big it is—to spend for food, and they will then have their food purchasing power supplemented then with bonus stamps. I do not know who your state or local welfare people are. Certainly, the requirements are there for them to pass judgment as to whether or not these counties should participate in the plans. So, they, certainly would not ask for it if there was not some need. I think most of the counties in your state are participating in the program.

Mr. GOODLING. If we had passed the amendment some of us tried to pass a year ago, I think we would have a better administration with the State in it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Goodling, the States must now help; they must do all of the certifying of the eligibles; they must go into the problem of whether people can qualify; they must be responsible for distributing the stamps and assuring the safety of the stamps and the cash.

Mr. GOODLING. They do not share in the cost.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They do not share in the cost of the bonus stamps. But they pay a large part of the administrative costs.

Mr. GOODLING. I have some more questions, Mr. Chairman, but I will yield now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone else?

Mr. Wampler.

Mr. WAMPLER. As you, perhaps, know, I have supported the food stamp program, and I hope to continue to support it. I am wondering: Do you feel that it would be desirable to authorize the President to appoint a national commission to study the causes of hunger and malnutrition?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would say it might be useful but it shouldn't really be necessary. I think we have enough commissions. I think that we can certainly get the departments that are responsible to go down and make these studies along with the State welfare people. But I did co-sponsor the bill by Mr. Foley and Mr. Goodell to create a commission, if there is dispute over the facts.

Mr. WAMPLER. One of the recommendations of the so-called "Hunger, U.S.A." report is that they called for the food programs—and this is both the food stamp and the direct distribution programs—to be removed from administration by the USDA. Do you think that should be done?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not know what I would say on that, but it would be my best judgment, and I have not gone in depth enough into the administration of all of these programs to give an expert answer—but I will say, as I said when I was discussing this with Mrs. May, that if they want to take the food stamp program away from the Agriculture Department and from this committee, then I think that the other food assistance programs, the Public Law 480 program, all of these, then, are programs that you should not concern yourself with, and maybe they should go over to some other committee. But as long as it is under this committee and as long as it is under the U.S. Department of Agriculture, then I think that this committee has every right to investigate the administration of these programs, to get the details on what is being done, and talked about around the country.

Mr. WAMPLER. In listening to your statement and also questions by various members of the committee, you are not coming here with any specific changes in the program other than for an increase in funds.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. An increase in the authorization for funds. Under the bills that have been introduced, including the sixth bill that will be put in today, we would require the Secretary of Agriculture to come back to Congress before the 20th of January each year with a complete report on what has happened to the program in the previous calendar year and up to date, so that this committee could look at it and have a basis for judgment on whether it should be increased, decreased or what. But to have to come back to you each year for another authorization of x number of dollars has been for all of us, we know, anything but a happy situation. I am not condemning anyone for their views on the merits of the program, but it is true that more than one-half of the members on this committee have been against this program for years or we would not have had the trouble having the program continued. Yet a majority of the House voted in favor of it in 1958, 1959, 1964, and 1967.

Mr. WAMPLER. During the last 2 years, I have had the opportunity to talk to literally hundreds of people in my district who are participating in the food stamp program. I might make the general observation that I personally feel that the program has worked better than has the direct commodity distribution program; however, I am concerned that a certain percentage of the poor do not have enough money,

actually, to pay for the stamps, even the minimum amount. I recall, in answer to another member, you stated that in this area the Salvation Army or some other charitable organization should take care of it, but not the Government. Are not these people actually poor, who need help? Are they not entitled to consideration by the Government?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. In the statement that I made, I said that the Secretary is allowing people to come in under the program for as little as 50 cents per month per person, or a total of \$3 per family, to get enough food to feed that family adequately for a whole month. I do not know how much less we could expect them to pay. Yes, if they do not have, or cannot obtain, \$3 a month for a whole family for food, they are out. I think that if we were to take off the need for making some payment, by the end of this year we would find ourselves giving free food for everybody of low income, so they could spend their full incomes for other things. I do not think that is the way to do it. I think they would become too lax in qualifying people when they make their investigations of them, if the whole thing were a free handout. That is what happened in the direct distribution program.

Mr. WAMPLER. I think you will agree with me that no program is any better than the way you administer it with workable guidelines. I think this is an area that needs study.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Mrs. Sullivan, I am sympathetic with your bill, so I will not ask any questions for the purpose of harassing you. I know you have been here for a long time but, just as a matter of information, there are two or three questions I have in mind and, perhaps, with your long experience in this program you could answer them.

One is: Who determines in any situation what amount of cash will be contributed or what proportion of the value of the stamps will be contributed by the family?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The State department of welfare.

Mr. Dow. In each instance?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. In conjunction with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Dow. In each county?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They have set that up by regulation. They work with each State on the standards for that State. And the standards vary somewhat from area to area.

Mr. Dow. Would this mean, basically, that the welfare officer in each county would be the one to determine that?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. In the State, not in the county.

Mr. Dow. Would he determine that family by family or simply on an across-the-board program for each?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. As I understand it, it is generally across the board for that State or that particular county, but with provisions for individual adjustments. We had to work that out in Missouri for the St. Louis project. I think that the Secretary might be able to tell you exactly what the various standards are. There are deviations from the standards in the States, I have been informed for certain individual families, but I do not know how that is done in all States. We did it in St. Louis.

Mr. Dow. Do you know, Mrs. Sullivan, whether there are supposed to be many counties where this program is needed but for some reason it is not under it or is not being applied?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes; a great many.

Mr. Dow. Why would that be?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would use my own State as an example.

We have many counties in Missouri right outside of the city of St. Louis that have pockets of poor that have appealed to the Governor and our department of welfare—appeals by a mayor or supervisor of a county—to put in a food stamp program. The Governor, in turn, made a request to the legislature. But we have not been able to pass the necessary legislation in our State legislature in order to give these counties the welfare money to participate in the food stamp program.

So, no county in the State of Missouri outside of the city of St. Louis, which is not in any county, participates in the program. And that is because our State legislature refuses to act. Arizona, Florida, Delaware, and New Hampshire are not in it either. On the other hand, many States now in it must wait for more Federal funds for the program in order to get it for more of their counties that want it. Only one-third of the counties in the country have it.

Mr. Dow. Does the Department of Agriculture have any authority to intervene in extreme cases and say that they will do it?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. He can do that only through the direct food distribution program, and he did that in some of the States in this past year.

Mr. Dow. So what you are saying, in effect, is that this program is still pretty much operated at the whim of the local officials and, therefore, it is undoubtedly operated in a rather unusual manner?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It depends upon the States, in order to take advantage of something that is offered them but not thrust upon them. And it depends, too—and that is why I am here—on sufficient Federal funds to expand the program to the many areas which have asked for it.

Mr. Dow. Thank you, Mrs. Sullivan.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. I think that you possibly are the best informed and most knowledgeable on this subject of any Member of the House, on this food stamp issue.

In your experience, have there been any stores that have taken advantage of these people?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. What has the Department of Agriculture done about this?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The Department of Agriculture has investigators going out on complaints, anytime they hear of a misuse of the plan, and violators are indicted and convicted; often, they are just warned of technical violations, but frequently they are suspended from participation.

Mr. MYERS. What type of misuse, briefly, are you speaking of or referring to?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. What type?

Mr. MYERS. Of misuse are you referring to?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We have cases in St. Louis where the owners of the stores took loose stamps from customers, which is prohibited.

We had an occasion where a store bought stamps from the individuals and gave them money, instead of merchandise. In other instances, nonfood items were sold.

Mr. MYERS. From your knowledge, which is quite extensive, have stores charged people more when they had food stamps than they would otherwise?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No. The sad thing is that in many of the areas where poor people live, the stores are small ones—the large stores, the chainstores are not operating there—and when it is the “mom and pop” store, they cannot spread their overhead, and their prices are necessarily higher, and it is too bad. I do not know what the answer is. We looked into this problem in the National Commission on Food Marketing. The small store cannot meet chainstore prices.

They do not deliberately charge more to people with food stamps. They charge more to anybody who goes into that store.

Mr. MYERS. The gentleman from Mississippi—I am sorry that he is gone now—earlier said that every county in his State participated in food stamps.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No; he said each county is either in the food stamp or the other type of program—the direct distribution program.

Mr. MYERS. Either the direct or the food stamp programs?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. Yet earlier, late last year, they came before us with a bill to assist these people with another type of program. Why have not these two existing programs worked? We have two programs now in Mississippi. Why did we need a third? Do you know?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I could not tell you.

Mr. MYERS. Did the administration in some part of the program fail?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think you have to go right back to your State welfare director and the people he assigns to this program. He is the one who is responsible for whether or not it works. However, many of these programs in Mississippi are new this year—and were not operating last year.

Mr. MYERS. As Mr. de la Garza said, you are not suggesting any changes; are you?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No; I am not suggesting basic changes in the law. I would not suggest that we force these stamp plans on a community or State that does not want it. I do not like to do that. We did not say what the administration of the plan has to be when we wrote the law. We laid down broad guidelines. The details of the plan itself were developed right in the Department; generally, they have worked very well, but it takes good people on the local level to explain the program and get more people into it.

Mr. MYERS. Earlier, you also said that money was not the only answer. You gave then an illustration of children buying soda pop and candy rather than food. Why is the food stamp program any different than cash? How do we know that these people will increase their nutrition when they can buy cookies and all of those things?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. In many areas where these programs were put into effect, the extension service went into the poverty areas to try to teach people about nutrition—to teach them how to buy. They had to teach some of them how to manage their money. Some complained

that they do not have enough money to buy a whole month's supply of food stamps at one time, because their money comes to them in dribbles. In many areas, such as in the cities where the extension programs had never operated before, they went down into the areas of the poor to try to teach them how to manage on maybe \$65 or \$70 a month which was all they got—how much went for rent and how much to use for other things, and how to use that money. They also taught them what they had to eat and what they should buy, in order to have an adequate diet.

I am in the process now of trying to get some of the schools that are being set up all over, to get for those schools some very simple things from the Department of Agriculture that show a picture of the kinds of vegetables, the kinds of fruit, and so on—not in writing, but in pictures, because they cannot all read—so they could show them “Here is what you should have in a meal; here is what you should have in a day.” [Illustrating.]

Mr. MYERS. Are you suggesting here, then, by this statement that possibly more funds is not the answer, that possibly we should have additional guidance for the cook and the family or the one who purchases, as to how to purchase?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not say more funds are not needed. I say that the funds for the operation of this program must be increased to add additional areas to the program, but there must be a better educational program besides to teach people how to buy and what to eat. I had one of the best examples of that in the Grace Hill Settlement House in St. Louis. Whenever they need volunteers to go out to the people, the Episcopal Church there can get 300 of these very most wonderful women volunteers to come in and go house to house explaining to the poor what these programs are and how they work. This is the way the food stamp plan got its best help in St. Louis—not from the paid workers in the food stamp office, because they could not always be bothered to explain to the people what was needed. It was the volunteers who went in and talked to these people and taught them the things they should know. It was these same volunteers who went into the neighborhood and told the people over 65 what medicare meant. These volunteers have done many things to help the poor. This is how people have to get themselves involved personally in this program, and in any program of this kind. It must be a community effort.

Mr. MYERS. It was the volunteers?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It was the volunteers.

Mr. MYERS. And not some Federal employee?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right.

Mr. MYERS. I must say respectfully that I was rather shocked with your statement. It appears that you are not very appreciative of what the committee has done here. You know, I am from a rural area in Indiana. We have a little saying out there that you can catch more flies with honey than you can with salt.

I am not subject, myself, to making any deals. When I see this [indicating], it kind of waves a red flag in front of me—it drives me in the opposite direction. Certainly, I may slip a little bit in my district, and my constituents may, too, but I am going to be very honest, I am not going to make any deals, and I think that until this country awakens to the fact that we have to think of the country as a whole,

what is the best for it, and stop thinking of deals, we are in deep trouble.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to talk to you after you have been here about 10 years to see how you feel. I think every vote of mine in the past 16 years has been cast not only on the basis of what it does for the people I represent, but how the laws we are making affect the entire country. We do not make laws for a little constituency; we make them for the whole country.

Mr. MYERS. I am quoting from your statement.

"If we have to have another fight, let's have it. But let's make it clear what the issue is going to be: If you do not let us use this method to assure adequate diet for all needy Americans wherever they live, then many of us from urban areas are simply going to withhold our votes on farm legislation until we again make another 'deal,' as we had to do in 1964."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Very blunt and perhaps crude, but it is very true. We had to "make a deal" in 1964 to pass a food stamp bill and a farm bill.

Mr. MYERS. Sure is crude, I must agree with you. I could not agree more. I could not say that you are interested in the whole country when you have to make a deal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Sometimes, we have to shock people. I do not, as a rule, talk about "deals" but this is the shocking truth of this situation.

Mr. MYERS. I am shocked, I will tell you that.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If you had been before a committee as many times as I have been before this one to plead a worthy cause, or if you talked to some of the Members who have been through this with me over the past 14 years, you would have a better idea of my frame of reference on this legislation. If it is no good, then vote against it. I am not questioning how you vote. That is your exclusive responsibility. But I know that whenever we have tried to get this legislation out, this committee has blocked it until you needed our votes on farm bills, and even then you reported out amendments to kill this program. That is the long history of it. I wish this bill could go to another committee, but it does not, and so we have to look at our situation as it is, not as we'd like to pretend it is.

Mr. MYERS. Let me say, Mrs. Sullivan, you suggest here that if everyone does not agree with you, that we are wrong. Let me say that I have voted "No," on many issues here, because I think there is a better way of doing it more economically; that is, I have so thought, and I think there are two ways or more to approach every problem. I am sympathetic with the poor, and I want to eliminate as much poverty in this country as we can, but I think there might be a better way; but you leave us no alternative—you have branded us by your indictment here in your statement that if we vote against it we are cold to the problems of the poor in this country.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not say that. I say that you are not for this program. That is your right. But the House believes in this program and votes for it, and we want the right to do so without going through a legislative wringer before this committee every year.

Mr. MYERS. I will yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Purcell?

MR. PURCELL. Mrs. Sullivan, I feel like I know you pretty well, I appreciate our opportunity to work together on legislation. I want you to know that I am for this program, and I want to make it work. And though we may wonder why there is poverty in this country, I think that we all must admit that it does exist. The reasons for it may be things that we do not have any control over; but I think that I know there are people who, through ignorance or lack of ability or through many things, are not properly fed. They are just as hungry as they would be if they had a lot more money.

I certainly think that this program belongs in the Agriculture Department and under this committee.

I am just sorry as a human being can be that we have seen a relationship which should be very friendly degenerate to the point where you have felt it necessary to make the kind of statements you have. But I think that you sincerely and honestly feel that way, and it is difficult when we have these things build up.

I think, like Mr. Myers said, that it is a situation that we find our country in today; regardless of whether we like the way somebody says something to us or not, we must face the problems that our country has, and it could be a lot easier. I think, if you take this attitude, it will make the situation much worse.

I hope to extend the food stamp program. I hope we then can work out these differences. I hope this committee can maintain jurisdiction of it and work with you or anybody else in improving it, to make for a better nutritional level and life for the people. I will try to keep on working for that.

I wish I had a question to ask you, but I think you have been asked too many already.

I am really sorry that you felt like you had to make this statement, but I think I understand why. With all of the things that have happened, to oppose this kind of legislation because of the person who introduced it, surely, is not the way to legislate. I hope when we get through with this we can work out a way to be more understanding and more cooperative and the time may come when you do not feel quite as badly as you have said here. Perhaps we might feel better about other things.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Purcell, but the statement that I made this morning is a statement that is true. If it were not true, we would have gotten this legislation out long ago. But more than one-half of the committee has always been against the food stamp idea, and tried to kill it, and we had to win on the House floor. I am not saying something that is not so.

Now, as far as there being a better way of doing things, there always is. Make proposals for improvements, but don't kill a good program merely because there might someday be a better plan. This is the one we have now, and it works. Help us to make it work better. As to threats—I went through an experience this morning that I do not want to go through again. I had someone who is supposed to be one of my constituents, and probably he is, come up from Resurrection City, to say that he had been there since Resurrection City opened and there were no shower facilities there. Anyway, it was for 20 minutes that I had him in my office. There were many threats. I do not agree with that kind of thing, and I do not agree that anyone has to threaten the whole

Nation, to threaten the country, as some people have threatened. I am ashamed to think that people could do what some of them did to our Attorney General. But all I did here this morning was to state an absolute fact, that the city people and many of their Congressmen do not want to vote for a farm program. You know that. You have talked to the Members. You have worked with them. On the other hand, many of the city Members feel, as I do, that we have to have programs to help the farmer earn a decent living, because we cannot have prosperous cities without prosperous rural areas. I often envy the people who are living on farms and in rural areas. I have had to live in a city all my life. I do not look down on farmers or call anybody hillbilly, or anything else; but I simply stated a fact this morning.

I have tried, in all of these years, to sell a program that I thought was a program of self-help. I do not believe in giving people something for nothing. When I see these people—and just the experience I had this morning—an able-bodied man, where there was no reason in God's world why he should not be out working, unless, of course, this is his field of work. When Mr. Gathings used that example—or the chairman used it this morning—of the plumber, I used that same example to my visitor who complained about the showers. I asked him where he was Sunday. I knew that a lot of people should have been out helping the plumber who came to help them have a place to take a bath. All I got in reply was a lot of abuse. I do not work under threat. I never have. In fact, I rear back, because I try to do the things as I believe they should be done. Never in my life have I said, "This is the only way to do it—and this is it." If I were not flexible, I would not be here. I have lived longer than you, Mr. Myers; you may, as you get to know me a little better, know that I am not threatening you with anything. I am stating some facts about the problems of this committee and of the House. I have helped to get city Members to vote for farm legislation, and I have talked to rural Members, as to why they should support bills for the cities. But the rural area Members do not go back, in many cases, to their own people and say why they should vote for housing and model cities, and why they should vote for many of these things that are city problems, if only because we have the people from the farms coming into our cities. What do we do with them?

This is not a threat on my part that you must do this or that, or that this is the only way that anything is going to be done.

I said this morning that in all of the years I have appeared before this committee, on this issue, it has always been a struggle. I came here because I believed the food stamp idea. It is up to all of you to do what you want to do with the bill. I will still do all I can to try to get it passed and to get an adequate bill passed.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will yield?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to support the food stamp program. We have before us today a bill which I introduced. We have in it the additional money the Department said was needed. I confess I am somewhat puzzled why any additional authority was needed. I was not here all morning when the discussion was going forward, so I will ask just what authority is needed which we do not have? Just what is the authority today?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The authority is that for this year we have \$185 million authorized for the plan, and there has been authorized \$225 million for the coming fiscal year. The Senate has passed a bill adding \$20 million to this, making it \$245 million for fiscal 1969 only.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Senate bill that we have before us. The committee presently has the Senate bill before it, which is identical to the Poage bill. So that we presently have authorization for this fiscal year, which will end in about 3 weeks, of \$200 million; and for the new fiscal year, which will start the first day of next month, we have an authorization of \$225 million, and under either the Senate or the Poage bill, you would have an authorization of \$245 million for fiscal 1969.

What is the appropriation this year and next year?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There was no authority for any further appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. You had an appropriation of \$185 million; did you not?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The \$225 million for the next fiscal year, but beyond that there is no authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that, but I am asking you what the appropriation is.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. \$225 million.

The CHAIRMAN. When, next year?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Fiscal 1969.

The CHAIRMAN. For fiscal 1968 that we are now in, what was the appropriation?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. \$185 million, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. And \$225 million for the next fiscal year?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is exactly the amount that we are talking about.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, that is right; they are the amounts authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. And what does the Department of Agriculture think they could use?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They asked for \$20 million in order to put in some of the programs that are waiting to start.

The CHAIRMAN. That is additional?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is all you have.

The CHAIRMAN. I introduced the bill to give them what they asked for. I am just not real sure that even though the Department does want more money, that we ought to give it to anybody under threat. I think you expressed our views on this matter of pressure when you expressed your own. You suggested that you tended to become more firm in your position when you were subjected to pressure. That is what you substantially said; is that not correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you not rather suppose that we as members of this committee might have about the same reaction?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, if you take this as a threat, I suppose so.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you intend it to mean?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I intended to tell you that exactly is what has been happening and is happening over this legislation. It is not meant as a threat.

The CHAIRMAN. I know you sought to tell us the truth, but a threat is merely to tell one something unfortunate is going to happen unless he acts as you ask. You told us what was going to happen, if we did not act as you want us to act.

Do you believe in farm legislation?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes; I believe in it and have for 16 years. I voted for it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking for your vote. Do you believe in it?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You feel that it is good?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am not sure that it is good enough. You say that it is the best that you can get.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want you to vote for it—I do not ask you to vote for it if you do not think it is good. You have been voting for it. I was simply trying to find out if you felt it was good or not. Do you think it was good?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There are many things that should be done, to improve the program, I am sure, but it is the best we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The best we have, yes. But do you think that legislation should be passed on its own merits, regardless of anything else?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You think the pending extension of our farm programs is good?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, on the whole—on balance.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not think that the 107 people feel that way; do you?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I did not say that. If you will read a little further, you will read that I am not speaking for all 107 on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think that they believe in it; do you?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am telling you, Mr. Chairman—telling you something that you have known through all of these years that we have been working on the food stamp legislation—that we have not been able, in this committee, to discuss the food stamp program on its merits. We have talked about money; we have talked about whether there should be free stamps—we have talked about many things, but this committee hasn't really made a study of the merits of whether this program is good or not. You vote it up or down, or to force the States to pay for it, but you don't indicate whether you believe in something like this. I do not know how else to tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it that you missed the whole point.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have. With all due respect to you, I do not believe that it is proper for me to demand that anyone support legislation simply because I want him to support it. I do not think that you ought to, as a Member of Congress, vote for it if you believe that I am wrong. I do not believe or think that John Myers will support this just because I have introduced it. I do not think he should. I do not think that I ought to support a bill just because some of my friends support it, unless they can show me that it is a meritorious bill that will help the Nation. If I am convinced that it does, I will support it, even though its author has never voted with me.

I have always tried to support every bit of the so-called social big city legislation, where I could be convinced that it was sound and good, and whether you ever vote for agriculture legislation or not,

Mrs. Sullivan, or whether any of the 107 on your list ever vote for an agriculture bill—and most of them never did—most of them have never voted for an agriculture bill like you have and John McCormack has. Beyond that, most of the people who tell me that “I always support farm legislation” simply have not paid enough attention to even know what they have done themselves. Most of these people never vote for a farm bill and never will. If you do not believe in farm legislation, I do not want you to vote for a farm bill. I do not want to see you stultify yourself. Anybody who comes in here and votes for a bill that he does not believe is sound for his country, because somebody else wants to trade with him, has a different concept from my own.

I thought this was a pretty good bill. We do want the Department's suggestions as to what they expect to do with additional money, and with a proper showing of need, I am willing to vote for it, and I will so vote, but I will vote for it because I believe in it, and not because you threaten me. No, I will vote for it in spite of that, because I think and believe it is sound. I do not believe that any member of this committee will vote for or against it because you threatened us.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank you for the chastisement. I think, in the votes I have cast, I have been able to stand up before my people and tell them why I voted as I did and I have told them. I have told the committee here again why I voted for farm bills. As far as what was said, all you have to do is to think back to the wheat-cotton bill back in 1964; think back to these other bills. I helped you. I helped you on many of these bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I ever ask you to vote for the cotton bill, the wheat bill, or any farm bill because I was going to vote against something that you were going to be interested in, if you did not?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. You never did ask; you never threatened, but we all know that in order to get legislation passed and in order to get the Members to listen—because if you can get the Members of Congress to sit down and listen when debates are going on about a program so that they really know what the “Sam Hill” is in the program, then you are a better man than I am, and it is only the fellow who does his homework that knows what he is voting for—but Members need help in getting any bill through. I have never apologized for voting for a farm bill, or helping to get others to vote for it. But I have said to you and to many others, that the Members from rural areas ought to listen to our problems and study about the needs of the cities. They do not vote for the city bills. I do not say that there must be a trade—I think it is a case of lack of knowledge. It is the same thing on the farm bill. It is a lack of knowledge. Some city Members are simply not going to vote for anything for the rural areas. That is too bad. If they listened and understood what the bill was about, maybe they would change their minds. The only place that I know to change their minds is in committee where you actually work on bills.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mrs. Sullivan.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I apologize for causing such an explosion. I think we understand each other.

(The following information was subsequently submitted by Congresswoman Sullivan for insertion in the record at this point:)

A check of rollcall votes on 18 yea-and-nay votes in the House in the past eight sessions on key agricultural issues shows that sponsors of the six Sullivan

bills introduced up to June 11 to expand the food stamp program cast 1,296 votes in support of the Administration positions, and 300 against.

On the resolution to agree to the Senate amendments to the wheat-cotton bill in 1964, establishing the wheat certificate program, and which passed by 211 to 203, sponsors of my bills who were present cast 72 votes in favor, 19 against.

On the recommittal vote on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, rejected 169 to 224, sponsors of my Food Stamp bills who were present cast 82 Nay votes and 26 Yea votes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mrs. Sullivan, I appreciate your views with respect to the need to help the farmers. In northeast Arkansas, we tune in to the Cardinal network, that comes down into my district. We go to see the St. Louis Cardinal games. It is because there are a lot of people in that general area, in that general farm territory, who trade in St. Louis. We buy from the distributors who operate in the city of St. Louis. We buy many things that come from St. Louis. So, we are a part of your general trade area. You recognize that fact, that we do spend those dollars in St. Louis, which is a hub of a vast agricultural territory in parts of several States.

May I go off the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(Discussion was had outside the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. Back on the record.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is what I have told my constituents in St. Louis all of these years. We all live in the same world. We, in the U.S. Congress, make laws for the whole country. We do not make laws for Arkansas or for St. Louis or for "Podunk." We make laws for the whole country. We have to take a broad view. We have to have people who have a broad outlook and who can see other problems in other areas, and this is the way I have legislated. I think that my people understand that, or they would not have sent me back for 16 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else?

If not, we thank you again, Mrs. Sullivan. We appreciate your being here.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you for your kindness.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two statements which, without objection, we will insert into the record at this point: One is from the Honorable Tom Bevill, and the other is from John C. Lynn, of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM BEVILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Mr. Chairman, members of the distinguished Agriculture Committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you today to voice my support of H.R. 15896 and S. 3068, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, increasing by \$20 million the authorization ceiling for fiscal year 1969.

This is my first term in Congress, Mr. Chairman, but I have followed very closely for several years now, the progress of the Food Stamp Program.

Walker County, in my 7th Congressional District, served as one of the pilot project counties for the program. There were other, older pilot projects in West Virginia and several other States. Walker County came into the program May 6, 1963. It came voluntarily—we did not have to take it. But we did try it and we found it very helpful to a lot of people. Not only were the people participating in the Food Stamp Program able to buy more to eat, but studies indicate a significant increase in purchases of high-quality protein and protective foods.

This additional appropriation as requested in H.R. 15896 and S. 3068 can, in my opinion, only increase the benefits already being derived from the Food Stamp Program.

As one closely associated with this program, I feel this is an effective, efficient and orderly way to work toward combating poverty, malnutrition and hunger. Therefore, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I respectfully recommend a favorable report on this legislation.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. LYNN, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

We appreciate this opportunity to present views of the American Farm Bureau Federation on legislative proposals to increase authorized funding of the program under which food is made available to needy individuals and families through distribution of stamps which can be exchanged for food commodities at retail outlets.

Because most farm families are engaged in production and marketing of one or more food commodities, farmers naturally are interested in sound and effective means which increase over-all consumption of food and, at the same time, foster better dietary habits among consumers. Data made available by the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that 2,200,000 persons were participating in the food stamp program at the end of last year. The cost of food stamps to those in most urgent need has been drastically reduced—to 50 cents per person per month, with a maximum of \$3 per family—and the selection of commodities which may be purchased with food stamps has been broadened substantially.

Even so, there are increasingly militant demands that the cost of food stamps be further reduced—to the point of free distribution—and that larger and larger quantities of commodities be made available at little or no cost to recipients.

Farm Bureau is concerned that this program, like others which were initiated on a more or less temporary basis, without appropriate safeguards will tend to become permanent and that it will be steadily expanded to the degree that it becomes ineffective. It is our firm belief that this program should be subject to the review of the Congress each year, both as to the amount of funds made available and also as to the soundness of its administration. To place the food stamp program on a permanent basis without Congressional authorization of funds annually would constitute unwise procedure and open the way for additional violations of both the spirit and operating regulations of the program.

In keeping with the nation's economic growth, it would seem appropriate that at some point participation in the food stamp program perhaps should begin to level off. The food stamp program was conceived as a means of assisting needy individuals to supplement inadequate diets and to help them become self-sufficient. It would appear reasonable to anticipate that at least some participants, after more than three years, would have taken advantage of other assistance programs, such as job training and special educational opportunities, to the extent that they no longer require food stamp assistance.

Submission of annual expenditures of federal funds to the authority of the Congress is a keystone of our democratic form of government, and this procedure should be maintained.

Starting with an original appropriation of \$100 million in fiscal 1965, funds for operation of the program have been steadily increased to \$185 million for the current fiscal year. We believe an increase from \$185 million to \$225 million for the next fiscal year would represent the maximum rate of growth which can be administered effectively. Excessive funding inevitably lead to inefficiencies in operation and waste and, in view of the nation's current fiscal situation, it is essential that each dollar of federal funds purchases the maximum in terms of benefits to those individuals intended to be helped.

We respectfully recommend that appropriation of funds for the food stamp program be maintained on a year-to-year basis, and that the authorization and appropriation for fiscal 1969 not be increased beyond its present level of \$225 million.

The CHAIRMAN. We will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time we will continue consideration of this legislation.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., a recess was taken until 10 a.m., Wednesday, June 12, 1968.)

This additional appropriation as requested in H.R. 31987 and S. 2333 is to be used only to increase the benefits being received from the program. It is not to be used to increase the number of persons receiving benefits. As one result of the program, the number of persons receiving benefits is expected to increase. It is expected that the number of persons receiving benefits will be about 1,000,000 in 1950, 1,500,000 in 1951, 2,000,000 in 1952, 2,500,000 in 1953, 3,000,000 in 1954, 3,500,000 in 1955, 4,000,000 in 1956, 4,500,000 in 1957, 5,000,000 in 1958, 5,500,000 in 1959, and 6,000,000 in 1960.

Statement of Louis C. Gray, Director of the American Farm Bureau Federation

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program. It is requested that this appropriation be used to provide for the additional costs of the program.

AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Jones of Missouri, Stubblefield, Foley, Vigorito, Jones of North Carolina, Dow, Nichols, Montgomery, Belcher, Teague of California, Mrs. May, Dole, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Burke, Mathias, Zwach, Kleppe, Price, and Myers.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; William C. Black, general counsel; Hyde H. Murray, assistant counsel; L. T. Easley, staff consultant; and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

We are met this morning for further consideration of various food stamp proposals and changes, and we are honored to have with us our colleague, Mr. Sisk, of California, who will present his statement before the Secretary of Agriculture arrives. I may say, Mr. Sisk, that your statement is just as important as that of the Secretary. We will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. B. F. SISK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to express my appreciation to you for making this arrangement, and to assure you that I will only take a very few moments of your time.

We all appreciate the responsibilities and the obligations of this committee. I want to express to you, Mr. Belcher, the ranking minority member, and to all members of this committee my deep appreciation and that of the people in California that I happen to have the honor to represent for the work that you folks do and what this committee does in trying to meet the needs of agriculture.

I am not going to take the time of the committee to read my statement this morning. I would ask that it be made a part of the record, and, then, I would like to make some very brief comments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, your statement will be made a part of the record, and we will be glad to have you make such supplementary statements as you care to make.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I have in connection with my statement, a statement prepared by the director of the Department of Public

Welfare of the County of Fresno, Mr. Reed K. Clegg, which I would also like to have made a part of the record. His statement deals with the whole subject of food distribution and the food stamp program.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Sisk follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. B. F. SISK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman: I appear before you today in behalf of the 14,000 poor families in Fresno County who are poor enough to be hungry but not poor enough to get welfare assistance. These are the primary beneficiaries of changes which I believe should be made in the laws governing food stamp programs in the United States.

Your honorable Committee has before it a wide variety of bills on this subject, including H.R. 1268 and H.R. 1269, which I introduced last year and about which the Committee took testimony when I appeared before you in March of 1967.

As I am sure the Members of the Committee are well aware, food stamps are an outstanding bargain. If they could be made available to the 54,000 welfare recipients and 14,000 poor non-welfare families in my home County, substantial improvements could be made in the diets of the families affected.

However, as is the case with most programs, the utilization of food stamps would require the expenditure of additional funds for administration. It has been my hope that by utilizing a combination of food stamps and surplus food distribution, the advantages of both systems could be utilized and substantial improvement made in the diets of the poor without burdening the county property taxpayer. Unfortunately, we discovered a number of obstacles in our path.

One of these obstacles was the fact that there was a prohibition against continuing use of both food stamps and surplus foods. The purpose of my two bills was to eliminate this prohibition and to make it possible for both food stamps and surplus food to be made available.

The other obstacle is the Department of Agriculture's definition of what constitutes an "emergency" as it applies to food stamps. As you know, even without new legislation, the Department will permit both food stamps and surplus food distribution in an "emergency."

I am advised by our County Welfare Director, Reed K. Clegg, that if the Department would agree to our definition of an emergency, Mr. Clegg is prepared to recommend the utilization of food stamps. Perhaps the Committee would consider this problem in deliberating on this matter. I would like to submit for the record at the conclusion of my testimony a statement by Mr. Clegg relative to this situation which might be of benefit to the Committee and its staff.

In essence, the problem is this. The use of food stamps will cost about \$100,000 per year in administrative costs. The County would like to recover some of the administrative costs by savings in its surplus food distribution program. However, the Department says that if Fresno County were to switch from surplus commodities to food stamps, Fresno County must continue to spend as much for food stamps, per recipient, as it now spends for surplus foods. Therefore, there would be no savings against which to apply the \$100,000 in new administrative costs. As a consequence, it is unlikely that the food stamp plan can be considered in Fresno County. Perhaps the Committee in its wisdom would define what constitutes an emergency in such a way to make it plain that an emergency relates to one family's needs at one particular time, and not alone to whether the emergency is of a general nature and is caused by flood, fire, famine or some other circumstances. This would give Fresno County a way to overcome the Department's requirement that expenditures be maintained at the \$2.00 per person rate. For instance, our Welfare Director argues with considerable merit that a family which applies for categorical aid and has no funds is in an emergency situation during the approximately 30 days it takes to process its application for aid.

He also believes a welfare recipient who has lost his warrant or whose warrant has been stolen, or whose warrant for some reason has not been issued, is in an emergency situation.

Mr. Clegg has been working with the Department of Agriculture to see whether a new definition of an emergency can be written, and I am hopeful that the Department will be able to do this. However, in advance of action by the Department, it may be that the Committee will want to assume jurisdiction in this matter and write the definition into the law or into its report on any new legislation which the Committee reports. This would be of immense help.

I appreciate the Committee's indulgence in permitting me to appear again on this subject, after already having been afforded the courtesy of a hearing last year, and I am grateful for any consideration you may be able to give to us on this problem.

(The document, entitled "Progress Report—Feasibility of Implementation of Food Stamp Plan in Fresno County," follows:)

PROGRESS REPORT

FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF FOOD STAMP PLAN IN FRESNO COUNTY

The economy of Fresno County, California, is somewhat typical of other regions in the United States where agriculture is the dominant industry. Fresno County differs only in that it produces more agricultural wealth than any other county in the United States and that it has corresponding peaks and valleys in its need for farm labor. In company with other agricultural areas of California, its welfare recipient rate is comparatively high (approximately double that of the statewide average) and it has a comparatively large population of low income families. Census figures and public welfare statistics would indicate that there are approximately 14,000 non-public assistance families whose annual income is less than \$3,000.00. The total number of welfare recipients in all categories approximates 54,000.

The prevailing pattern of payment for labor in agriculture is either on a piece-work or hourly basis with payment being made in cash at the end of the day. Farm labor families in Fresno County are large (an average of seven children per family) and the combination of seasonal employment and daily payment of wages has resulted in most cases in a pattern of daily buying and spending habits. Consequently even a brief period of inclement weather or lack of work for other reasons finds most farm labor families without funds for food and other necessities.

This problem has existed in Fresno County for many years. The County Welfare Department in years past attempted to alleviate the problem solely by distribution of surplus foods. Since 1963 when the Aid to the Unemployed became effective in California, unemployed farm laborers and other unemployed have applied for and received cash grants during periods of unemployment and have received surplus foods during the period when their cash grant applications were being processed and at other times of emergency. The Aid to Permanently and Totally Disabled program has resulted in the transfer of cases of incapacity from General Relief rolls to the categorical aid program to the Disabled. The combination of Aid to the Unemployed and Aid to the Disabled has materially reduced Fresno County's on-going General Relief program. At the present time there are only 25 recipients of on-going General Relief in Fresno County. This group consists of individuals who cannot qualify for Aid to Totally Disabled but by medical definition are unable to work.

Fresno County's surplus food distribution has shifted from a large volume program on an on-going basis to a program taking care of emergency situations. These consist of the individual or family which makes application for a categorical aid (Aid to Aged, Blind, Disabled or Dependent Children) and who is without funds to provide basic necessities during a processing period of approximately 30 days; the non-categorical aid applicant or recipient who has an emergency situation; and the categorical aid recipient who has lost a warrant, had it stolen or its issuance unavoidably delayed. The only non-emergency cases receiving surplus foods are the 25 on-going General Relief cases described above.

If Fresno County shifted from surplus food distribution to the Food Stamp program it would have to include all of the above groups except the categorical aid recipient in an emergency situation. In addition food stamps would be available to all categorical aid recipients and to low income families who are not welfare applicants or recipients.

There are many obvious advantages to the Food Stamp program. It takes county government out of the grocery business, stimulates the economy through

banks and privately owned grocery stores, provides additional food to categorical aid recipients and includes the low income, non-welfare group.

Fundamental to the consideration in a request to shift from food distribution to the Food Stamp program is the item of comparative costs. With current monetary problems facing Fresno County government any such program shift would have to be made within the limit of funds now being allocated for food distribution.

Changes in Food Stamp regulations and recent discussions with U.S. Department of Agriculture officials appear to make consideration of the Food Stamp plan in Fresno County more feasible than it formerly was. There are, however, some problems to be resolved. Under Fresno County's definition of emergency aid individuals and families now receiving surplus foods from the Welfare Commissary could be included in the Food Stamp program with the county making cash outlays of \$3.00 per month per family and 50¢ per month per single person. This would result in the single person receiving \$14.00 in food stamps and the family receiving \$70.00 in food stamps. A Department of Agriculture regulation would require the County to make cash outlays equaling its present cost of surplus food distribution which would approximate \$2 per person per month. As a following computation will show, this regulation would require the expenditure of sums over and above that now allocated for food distribution. Even with the implementation of the Food Stamp program emergencies would occur which could not be alleviated under the provisions of the Food Stamp program. These would consist of the categorical aid recipient who might be participating in the Food Stamp program but who had lost an aid warrant, had it stolen or its issuance unavoidably delayed. There also will be the occasional family unable to manage its food stamp allotment and would shortly after receiving food stamps have no food for the family. Fresno County has experienced this in its food distribution program. Thus it would be necessary for the county to allocate funds for food purchase. This would be made necessary by the fact that present U.S. Department of Agriculture regulations prevent a county from distributing surplus foods and participating in the Food Stamp program at the same time. I would recommend that any difference between costs of the Food Stamp program (based on Fresno County's definition of emergency) and the present food distribution program be allocated for purchase of emergency food for those situations described above.

There are also limitations placed on the Department of Agriculture. Appropriations at the present will only support those counties already approved for and operating Food Stamp programs. While the eventual intent of the Department is to substitute the Food Stamp program for commodity distribution, any expansion must depend upon increased congressional appropriations.

I. 1967-68 estimated cost of food distribution in Fresno County, \$166,144.00

Number of 1-month food orders, families, 14,000

Number of 1-month food orders, single persons, 2,050

II. Estimated costs, food stamp plan (Fresno County definition of emergency)

1. Low income, non-public-assistance families:

A. Administration:

1 Social work supervisor I	\$9,528.00
5 Social worker aides	25,920.00
3 Junior typist clerks	12,204.00
1 Account clerk	4,824.00

52,476.00

Equipment and supplies

5,000.00

*Bank transactions

31,752.00

89,228.00

Less Federal share (25 percent)

22,307.00

Estimated administrative cost to Fresno County

66,921.00

*14,000 families, 15 percent participation=2,100 x 24 transactions
x 63 cents per transaction.

2. Public assistance recipients :

Adult aids—*2,310 persons x 12 transactions x 63¢ per trans- action -----	\$17,463.00
Families—**1,500 families x 24 transactions x 63¢-----	22,680.00
	<hr/>
	40,143.00
Less Federal share (25 percent)-----	10,036.00
	<hr/>
Net estimated Fresno County cost-----	30,107.00

3. Replacing commissary operations : 14,000 Family Food Orders (38%

Public Assistance Recipients) 2,050 Single Food Orders :

Families

14,000 —38% (5,320) =8,680	
8,680×63 cents (Transactions)-----	\$5,468.00
Less Federal share (25 percent)-----	1,367.00
	<hr/>
	4,101.00
8,680×\$3.00 (cash outlay)-----	26,040.00
	<hr/>
Net cost to Fresno County (families)-----	30,141.00

Single Persons

2,050×63 cents (transactions)-----	1,291.00
Less Federal share (25 percent)-----	323.00
	<hr/>
	968.00
2,050×50 cents (cash outlay)-----	1,025.00
	<hr/>
Net Fresno County cost-----	1,993.00

4. On-going general relief :

25 Recipients × 12 months × 63 cents (transactions)-----	189.00
Less Federal share (25 percent)-----	47.00
	<hr/>
	142.00
25 Recipients × \$24.00 (cash outlay)-----	600.00
	<hr/>
Net Fresno County cost-----	742.00
Total net county cost-----	129,904.00

Recap county costs

Non-public-assistance, low income-----	66,921.00
Public assistance recipients-----	30,107.00
On-going general relief-----	742.00
Replace commissary-----	32,134.00
Family -----	30,141.00
Single -----	1,993.00
	<hr/>
Total net county cost-----	129,904.00

*15 percent participation.

**20 percent participation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE DETERMINATION THAT FRESNO COUNTY EMERGENCY
AID IS ON-GOING GENERAL RELIEF

All costs would remain the same except for families and single persons now served by the Commissary. Our expenditures for these groups are now approximately \$2.00 per person per month. If the Department of Agriculture defines this as on-going General Relief, not emergency aid, Fresno County would have to make cash outlay of \$2.00 per month per person.

8,680 families \times 5 persons per family = 43,400.

43,400 \times \$2.00 (cash outlay) = \$86,800.00.

\$2,050 Single persons \times \$2.00 (cash outlay) = \$4,100.00.

Total county costs under this definition :

Public assistance recipients.....	\$30,107.00
Non-public-assistance (low income).....	66,921.00
On-going general relief.....	742.00
Replacing Commissary—	
<i>Families</i> —\$86,800 (cash outlay) + 75 percent issuance costs....	90,901.00
<i>Single</i> —\$4,100 (cash outlay) + 75 percent of issuance costs....	5,068.00
 Net County costs under Dept. of Ag. determination of Emergency Aid as on-going General Relief.....	 193,739.00
 Costs—Department of Agriculture definition of emergency aid....	 \$193,739.00
Costs—Fresno County definition of emergency aid.....	129,904.00
 Difference	 63,835.00
Costs of Present Food Distribution.....	166,144.00

Fresno County's definition of emergency aid, consisting of those persons and families who come to the Welfare Department and require immediate aid would make an application to operate a Food Stamp program feasible. The balance of funds between Food Stamp operation costs and present food distribution costs could be set aside for unusual situations which cannot be covered by the Food Stamp plan.

A definition by the Department of Agriculture that persons and families applying at the Welfare Department for assistance who need immediate aid constitute an on-going General Relief would cost Fresno \$63,835.00 more than the present food distribution program, and in view of current fiscal problems would preclude an application to conduct a Food Stamp program in Fresno County.

Were it possible to conduct food distribution and Food Stamp programs at the same time, costs would exceed present appropriations if the Department of Agriculture determined all Fresno County Commissary aid to be on-going General Relief.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate this opportunity, particularly, to appear for the second time on a couple of little bills that I have pending before your committee. These bills, H.R. 1268 and H.R. 1269, were introduced last year. You gave me the courtesy of a hearing at that time and I appreciate this second opportunity.

These two bills deal specifically with the joint operation of the food distribution program which we in Fresno Country are at present using and the food stamp program.

I recognize that the committee, in its wisdom, has seen fit not to combine these two programs. I am sure that there are good and justifiable reasons for this position. However, the Department has under its regulations what is referred to as "emergency measures," where USDA provides food stamps and assistance to people without funds. But according to the definition that the Department has on "emergency," it deals only with an area where there has been a flood, a tornado, or such natural disasters.

My contention and the point of my statement, as well as that of Mr. Clegg, is that an emergency, in many instances, such as with the migrant families, which we have a great many of in California, exists

when they find themselves without funds. This occurs particularly in the wintertime. These families have as great an emergency as any other kind. We were hopeful that the Department would modify or redefine their so-called interpretation of when an emergency exists. But this has not happened.

My bills deal specifically with this matter—one would redefine the term "emergency" and what constitutes an emergency, while the other would permit the surplus foods program and the food stamp program to work side by side. As I say, I recognize that the Committee has, for many years, not seen its way clear to provide for this authorization. You may feel the same way, but that is the point of my bills.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, with a brief comment on my position. As I say, I appreciate the job that this committee does. As you know, I have basically supported the programs of agriculture and am now supporting a bill which this committee brought out to extend for 1 year the present agricultural program. I have also supported over the years the food stamp programs, and I, without meaning to be critical of any individual, wish to say that I think it was unfortunate that certain statements have been made with reference to bargaining, one program vis-a-vis another program. This does not seem in my opinion to be in the best interests of winning friends and influencing people. I think it would be most unfortunate if the Congress ever found itself in a situation where we are pitting one group of Americans against another—city versus the rural, or, in any other way, attempting to bargain the interests of the American people. I deplore this kind of a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you defer for just a moment?

May I call the attention of our guests to the fact that under our rules we cannot have any more visitors than we can seat. I do not want to be rude to anyone. If you can find seats, all right. There are some right up in front here. We are not going to permit anybody who cannot be seated to be in the room. There are circumstances which have developed in recent days which make it necessary for us to require the enforcement of the rules.

You may proceed.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to conclude by giving one further note. I want to commend the Department of Agriculture and also this committee for their interest in these programs and to say that basically I think you are doing a good job. I am sure that it is not perfect, but I deplore such falsification and distortion as appeared recently on a national television program. I think it was completely and totally distorted.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for making it possible for me to appear here this morning.

That concludes my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Sisk.

Are there any questions of Mr. Sisk?

Does any member have any questions of Mr. Sisk?

If so, we will be delighted to have them now.

We are always delighted to have your suggestions.

You have gone into questions which trouble the Committee, Mr. Sisk. Programs for the distribution of food always pose a difficult problem; it is one which concerns the committee and has concerned

it for some time. The Committee knows of the serious problems involved in obtaining proper and adequate food distribution to welfare recipients so as to take care of their needs.

I think I should call your attention to the fact that there is now legislation which came out of another committee of the Congress that sets up a third food distribution program in the United States without any limitation whatsoever as to the existence of other programs. That is the program which was brought to the floor by the Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. SISK. I recognize, of course, that all of these things cause problems when you get into a variety of programs. You get into the matter of overlapping and duplication. I would certainly hope that would not be true in the situation I am advocating. I do not believe it would be. However, I recognize the problems when we deal with more than one system of distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Belcher?

Mr. BELCHER. I just want to say that I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from California has appeared before this committee to give us these suggestions. I think they are very good, and I know that this committee will give careful consideration to your suggestions.

Mr. SISK. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly concur in those observations made by the witness. I welcome having him come before us at all times.

Mr. SISK. Thank you. I appreciate the comments of my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we thank you, Mr. Sisk. We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I notice that the Secretary has not yet arrived. Mrs. Freeman is here, and we want you to know that we welcome you. The Secretary is not late—we told him he need not be here till 10:15. It is not yet that time but we do anticipate that he will be here shortly.

Let us go off the record.

(Discussion was had outside the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. We are back on the record now. We are delighted to have you, Mr. Secretary. It is always a pleasure to have the Secretary of Agriculture appear before us, and this morning, on this subject we are discussing, the subject of food stamps, we especially welcome you.

If there are any possible changes that might be suggested in the food stamp legislation, we would be pleased to have those suggestions.

We are delighted to hear from the Secretary of Agriculture at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Secretary FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I welcome the opportunity to meet with the committee.

Today, I want, once again, to report to the committee on the status of the Department's consumer food programs. I want to make, if I

may, some general long-range recommendations for consideration by the committee.

And I want to specifically discuss the funding of the food stamp program.

This matter cannot be discussed in isolation from the larger issue of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that committee members are aware that I have publicly deplored the emotionalism surrounding the recent public debate on this matter. It is an emotionalism that is obscuring both the complexity of the problem and the progress that has been made to provide food assistance to the poor.

Possibly I should change that word "emotionalism", because I know that every member of this committee, as well as myself, know that the thought is to feed the hungry. But while I deplore that emotionalism, I want also to say: More needs to be done; the problem of hunger—at times, for some poor families—and of malnutrition—for larger numbers of poor families for longer periods of time—are a present-day fact.

The ultimate goal, the positive commitment, must be: No American—regardless of race, creed, color, or material possessions—should go hungry or suffer from severe malnourishment.

Therefore, before presenting recommendations on food stamp funding, I want to:

Summarizing the change in scope, emphasis, and accomplishments in the Department's consumer food programs in the decade of the 1960's—the USDA programs directly concerned with hunger and malnutrition;

Project for the committee what can be, and should be, done with the food stamp program—if it is to make its maximum contribution to banishing hunger and malnutrition in the years ahead.

I shall conclude my recommending what we can and should do about food stamp funding now.

During the decade of the sixties:

The concept of family food assistance programs has shifted from distributing a few surplus food items to increasing food purchasing power through the use of food stamps; and from supplementing the families' food supply to providing a more nearly adequate diet.

The administration of these food assistance efforts had changed from a passive offering to State and local government—"food is available if you are willing to distribute it"—to active encouragement, and the promise that Federal authority will intervene if necessary to make food available to families.

The concept of child feeding programs has been enlarged from the narrow view of providing a noonday meal service to one that includes school breakfasts and feeding programs outside the school system—with greater emphasis on reaching the poor school and the poor child.

These broader, more positive, concepts—and the more positive Federal direction and leadership and financial support—have resulted in substantive and significant progress.

But they also demonstrate the scope and depth of the further commitment that must be made if someday, and in the not too distant future, it can be truly said that there is no hunger in America.

In child feeding:

In 1960:

12.8 million children were eating balanced lunches under the national school lunch program. About 1.2 million children were receiving their lunches free or at a special token price;

There was no legislative authority directly that special assistance be provided poor schools that had a large number of poor children in attendance;

There was no way, other than with surplus food, to help poor schools with a breakfast program or to help them buy some essential lunch-room equipment;

There was no way, except for the special milk program, to extend assistance to feeding operations in nonschool situations.

But in the 1968 school year now ending:

19.5 million children ate the type A school lunch and 2.5 million were poor children, under the 1962 amendment to the National School Lunch Act;

Under the Child Nutrition Act, we are building the base for further food services for poor schools and poor children with the \$4,250,000 in appropriated funds.

And, this year, new authority has been provided by the Congress to move into nonschool feeding programs.

And we have the operating school breakfast program reaching 200,000 children which is rapidly expanding. In needy family feeding:

In 1960:

Our only tool for family feeding was the commodity distribution program;

Under it, we were offering five low-value foods worth, at retail, \$2.20 per person per month;

We were reaching 3.5 million needy people in family units with about a 6 percent national unemployment rate;

About 1,200 counties and areas were distributing food to their needy families;

Of the 1,000 poorest counties, there were commodities distributed in only 370.

In contrast, in 1968:

The food stamp program has been added to our kit of tools, and commodity distribution has been improved and strengthened;

Needy families now being assisted under the commodity distribution program have 16 foods now available, and we have announced the addition of six more;

We are now reaching, or shortly will be, 6.1 million people in 2,400 counties with commodities or food stamps—with the national unemployment rate now below 4 percent;

All of the 1,000 poorest counties are being, or soon will be, included.

Progress was accelerated this past year through the major modifications in these family feeding programs that I announced last July. They were:

For the first time, the Department would offer to pay up to the full local operating costs of the commodity distribution program in any of the 1,000 poorest counties then with a program;

There were 331 counties in this priority or target group.

In the food stamp areas:

(a) The minimum purchase requirement was being reduced from \$2 per person per month to 50 cents;

(b) The purchase requirement for all new participants was to be cut in half for the first month, allowing the family to make the transition from a credit to a cash basis; and

(c) Low-income people were to be hired, in a number of sensitive areas, as program aides, to help reach eligible nonparticipating families and bring them into the program.

And, finally, Department field personnel, spearheaded by technical action panels, community action agencies and other groups, were joining in an intensive outreach effort on USDA food assistance programs.

The results have been dramatic when one considers that we are now down to dealing with the hardest-to-reach people and counties.

We increased food stamp participation by a monthly average of 300,000 people in the same 830 areas that were in operation in June of 1967. And, of course, we reached more people in the new areas that came into the program this fiscal year.

On the commodity side, our offer of financial aid to the poorest counties, together with vigorous leadership, has resulted in the local officials of 277 of our original 331 target counties taking action to accept and agree to operate a commodity or food stamp program for their poor families. An additional 14 counties are in process of making a decision.

In the remaining 40 of the 331 counties, USDA personnel are now undertaking the work to set up local facilities for certifying needy families and handling and distributing the food, preparatory to direct Federal operation. This step was taken reluctantly and only when I was convinced it was the only way to bring food assistance to poor families in these remaining poorest counties.

Even when we do directly inaugurate a program, it is our hope that arrangements can subsequently be worked out for a return to the traditional State-local operating base.

Thus, our commodity operations are helping to fill the gap until these family feeding operations can be replaced with a stamp program.

I want to restate and reinforce my several earlier statements to the committee that food stamps do provide the most practical and efficient way to meet the food problems of poor families. Stamps provide the low-income family with the means for a wider, more varied diet—a way to adjust food purchases to the varying needs of the family. It incorporates the desirable self-help principle. It utilizes, rather than competes with, the best food distribution system in the world, our commercial marketing complex.

The food stamp approach has strong support and appeal among the State and local officials to whom USDA looks to get the food assistance job done.

Of the 331 target counties, 128 elected to go the food stamp route and 11 more have notified us that they intend to request a program. This election was made even though there was no way to relieve the States or communities of responsibility for local operating costs. This appeal and support can be a real strength as we move to make our food assistance reach all those in need.

It is, then, becoming increasingly clear that the events of the past year have placed new demands upon the food stamp program—de-

mands that must be taken into account when future program funding is discussed and planned.

More poor people are coming in to be certified in counties that have the stamp program, as we refine and improve program provisions. More counties want the program and they should have it.

And, there are more "demands" that even more be done to see more people are reached and that even more assistance is provided to those already being reached.

There is room for further improvements in the food stamp program. Some can only be accomplished as experience shows us the way to remove barriers to participation. And, all of them will have an impact on program funding.

But if we are to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country, our tools must be equal to the task. To effectively reach poor families in their homes we need a food stamp program that:

- Is operating in every county and independent city in the country;
- Has eligibility standards that encompass all financially needy families;

- Is readily accessible to all eligible families, with the States and localities providing prudent but prompt certification services and accessible locations at which to purchase coupons;

- Makes available to each participating family sufficient total food stamps to enable the family to purchase an adequate diet, with the family's monetary investment related to its basic ability to buy food;

- Includes homemaker training and educational services on what makes for a good diet and how to buy and prepare food to meet the nutritional needs of their families.

This is the kind of family food assistance program we need to operate and fund if we are to ever eliminate hunger and severe malnutrition in this country.

It is also clear that we cannot develop, fund, or place into nationwide operation that food stamp goal this fiscal year. But we must see that the momentum we have built up continues and, in fact, that we accelerate the pace during the next fiscal year. The times and the national need require it.

Substantial additional funding is necessary in fiscal 1969.

We increased the number of operating areas from 838 in June, 1967 to 1,027 areas this fiscal year. We need to provide "full-year" financing for these nearly 200 new areas. As well, we want to reach even more of the eligible families by program refinements or better State or local services.

There are 239 project areas already approved waiting to begin operations. (One hundred sixty-six of these areas wanted to open this May or June. But we had to ask them to postpone their openings because of a shortage of 1968 funds.)

We had 145 areas, as of the close of business, Monday, June 10, officially requested the program and are anxious to start the program in 1969.

The designated and waiting-to-be-designated areas now on the books involve 35 States. For example, there are 36 counties in Georgia; 30 counties in South Carolina—to make a statewide program there; 16 in Louisiana; 18 counties in Arkansas; two in Washington—to complete the statewide program.

In the Midwest, there are 16 counties in Nebraska included; 11 in Minnesota; 11 in Iowa; North Dakota has 13 counties; and Ohio has 12. Massachusetts, which entered the program for the first time, has seven designated areas waiting to enter. Alaska is on the list with nine areas for a statewide program.

And more requests are being received every day. We would expect to receive at least 100 more requests in the next few months from areas that want to start programs in fiscal 1969.

I can clearly define the kind of nationwide food stamp program to which we need to progressively move. But it is not possible to precisely forecast the maximum possible pace at which we can proceed to move toward that goal. Nor can its ultimate cost be accurately predicted.

It is difficult to judge exactly when we can complete the shift to food stamps for the rest of the country.

The level of participation is equally difficult to forecast. We would expect more families to continue to move out of poverty, but there may be temporary periods of increased unemployment in some areas. We do not know when experience will show us improved ways to reach more of the remaining eligible people through outreach, education and motivation, improved program services, et cetera.

But the need to eliminate hunger is clear and consistent with the national interest and our standard of values. This certainly should outweigh the uncertainty over the pace at which this national need can move forward both from a practical and financial standpoint. No artificial barriers should prevent progress toward that goal. Rather, the urgency of the need dictates development, now, of the best legislative basis under which this country can move toward the kind of stamp program that will meet national need.

I strongly urge this committee to accept the identical bills H.R. 17721 through 17725 introduced by Congresswoman Sullivan and 107 other Members of the House.

These bills provide for a 4-year authorization with no specific monetary limitations specified in advance. But to assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decisions, the bills require specific rules for such an indepth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation.

Mrs. Sullivan's bill provides for effective congressional direction, leadership, and program review. But it will permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. The national need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for such action.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. You sort of left me hanging on the limb, did you not?

Secretary FREEMAN. I hope not.

The CHAIRMAN. You recommended on February 28, did you not, a bill which I introduced on March 12, to provide an additional \$20 million for the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had a change of mind, have you not?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir; I thought I had informed everyone.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions of the Secretary?

Mr. Jones of Missouri?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Secretary, I have a copy of a letter that you wrote to Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, protesting, I think very properly, the Columbia Broadcasting System's report, "Hunger in America." I would like to ask if you have had any reply to that letter, indicating that you would be given an opportunity to appear with equal time, or something like that, to tell as you did in a letter—I believe it was to Mr. Perkins—where you branded, at least some of the statements there, "This is a lie." Have you heard from Dr. Stanton or the Columbia Broadcasting System, and what is their attitude for the misrepresentations which they gave on this program you have discussed this morning?

Secretary FREEMAN. I received a letter from Dr. Stanton which I would be happy to submit for the record. I do not have it with me. In this letter, the Columbia Broadcasting System refused my request that I be given equal time or time to correct the very glaring misstatements of facts and the wrong impression given which, and what I have said before I will say again, constitute a travesty on objective reporting.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that there be included in the record at this point a letter written by the Secretary of Agriculture under date of May 27 to Dr. Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, and also the response to that letter which the Secretary indicated he has received, denying the Secretary an opportunity to correct the error. I think that most of us recognize there were errors in their broadcast, and it is not understandable to me why supposedly responsible people like Dr. Frank Stanton would refuse to permit a correction. I ask unanimous consent that those two letters be included in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, they may be.

Secretary FREEMAN. May I make the point, which is valid to this, to complete this? I have responded; it will be a letter going to Dr. Stanton today reiterating my demand and specifying additional misstatements of fact in the program that subsequent investigation has disclosed. Perhaps that letter ought to be included as well, in due course.

(The correspondence referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 27, 1968.

DR. FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting System
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. STANTON: My disappointment with CBS Reports' "Hunger in America" is matched only by my indignation.

For the second time in recent months, the television industry has done a great disservice to the domestic food programs of the Department of Agriculture. But of even more importance, the industry again has done a great disservice to the poor and the hungry of this country.

When the Public Broadcast Laboratory's "Hunger—American Style" was telecast on February 25, I was privately outraged but publicly silent. I was able to excuse the superficial treatment of a complex problem by taking into account PBL's youth, its inexperience, its zealotness, and its naivete.

But when I watched CBS compound the superficialities, the misinterpretations, and the mistakes of fact of PBL's examination of hunger and food programs, I decided I could no longer remain silent.

"Hunger in America," bluntly and simply, was a travesty on objective reporting. It presented to millions of viewers a distorted, oversimplified, and misleading picture of domestic hunger and what is being done to combat it—and it served to further disillusion, disappoint, and disenchant those hungry people who now have been told that no one cares, that no one is doing much to help them. This, in turn, can only serve to increase the bitterness and the unrest that so disturbs American society today. I know that this allegation of indifference is untrue. The people of the Department of Agriculture who work so conscientiously to transform humanitarian concern for the hungry into action programs know this is untrue. And those hungry people whom we have reached and whom we have helped—within the rigid limitations of statutory and budgetary restrictions—know this is untrue.

But millions of affluent Americans—and millions of poor Americans who have not yet been reached because we have too few funds and too restrictive authorities—do not know this is untrue.

Because of this, Dr. Stanton, I am asking equal network time to refute the errors of fact, the misinterpretations and the misinformation that were dispersed through "Hunger in America" and to assure the hungry of this Nation that the USDA *does* care, that it *is* doing what it can for them—that it *wants* to do a great deal more.

I am attaching to this letter a bill of particulars citing the errors in "Hunger in America." At its request, I am filing the same bill of particulars with the House Committee on Education and Labor.

I charge CBS with shoddy journalism. The job of researching for this program was inadequate, and the shallow overview of the problems underscores the danger of beginning with a preconception, only to end with propaganda.

When your researchers first came to our Department last October, our people were delighted to cooperate. The fight to win the war on hunger—the very attempts to call public attention to domestic hunger—have been lonely pursuits, and we welcomed the prestigious interest of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The last time your researchers called upon our Department for information was nearly 2 months ago. So far as we are able to determine, no attempt was made to check program allegations against facts after that time.

But this is really beside the point. After 5 months of researching, CBS ought to have had a much broader, much deeper understanding of the problem and the efforts to solve that problem than was apparent in the documentary aired on May 21.

Nowhere in your program was there a clear explanation of the Federal-State-local government structuring of the food programs, nor of how this structuring frequently frustrates or delays initiation of food programs.

Nowhere in your program was there an accounting of the progress made in feeding programs over the past 7 years.

Nowhere in your program was there evidence of the 7-year effort of the Department of Agriculture to obtain broader authorities and increased appropriations for our programs to feed the poor and the hungry.

The tragic paradox of hunger in the midst of plenty is the prime reason I accepted the job as Secretary of Agriculture. Since the day John Kennedy swore me into his Cabinet, I have used every means at my command to resolve that paradox. Moreover, the career people who administer the food programs of the Department of Agriculture share my concern, share my determination, and have been unjustly maligned by your presentation of the Department as an inefficient and an insensitive vehicle for moving food to the hungry.

Year after year, time after time, we have gone before the Congress to plead for more funds, more authority, a more systematized program for feeding the poor. Year after year, time after time, we would have more than welcomed the support of the television industry in our efforts. Where was CBS when we were fighting this lonely battle?

But despite the 7-year delay in your expression of concern for our hungry, despite the funding and the statutory limitations under which we have had to operate, we have made progress, Dr. Stanton, progress that professional journalistic ethics alone should have required CBS to report.

When I became Secretary of Agriculture in 1961, only 1,200 of the Nation's 3,090 counties had a food program. That program consisted of the distribution of five surplus commodities worth about \$2.20 per person per month. Only 3½ million people were being reached.

President Kennedy's first Executive order doubled the amount and increased the variety of these foods.

Direct distribution provided only nonperishable foods and could not provide the foods necessary for a balanced diet. By Executive order, I established a pilot food stamp program that allowed the poor to purchase a variety of foods in grocery stores. A predecessor program of the early forties had been seriously discredited through administrative weaknesses that led to such abuses as stamp bootlegging. Fully aware of this, we administered the new pilot food stamp program as carefully and as efficiently as possible. The resulting absence of scandal encouraged public and congressional confidence, and when President Johnson urged the Congress to make the food stamp program a permanent program in 1964, and put the full force of his energy and skills behind its passage, Congress responded favorably. Funding the first fiscal year of the permanent program came to \$35.1 million. This year the program is funded at \$187.5 million.

Today 2,200 counties, two-thirds of those in the country, have food programs. Some 5.9 million people, nearly double the number 7 years ago, are being fed.

Those people still receiving direct distribution of commodities now get 16 different foods worth nearly four times the amount they received in 1961. Food stamp recipients are now adding to their food dollars by a current rate of almost \$17 million a month, or roughly \$200 million a year, in additional food purchasing power. Food stamp program participants have the opportunity to purchase a much more nutritious diet than those who receive only direct distribution commodities.

In 1962, the peak year of direct commodity distribution, \$253 million was spent to feed the poor. This fiscal year, \$360 million is being expended in direct distribution and in food stamps, a 42-percent increase in funds.

Furthermore, over the past 9 months the USDA has—

1. Begun or gained commitments from local governments to begin food programs in over 250 of the 330 poorest U.S. counties.
2. Extended food assistance to another 1 million people.
3. Reduced the amount needed for food stamps to 50 cents per person per month for the poorest of the poor.
4. Cut the food stamp payment in half for the first month participants.

I have said before, and let me repeat again, that reaching the remainder of the Nation's poorest counties has our top priority. But if CBS' researchers had done their job, they would have known that in some of these areas local authorities simply refuse to cooperate.

Last month we initiated direct Federal distribution of food in two counties where we were unable to get a commitment from local government to administer the program. This action was initiated *more than a month* before "Hunger in America" was aired. No mention was made of this, nor of the fact that we have subsequently notified 59 other counties that we will take similar action unless they move to initiate the program. In addition, we are now paying all or part of the food program administrative costs in many of the poorer counties that are cooperating.

The USDA has been using some nonprofessional aides, recruited from the poor to work in nutrition and to tell the poor about their rights under the food stamp program, and plans to recruit and train hundreds of them within the next year.

Last week I ordered that new foods be added to those now being distributed to 3.5 million poor. These include evaporated milk, instant cereal, fruit juices, canned chicken, and scrambled egg mix. Earlier I had also directed that all allowable enrichment be made of those commodities now, or soon, to be available, particularly to increase the vitamin and iron content so lacking in the diet of the poor. These new commodities will be directed particularly to pregnant women and preschool children, a group where dietary deficiencies can leave the most serious consequences.

This, then, is what we have been able to do with what has been given us by the Congress. The Department is now working to the limits of money and authorities. It is seeking new authorities and more money to help it do a better job.

This help might well have come to us years ago had CBS viewed the problem then in proper perspective and exerted its considerable influence in the right direction.

I look forward to a favorable response to my request for equal time. In this way the true story of hunger in this land, what is being done about it, and what more can be done about it will be made known to the American public.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

CBS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 29, 1968.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your letter to me of May 27 requesting "equal time" to reply to allegations contained in CBS reports: "Hunger in America" was received in the mail only this morning although released to the press on Monday. Pending an opportunity to make a complete study of your charges I would like to make four points. First, no issue of "equal time" is involved since such an obligation can only arise under section 315 of the Communications Act relating to appearances by candidates for public office. Second, we acknowledge an obligation to make a reasonable effort to present contrasting viewpoints on controversial issues of public importance on an overall basis. We will continue to provide news coverage of the differing views on the issue of hunger. Third, the thrust of your complaint does not appear to be concerned so much with the existence of any significant inaccuracies in our reporting of the issue as it is with your feeling that any blame for inadequacy in meeting the problem of hunger in America should have been attributed to inaction by Congress or by local governments and not to the Department of Agriculture. But the issue of hunger in America transcends the superficial issue of assessing blame for its continued existence. Fourth, the purpose of the broadcast was to report to the people the fact that hunger is a problem in America not that most Americans are well fed. Finally, just as your colleagues in the Department of Agriculture are properly jealous of their reputations so our journalists at CBS News are proud of their profession and seriously concerned about intemperate attacks on their honesty and integrity. "Hunger in America" was a hard hitting job of investigatory reporting with respect to a critical and shameful national problem. Unless it is established that the report was in significant respects erroneous, it is my purpose to stand by those who researched and produced it.

FRANK STANTON, *President.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 12, 1968.

DR. FRANK STANTON, *President,*
Columbia Broadcasting System,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. STANTON: Having heard no more since your tentative denial of my request for network time to correct the many mistakes of CBS Reports—"Hunger in America", I write once again to ask your reconsideration of my request.

I enclose further documentation of serious errors that strongly contributed to the emotional impact of the program, but certainly did not do credit to responsible reporting standards.

A quick telephone call to verify the validity of statements made by two of the poor people interviewed would have disclosed these mistakes. No such calls were made. May I ask if this is the usual standard of accuracy you require of your writers and producers? If it is, then I submit that even more stringent statutory requirements for fair play by your medium may be in order. Television is too powerful to be allowed to subject the American public to shocking inaccuracies for the sake of eliciting emotional response.

In the same vein, may I say, Sir, that I had expected more of CBS than a cavalier dismissal of the responsibility for correctly assessing blame for the continued existence of domestic hunger as a "superficial issue." I think others, too, will consider this a shocking admission of negligence in the preparation of a documentary that purported to examine a tragic problem in depth and in perspective.

From your denial of my request, it would appear that you believe my purpose was to defend the Department and its good programs. Dr. Stanton, these

programs and the career people in the Department do not need defending. Given the programs' statutory and budgetary restrictions, these programs have been effectively administered and steadily expanded. And they have been free from scandal. The mistakes that virtually destroyed the forerunner of the food stamp program in the early 40's have been overcome.

No, Dr. Stanton, I do not ask network time to defend the Department and its programs. I ask it because of my concern for:

(1) *The poor themselves.* There is no doubt your program succeeded in focusing new public attention on the problem of hunger. I welcome that as one who has spent much of his public life deploring the paradox of need in the midst of plenty. But while you jarred the consciences of affluent Americans, you also undermined the hopes of the poor and hungry by implying that no one cares, least of all their Government. "Hunger in America" told the poor that little worthwhile was being done for them and sharply discredited the very Department of Agriculture machinery that today is reaching six million people with food.

This could only serve to further disillusion and embitter the people we are trying to help and to make the job of reaching them much more difficult. It undermines the very institutions that carry the most promise for reaching the hungry.

(2) *The thousands of people working in food programs throughout the country.* The Food Stamp Program is the best way we know to help the hungry, but CBS discredited it and the people who seek to administer it. Of course the programs can be improved. But we know that the program operates smoothly and effectively in hundreds and hundreds of counties where cooperation, understanding and hard work combine to bring food to millions of needy people. There was no evidence of those many instances of success in your program. This omission, too, can only serve to disillusion, disappoint and discourage not only the beneficiaries of the program, but those who administer it on the local level.

(3) *America's family farmers.* The calculated thrust of "Hunger in America" was an affront to America's farmers. There is no relationship between the commodity programs that were attacked and ridiculed and food for the poor. We are blessed with an abundance of food in this country. The problem is developing the will and the machinery to reach all of the hungry with our abundance.

One of the prime reasons why we have an abundance of food, indeed, why we are a prosperous country, is the existence of those very farm programs CBS maligned, programs wherein payments are made to farmers, big and small, who respond to their Government's request to retire land from production and receive in return a rent roughly commensurate with what that land in production would have earned.

It is only in this way, Dr. Stanton, that we can prevent serious overproduction that would have grave economic consequences, and leave in its wake even more poverty and hunger. I might point out that 87.2 percent of the farmers participating in our programs receive less than \$500 a year in farm payments.

Your documentary's attack was a careless and thoughtless insult to our family farmers and was in no way germane to the issue of hunger.

Accordingly, Dr. Stanton, I repeat my request for network time and ask you to reconsider your decision. If you are unwilling that I should have time to tell the true story of these food programs, would you consider a program to be developed by CBS with the Agriculture Department's assistance? We assumed that CBS worked constructively with the Department in the production of "Hunger in America." Clearly it did not.

If I have spoken strongly in this letter, it is because I feel so strongly that CBS has done a disservice to the poor people, to the family farmers of America, and to the viewing public. I feel strongly that CBS, a great network reaching millions of people, allowed its professional and its ethical standards to sag in this production.

I would hope that CBS is not "above acknowledging mistakes", that you will cooperate in correcting those mistakes, and that, most important of all, you will henceforth require of your staff documentaries that meet reasonable standards of accuracy and fair play. In the absence of such a positive response, I can only foresee a further erosion of public confidence in your medium.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

THE FOOD STAMP SITUATION OF THE ZANDERS AND CARLILE FAMILIES OF ALABAMA—"CBS REPORTS—HUNGER IN AMERICA"—MAY 21, 1968

THE ZANDERS FAMILY

As Presented by CBS

A man and wife with 10 children living on the husband's part-time employment—earning \$3 to \$4 a day when he worked.

Despite this low income, the family was required to pay \$70 a month for stamps.

With this unrealistic purchase requirement, the family could not take advantage of the stamps.

The welfare department would not help the family get food stamps because they won't help if there is a "living husband," even if he is not working.

As Revealed in Food Stamp Records

When first certified for the Food Stamp Program there were 13 in the family, husband, wife, grandmother, and 10 children. *Monthly income was just over \$180 a month*—from farming operations, part-time work, and a combined welfare grant and pension of \$82 a month for the grandmother.

Based upon an income of \$180 a month, the purchase requirement was \$70 a month to receive \$128 in stamps—or a monthly bonus of \$58.

The family began to participate in the Food Stamp Program in September 1967 and has participated quite regularly. The Zanders last purchased a half month's supply on May 13.

On the 17 semi-monthly purchase periods since September, the Zanders had made 15 purchases. They had received \$783 for an investment of \$246—allowing them to buy more than three times as much food as they would have been able to buy without the stamp program.

Since September 1967, when the Zanders family first bought stamps, they have been recertified six times to take into account changes in family income and the number in the family. In March and April of this year, when family income was reduced because the husband was not working, the family bought \$108 worth of stamps for \$18 in each of the two months.

It is true that the Zanders family is not eligible for regular welfare because there are employable people in the family. In fact, USDA food stamps are the sole source of help to this family that needs more than help with food.

THE CARLILE FAMILY

As presented by CBS

The Carlile family lives solely on the part-time earnings of the husband—about \$20 to \$23 a week.

The stamps cost the Carlile family \$33 every two weeks.

CBS concluded the Carlile episode by saying: "Food stamps are not free and too often, the people who need them most can't afford them."

Dr. Wheeler: Mrs. Carlile, why don't you raise your own food?

Mrs. Carlile: Well, we raise what we can. We raise that okra, we raise all stuff like that in the garden, when we can, but not no corn. That's the only food we can grow.

Dr. Wheeler: Why no corn?

Mrs. Carlile: Because we don't have no corn acres.

Dr. Wheeler: What do you mean?

Mrs. Carlile: The landlord said he sold the corn acres to the Government. And we can't have no corn.

Dr. Wheeler: So then who plants the corn?

Mrs. Carlile: Don't nobody plants none. Just the land for the corn lays up and it's nothing.

Dr. Wheeler: The land's there.

Mrs. Carlile: That's right.

Dr. Wheeler: But nobody plants it.

Mrs. Carlile: That's right. Can't plant it, when you sell it to the Government. Whoever sell it get a check off it. Can't raise nothing on it. Just have to stay there. I've always been raised on corn. Having corn, raised hogs, chickens, turkeys. But I can't raise them 'cause I don't have food to feed them. I can't raise corn and I can't buy it.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service records show

Food stamp records reveal that the income of the Carlile family was \$166 a month when they first purchased stamps—from farming and off-the-farm employment.

Based upon an income of \$166, the family paid \$66 a month to receive \$142 in stamps. The Carliles received a monthly bonus of \$76 in free stamps—more than doubling their food purchasing power.

The Carlile family first purchased stamps in September 1967 and had been regularly participating when they were interviewed for CBS late in 1967.

The Carliles never did grow corn on the land that they rent from a Turpin Vice, Hale County, Alabama. Vice diverted his corn acreage under the feed grain program. Vice met with his tenants and offered to share payments under the feed grain program with them, as he was required to do. Or, in lieu of this, he offered rent-free land to the tenants for the commercial production of vegetables. All tenants elected to grow vegetables since the payments they would have received were low, because of the small amount of acreage involved. Because Carlile had never grown corn on his rented land in the past, he was not eligible to share in the payments Vice received for diverting his acreage. But, according to Vice, he also offered Carlile "land, rent free" to grow cucumbers and okra. Carlile did grow some of these crops, and also received \$618.02 in cotton payments in 1967. He also could have grown sweet corn for human use on the land Vice offered him, had he wished to do so.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Secretary, again, while you and I do not agree on everything, I think that generally we are in agreement, although I feel, this morning, that I cannot go all the way with you on Mrs. Sullivan's bill, because it is an open-end authorization without any respect to the money, and I think that if this committee is going to handle food distribution under the food stamp program or direct distribution, that we should continue to have some control over it. I cannot go that way with you.

I do commend you, though, for your position as expressed in your letter, both to Dr. Stanton and to the Honorable Carl Perkins, setting forth the errors in that supposedly so-called documentary which was nothing but propaganda and a gross misrepresentation. I watched that

program, and I think it is time that the Government of the United States, which issues valuable licenses to television stations, assert more control and demand of these people that they comply with telling the facts and not dispensing propaganda when they know, as you said, that it is a lie.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I do want to commend the Secretary for his response to CBS and I have requested and have received several copies of the Secretary's reply which I sent to people writing me expressing great concern about this problem. I talked to Mrs. Teague last night, and she told me that CBS is advertising the fact that it will repeat the program again this Sunday. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kleppe?

Mr. KLEPPE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I am curious about a couple of things in here that I would like to ask you about.

On page 7 of your statement you talk about "USDA personnel are now undertaking the work to set up local facilities for certifying needy families and handling and distributing the food."

Can you explore this a little bit for me, as to how you go about certifying needy families, other than working through the local welfare channels at the local levels?

Secretary FREEMAN. As I make quite clear here, this is an extraordinary step, one that we came to only as a last resort. There are people here who could give you a good deal more exact data, but, roughly, we do the same as the local public welfare people would do. These people come in, and in a variety of ways we check to determine whether they are actually needy people in relation to the standards that have been established in terms of their income and their family status, et al., and they are then certified. In this instance, if the local people will not do it, the Federal Government does it.

Mr. KLEPPE. I am sure you understand my question, because of the determination of these needy people, whether college students or hippies, or somebody else receive this help. This question of being needy is a real important one, insofar as the food stamp program is concerned.

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me say more objectively, then: There is a criteria that is followed, and, generally, followed all around the country which states that people under certain income levels, with a certain number in the family, will qualify for the program, and that is generally used by the Federal Government as well as by the States.

Mr. KLEPPE. Specifically, I was wondering what the USDA was doing additionally, on this standard, to that of the local officials in welfare who are working in this area.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think we are not doing anything.

Mr. KLEPPE. Nothing in addition?

Secretary FREEMAN. In connection with what is the normal State function—certifying people for Federal-State programs under social security—why, there, we are not involved. In the case of nonpublic assistance applicants, depending again on the local situation and the physical problems, we try to cooperate, to get information, but the standard is one that we apply relating to income in the family.

Mr. KLEPPE. Let me go to my second question then. I am now looking at your statement on page 9 where you recite, "as experience shows us the way to remove barriers to participation."

Would you, Mr. Secretary, recite what are some of the barriers to participation in the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, the biggest area is information.

First of all, people do not know about it, and the people we are trying to reach are the subpoor people. Sometimes they have no communications. Often they do not read nor write. Their perception and their interest are rather at a low level. They are not easy to reach, and so they need to be reached.

Certainly, there is always misinformation. Part of this information is the amount that people must put in themselves in order to get food stamps. That frightens a lot of people away, so that we try to get that information to them.

Other problems are to be as efficient as we can be to make available the certification to people so that they do not have to go so far, to have as many physically as possible to do as efficient a job as possible, to treat people as well as possible, so that they will not be repelled and alienated—primarily, administrative problems.

Mr. KLEPPE. Do you run into some that would rather have the commodity distribution than the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Surely. This is obvious, because, you see, there are people, let us say, in the higher range of income level who still qualify. They get a given amount of food. Pretty much everybody gets the same amount of food, for administrative reasons, and they do not have to put in anything. On the food stamp program, in the highest range, they may have to make a fairly appreciable input and may not get too many stamps because they are in a fairly high range of income, so that would, naturally, get the free food where they get quite a bit, whereas with the food stamp program they get less.

Mr. KLEPPE. On this matter that you gave, to get more people to know about the program and to understand it, does the USDA, through the food stamp program, expend money for advertising, trying to get areas or counties to participate?

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me check that question with some folks here. You mean, at the commercial advertising level?

Mr. KLEPPE. Yes, sir. I am always wondering about this, because it seems to me that we have a number of Government programs, and then the first thing we see on television or on radio is a commercial trying to get people to participate, and it makes me wonder about the real need. Are we spending any money of the food stamp program to try to sell it to people that you say need to be educated?

Secretary FREEMAN. Let us put it this way: We get public service time.

Mr. KLEPPE. I understand that.

Secretary FREEMAN. To reach the poor people. I would have to say, of course, we are trying to reach people with information about the program. We are trying to get people whose incomes are lower than the level available to participate in the program to improve their diet and nutrition.

Mr. KLEPPE. So, then, the USDA is expending funds for the preparation of these commercials that are to be run on public service time? Would that be a fair statement?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think it would be.

Mr. KLEPPE. Would it also be a fair statement that the USDA is spending money to prepare pamphlets, brochures, and what have you, to mail or to distribute to potential needy people for the certifying of needy people?

Secretary FREEMAN. If they are needy people they get it. They are not potential needy people. We are sending information to people who would come into the program if they knew about it. The answer is "Yes" to that.

Mr. KLEPPE. Would it be a fair estimate to say that 1 percent of the cost of the food stamp program is used for such advertising or merchandising purposes, as it were?

Secretary FREEMAN. I do not know. I would have to check with that. I am told by Mr. Davis that we do not.

Mr. KLEPPE. One-half of one percent?

Secretary FREEMAN. It is not anywhere near that. We will have to check the figures.

Mr. KLEPPE. Would you? I would appreciate knowing approximately how much of this money would be spent for such a purpose.

(The information follows:)

It is estimated that one-fortieth of one percent of program costs could be attributed to carrying out this purpose.

Mr. KLEPPE. Then, my last question, Mr. Secretary—I guess you have answered it, but would you give a horseback opinion of the cost of the bills proposed on pages 9 and 10, as to how the food stamp program could be made effective, to reach all of the people necessary?

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me say this again—and I am sorry if I misled anyone in connection with this, particularly the chairman: I have talked to many of you from time to time. I concluded, and I thought I had indicated such to many of you. This is not unlike the commodity programs under the Commodity Credit Corporation, in a way, because you have got so many varying circumstances: employment, unemployment, economic well-being, the number of people that come into the program the way we already have it, the number of counties that decide to come into the program that we do not know about—it is terribly difficult to tell, but I think that everyone on this committee—I know everyone on this committee does not want anybody in this country to suffer malnutrition or hunger.

With the food stamp program, there is careful reviewing and checking of entitlement. To our best knowledge, people make mistakes and people may be poorly certified in some places, but fundamentally this program is run well. There is a minimum of cheating. Rather than people coming in that should not be in, there are more people not in that should be in, in my best judgment. This is certified by local people, by local relief standards, according to certain criteria, and that being the case, why, it seems to me, that we would want to fund this program up to the maximum and do it right away.

If the program is poor, if it is wasteful, if people are getting food that are not entitled to it, that are not hungry, that are not potentially hungry, are not in the relief program, then we had better fix the program.

In the meantime, we have enough food in this country and a system that is working well after 7 years of experience, and, sir, therefore,

why in the dickens are we not seeing to it that people are really reached under this program?

We cannot put numbers on that directly, for reasons I have tried to give. That is why I think this so-called open-end proposal has its merits.

Now, I would say this—

Mr. KLEPPE. Would you, basically, indicate, Mr. Secretary, that they could be reached if the funding was supplied?

Secretary FREEMAN. I am saying that we could reach—yes—we could reach them with funding.

Mr. KLEPPE. My question is: Could you give a horseback opinion on what they would cost in each of these counties based on the stipulation that you have on page 10?

Secretary FREEMAN. It would, really, have to be a horseback opinion.

Mr. KLEPPE. I will be satisfied with that.

Secretary FREEMAN. We should have to go as far as we ought to in the next year to reach the counties that we have not yet reached. We will need to do that, at least \$100 million more than the current authorization.

Mr. KLEPPE. \$100 million more?

Secretary FREEMAN. Than the current authorization. To improve this program and to begin to move it towards an adequate nutritional level—we are still below where we ought to be—will take considerably more. I would not even attempt to estimate that. In the long run, to reach all of the counties, to reach all of the people, to have a mature and efficient working program, the total program would run—and, again, a horseback opinion—about \$1.5 billion.

Mr. KLEPPE. Thank you very much.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. So that there may not be any misunderstanding—and I am not putting any blame on anybody, because I do not always understand everything—

Secretary FREEMAN. So do I not.

The CHAIRMAN. I just want to say that in the past I have fixed my opinion on things by what has gone on before, and I have before me now a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House, Mr. McCormack, dated February 28, recommending a bill identical to H.R. 15896. You told us at that time that that bill had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, as I read it. Is the legislation which you have just endorsed consonant with the program of the President?

Secretary FREEMAN. I must say that I honestly do not know, because the action that has gone forward since that letter sent, particularly pertaining to tax increases and to the \$6 billion of budget decreases, have resulted in a confused situation. Until this is actually concluded, frankly, I just do not know, and I do not think that anybody does, either.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking you that. At the time I introduced the bill, it was stated that it was consonant with the program of the President.

I am asking you about the Sullivan program which you just endorsed, the Sullivan bill.

I am asking if this is in accordance with the President's program?

Secretary FREEMAN. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The President's program seemed to be of considerable importance on February 28, when you had clearance from the Bureau of the Budget. Has it become or no importance now?

Secretary FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, the normal procedures in connection with these matters, in preparing budgets and making adjustments, in light of all of the practices, were followed, and the program in contemplation was submitted to the Congress and to this committee. And the chairman very graciously introduced it. Since that time, there have been some events in regard to actions, potential, in terms of budget cuts and tax increases which have come up, and has meant, really, that until those matters are resolved, some of the decisions as to allocations and how it will be done simply will not be made. So, I suppose you are saying, in a sense, that the judgments made here are judgments which may be subject, eventually, to final determination in the light of all of these developing factors, but this committee has asked me to testify, and I should properly, and, therefore, I am doing the best I can, under a situation that is somewhat uncertain, to give my recommendation as to the current situation, as to the issue before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you: Do you still support H.R. 15896 which you suggested?

Secretary Freeman. I think it is clear—and I hope so, Mr. Chairman—that I support considerably increased funding.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we would like to have a straightforward answer. Does the Department of Agriculture still support and do you want this committee to pass H.R. 15896?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I hope that this committee would pass it. That is what I tried to testify to. The bill that is known as Mrs. Sullivan's bill will do it, I think—what needs to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood what you said about Mrs. Sullivan's bill, but I have not yet understood what you said about the Poage bill. Do you want it passed, or do you not?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would say that the Poage bill is on the way going toward the Sullivan bill, and in this business, I suppose that the Poage bill, in this instance, is a step in the direction of funding the program adequately, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a Senate bill identical with H.R. 15896 which has passed the other body.

Secretary Freeman. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want that bill passed?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that bill has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. It has passed the Senate. Do you want it passed by this body?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would hope that that bill would be incorporated into the recommendations that I have made here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not our question.

We are getting down to the question. I am still in favor of the \$20 million increase. I think it is sound. I think you have made a good case for it. You talked about the need for the money, and you talked about the amount that we would spend, and those things have to be taken into consideration. You now come up with something else that I did not know about.

Did you advise Mrs. Sullivan that you were endorsing her bill? Secretary FREEMAN. I have discussed the food stamp program with her. Did she see this testimony? The answer is "No."

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the question at all.

Secretary FREEMAN. She heard I was sympathetic to the principle.

The CHAIRMAN. You have advised her that you were sympathetic to the legislation—

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Without telling this committee that you had changed your viewpoint since February 28?

Secretary FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thought that is what I was here for, and—

The CHAIRMAN. You did not inform us as to that.

Secretary FREEMAN. No, I did not. I thought I informed the chairman and some others that I have mentioned here, as I have from time to time, that we are concerned about the funding of this, and this is, I feel, a sensible way to do it, to get the job done.

I do not come before this committee, and I have not in 8 long years, and said, "Either, or"—"This or nothing." I think I have a little more sense than that. That is not the way that we get things done. I am just saying quite honestly, quite sincerely, what I think is the best way to do it, and to meet a real need, logically, truthfully, prudently, and effectively and have the resources to do it. And this committee may not follow that judgment. It may feel that we cannot go this fast, or whatever it may be. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. It is your estimate that it would take about \$100 million additional?

Secretary FREEMAN. To reach those who are now seeking the program—to reach the counties. It is in the neighborhood of that. It would be about \$325 million, and with that I think we can reach the counties that are pending now, and more would come in if the authorization were reached. We could get funding for about \$300 million at that level.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Belcher?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Secretary, on February 28, you meant exactly what you said to Mr. Poage, that if he should introduce this bill at that time, you were supporting the bill. Now, has any event in the last 30 days changed your mind?

Secretary FREEMAN. No. I do not think it changed my mind a bit, and if you went back to the testimony on this subject that I made before this committee, before, in terms of the goal and the purpose and the funding, why, you would find that this has been a long-held position. What has changed my mind has been the fluidity of the situation which has been a product not of the last 30 days—and I think by that you mean the poor people, per se—but rather of the action taken and the events that have happened in this country with regard to the budget and the tax increase, which has made a whole new dimension of fluidity and a new consideration of priorities which did not exist at the time that the present budget and the bill before you now was sent up here.

Mr. BELCHER. On February 28, there was not any \$6 billion cut in the expenditures of the Federal Government, was there?

Secretary FREEMAN. No.

Mr. BELCHER. Why, in view of the fact that every other department is going to have to cut, do you come up here today to ask us to raise this bill five times—Is that the way to cooperate with the President and the Congress in cutting expenditures?

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me put it this way: I think the whole question of priorities is now in the process of having a further examination in the minds of the Congress and in the minds of the country, and I think in the minds of the administration as well.

Mr. BELCHER. In other words, do you want to raise it five times and then take a cut off of the \$100 million instead of the \$20 million?

Secretary FREEMAN. Wait a minute, now. Out of what?

Mr. BELCHER. You say now that everybody is going to be cut, that you want to start to be cut from \$100 million rather than being cut from \$20 million?

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me say that I give this program a high priority and ask for the increase regardless of the fact that other things may be decreased.

Mr. BELCHER. You do not give it any higher priority now than you did on February 28, do you?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, I think I do.

Mr. BELCHER. Well, then, you, undoubtedly must have had something that has changed your mind within the past 30 days.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think we have learned a good deal about this program constantly, and that we have been expanding it, learning as we go, satisfying ourselves as to its effectiveness, as to the accuracy of the entitlement, as to the facilities and the effectiveness of distribution, and we have been finding out the extent of need as well, as the programs having expanded rather rapidly.

Mr. BELCHER. The only information that you have presently is the information that you have received—that appeared before you down in the Department of Agriculture, is it not?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, that is not true at all.

Mr. BELCHER. What information do you have now that you did not have on February 28?

Secretary FREEMAN. I have had very little information from the witnesses who have appeared before me in the Department of Agriculture. We had a dialogue, but I did not learn anything then that I did not know before. We have information fed in as the programs have expanded, as we have learned from experience with these programs, and we have moved more directly into areas around the country. In the last 6 months I have been in, at least, a dozen subpoor poverty counties myself. I have been in at least 20 or 30 of these one-room tar-paper shacks where people need help, and I had not been there before. It made an impact on me.

Mr. BELCHER. And the events in the Department of Agriculture recently had nothing whatever to do with it?

Secretary FREEMAN. It is pretty hard to psychoanalyze yourself as to what affects you, but I would have been here making this presentation to this committee, urging an increase in the appropriation again, if there had been no poor-people's march. This is not something that has been bludgeoned out of the Secretary of Agriculture, I can assure you. I do not bludgeon easily.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not want to enter into any controversy between you and the Chairman. He and I do not always agree, but I would have thought, as Secretary, that you owed him the courtesy, at least, to tell him privately that the bill that he had introduced for you was not satisfactory any longer, rather than coming in here and telling it in public for the first time.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think you are absolutely right. I thought I had done so, but I apparently have not communicated very well, and for that I would, certainly, make apologies to the Chairman.

Mr. BELCHER. How many employees are now involved in the food stamp program in the Department of Agriculture?

Secretary FREEMAN. 950.

Mr. BELCHER. How many do you contemplate will be needed, necessary to handle the program that you want to put into operation?

Secretary FREEMAN. You mean, the final result? It may be 2 or 3 years ahead of us.

Mr. BELCHER. Yes, sir. If you get the \$100 million.

Secretary FREEMAN. The \$100 million, I do not think that would involve very many, but down the road, the program reaching all over the country, would be another thing.

If I may, I would like to submit that number for the record here.

It is a hard one to get off the top of your head.

Mr. BELCHER. I know that you can not give such a figure, that it will take so many people. What would be your estimate as to the number of additional employees?

Secretary FREEMAN. For the next year, in order to expand it to these counties, how many? About another 300 employees to reach these counties that I indicated would come in the program.

Mr. BELCHER. Thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Dole?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Secretary, do you feel food stamps should be available to those on strike, or would you support a prohibition including strikers and college students?

Secretary FREEMAN. The criteria, which is applied in this program, is hungry people. If people are hungry their income is below a certain level, why, they then by law are entitled to participate in the program. And we have so administered it.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand it, originally the act was to help the disadvantaged, the infirm, the sick, the disabled who are not able to find gainful employment.

I would hope that is still the thrust of the program, that we are really trying to take care of those in need.

Is that the way you understand it?

Secretary FREEMAN. Of course, the people in need, and the measuring criteria for the people in need is their income level.

Mr. DOLE. In Detroit, for example, a lot of the money, food stamp money, went to striking members even though they had strike funds available. This, in effect, takes away from the people who do not have the money. I just wondered if you feel this is a proper use of program funds?

Secretary FREEMAN. As I say, the program has been applied to people whose incomes are below the level that is requisite for certification. And, on occasion, that food has gone to people who are unemployed because of a strike. We have not said, in the law—We are not permitted to say that people should be disqualified under such circumstances, whether their income and whether their status of availability for food is down or not.

Mr. DOLE. Do you have any idea how many college students will participate in the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Frankly, I have no idea whatsoever. We can make a detailed check on that and submit it for the record, if you wish.

Mr. DOLE. Again, you do not feel that there should be any prohibition, so long as they do not work or do not have any income, they should be eligible?

Secretary FREEMAN. People come in and establish their income below the level, and if they do they are entitled to food, to make these payments for their food stamps, according to what they have been spending for food, and if they check out on that basis, why, then, they would have entitlement.

Mr. DOLE. It has occurred to me that we should not encourage the able-bodied to do something rather than apply for food stamps.

Secretary FREEMAN. Mr. Dole, it would be my guess there are not very many people who would be unwilling to work or to participate in other activities because they are on this program. There may be some, but I doubt that there are very many.

Mr. DOLE. I believe we share the view that the program was designed to primarily aid those who might not be able to find work, not those who can take care of their own needs.

Secretary FREEMAN. Surely. Really, in my judgment, one's problem in regard to it is that people are concerned about relief and poverty and are focused on food, because it is the most easily understood. Many of these instances we have seen in some of these reports, and in the CBS program, for example, may very well have been the results of dysentery, infection, worms, a whole host of things not related to the actual food available. But, basically, I think that we all seek jobs for people so that they can buy their own food. Hopefully, all wish to see the day when we will not need a food stamp program, except for people who are genuinely physically limited and where everybody can get a job in this country. But it is not that way yet, and I think that we ought to face that.

And so we have, indeed. We are trying, all over the land, to develop machinery whereby hungry people ought to get food. We have the food. I think that we should do it. That is my plea.

Mr. DOLE. I think that you, also, agree that notwithstanding the Columbia Broadcasting System documentary, some of the problems are based on ignorance, some based on inaccessibility. How can your Department ferret out every single case of hunger in America, where there is indifference, ignorance and apathy?

Secretary FREEMAN. We cannot. All we can do is to have nutritional education. A lot of people do not know how to buy, do not know how to plan, do not know how to prepare, do you have storage facilities. This is your basic poverty problem. In the meantime, even though they

waste some of it, I think that everyone on this committee thinks it should be done. We do not want to have any hungry people in this country. We have the food, and we should not have them.

Mr. DOLE. I think it is unfair for some to indict you or this committee or the American people or the Congress, generally, for making such statements, but there is, of course, a continuing responsibility all of us have. That is all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Dole.

Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I must say that you have been fair to my State of Mississippi in the criticism that we have received in trying to see that the people get food and that there are not hungry people in our State. As you have said many times across the country, I believe up until maybe today, Mississippi was the only State where all of the 82 counties either had a food commodity distribution system or the food stamp system. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. My question has been touched on by Mr. Dole and also by Mr. Kleppe. We have the experience now in Mississippi that the direct food and food stamps are available in all counties. The problem is one that you touched on. They do not know about the availability of the stamps and other foods. It is ignorance—not knowing where to go.

Second, in checking out some of the cases that we have had in Mississippi, specific cases, the food was found to be there, but it was not prepared either by the mother or the father, or they were not even there. So some children were hungry.

The storage facilities were bad. This seems to me, Mr. Secretary, to be a field where the Agriculture Department could further move in—to improve the diets and let these people know where they could get the food. Then, I do not know that you can do anything more, with nobody to prepare the food—the mother and the father having disappeared, and these children are hungry. But that is the experience we have had. Food is available, but some times it does not get down to the hungry child.

Mr. Chairman, could I insert a State board of health press release concerning such in Mississippi into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The document referred to, dated June 7, 1968, follows:)

PRESS SERVICE,
MISSISSIPPI, STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Jackson, Miss., June 7, 1968.

SPECIAL FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

A recent survey of some 600 Mississippi pre-school children has revealed no overt evidence of malnutrition, Dr. Frank J. Morgan, Jr., Acting Executive Officer, State Board of Health, said today.

The study was made in 17 Mississippi counties in the winter of 1967-68, following nationally-publicized charges of "hunger" and "starvation" in Mississippi.

The study was financed by the U.S. Children's Bureau and was sponsored by the Children's Hospital Reserach Foundation in Columbus, Ohio, by the Missis-

Mississippi State Board of Health, and by the University Medical Center in Jackson.

The work was directed by Dr. G. M. Owen, department of pediatrics, Ohio State University, and Dr. J. M. Montalvo, department of pediatrics, University of Mississippi Medical Center.

The two physicians stated today that "No children were seen in the survey who had overt evidence of malnutrition," Dr. Morgan reported at the State Board of Health building in Jackson.

The physicians added:

"Children in poor families—mostly Negro—were found, as a group, to be receiving sub-optimal diets by usual standards. These children were below average in stature and were somewhat anemic. In addition, blood and urine levels of certain vitamins and other nutrients were indicative of a restricted dietary intake.

"These observations are based on a preliminary review of available data and therefore must be considered tentative in nature.

"No further interpretation concerning the results of this study can be made until data analysis has been completed."

Dr. Morgan said today:

"The Mississippi State Board of Health has always recognized the fact that there are malnutrition problems in this state, as in other states, and we have employed nutritionists for 30 years to work with the people and with county health departments to meet this problem.

"This study shows no extremely prevalent malnutrition among our preschool children. It does show, as would be true anywhere, that some diets are at a sub-optimum level, especially in poverty-level income groups.

"Many of the widely-publicized reports on malnutrition in Mississippi have been anecdotal. They have been based upon interviews. They have not been based upon scientific, measurable observations. This study was an attempt to measure nutrition on a more scientific basis using a battery of fourteen laboratory tests per child."

Dr. Morgan said the study was made in Mississippi at the request of the U.S. Children's Bureau and was welcomed by the State Board of Health. He said a survey team headed by Dr. Owen met with State Board of Health and University Medical Center officials in July of 1967 and again a few days ago in Jackson, when a preliminary survey report was made.

Dr. Morgan gave these details of the survey procedure:

Ten interviewers (seven from Mississippi and three from Louisiana) conducted the study, with four interviewers with experience in a similar study in Columbus, Ohio, serving as supervisory interviewers.

After orientation sessions in Jackson in October and November of 1967, the interviewers fanned out over the state.

Arrangements were made with the State Board of Health to perform clinical examinations in county health centers in Coahoma, Copiah, Covington, Forrest, Franklin, Harrison, Humphreys, Itawamba, Lowndes, Pike, Rankin, Scott, Stone, Tallahatchie, Tippah, Tunica and Yalobusha counties. These counties were selected by an independent research organization in Ohio.

Dentists in these areas were recruited as dental examiners, and pediatric examiners were recruited from the fellowship and residency programs of Charity Hospitals and Tulane Medical Center in New Orleans; University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson; and the Children's Hospital in Columbus, Ohio.

A procedural outline for physical examinations was provided for the examiners.

Composition of the group of children surveyed was designed to reflect the urban-rural and white-Negro ratios of the entire state. Almost 600 children were interviewed, and 504 children were seen in the clinics. They ranged in age from one to six years. At least ten percent of the white children and 25 percent of the Negro children were found to be anemic. Iron deficiency was "at least twice as prevalent among Negro as among white children."

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The problems are (1) the food is there and parents won't prepare it; (2) when prepared it is not properly cooked or served; and (3) people are still ignorant that food stamps or commodities are available.

Secretary FREEMAN. You stated it very well, Congressman Montgomery. This is the problem. It is not one that can be solved by push-

ing a button or waving a wand. It is hard work. We have tried to give a lot more attention to extension, to the hard core in homemaking. Even though it may be at the expense of the many resources of the normal homemaking programs, which are fine programs, the choice has to be made. These are the hard-core poor people with limited backgrounds that we need to try to reach and help. You have outlined it very excellently.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nichols?

Mr. NICHOLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I have been one who has supported over the years the food stamp program. I believe it does more good than it does harm. I am not prepared at this time to go as far as you have suggested this morning, Mr. Secretary, in supporting an open-end appropriation for the food stamp program, but the matter I want to speak to the committee and the Secretary about is the commentary on the Columbia Broadcasting System show. As a member of this committee, I want to commend you, sir, in your presentation of the facts that you have brought us.

The implication was certainly left by CBS in this documentary which I saw on the night it was presented that people in my State of Alabama are starving on a wholesale basis, that they are hungry and that we do not care for them and that we do not look after them. Such is not the case, Mr. Chairman.

But for the benefit of my good colleague next to me, I want you to know, Congressman Montgomery, that my State of Alabama with 67 counties has a record where 66 counties now have either the food stamp program or the commodity program. The 67th county has made application. We hope it will be funded in the very near future, Mr. Secretary.

I want to call to the attention of the committee, a particular case that was pointed up in this CBS documentary of the Carlisle family in Hale County, Ala. Hale County is not in my district, Mr. Chairman, but it is in my State, and I would be derelict if I left this committee without clearing the record on this. As I recall, the question was asked of this lady as to how many children she had, and she replied that she had 10 children, I believe. The record from the Hale County Department of Pension and Security indicates that this family has eight children; there are six grandchildren living in the home also who are the children of the oldest daughter of the family who has never been married. So, there are 16 in the family. Certainly, regardless of the circumstances, my heart goes out to these children, and I did not want anyone to feel otherwise. But the question was also asked as to whether she had made application for public assistance in that county, and my recollection is that she indicated that she could not get any help down there whatever and that no one would help her.

Mr. Secretary, the records, again, from Hale County, Ala., show that, from the very first time that the food stamp program was instigated in that county, this family has been receiving on a bimonthly basis \$142 worth of food stamps per month. The original contribution from the family to begin with was very small. They paid \$16.50 and received \$71 worth of food stamps.

Now as one of the older children became employed in the family, the food stamps began to cost more, but this family has received food

stamps beginning September 5, 1967, up to the 5th day of March in 1968. There is no record of them coming into the office from that time on, presumably because the stamps given cost a little more because the family is earning a little bit more, but I want to set this record straight, Mr. Chairman, that where we have hungry people in our State we do our best to try to feed them, and if public officials down there know about it, we try to see that they get groceries in the house.

I certainly resent the implication and the complete falsehoods that this CBS documentary may have left in the minds of some people who saw it. I would hope, sir, that if you are afforded the time to speak in rebuttal, that you will bring out this particular case and the facts as they exist.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to the insertion of this statement into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The document referred to, dated May 24, 1968, follows:)

HALE COUNTY FOOD STAMP OFFICE,
Greensboro, Ala., May 24, 1968.

Re Wade and Sallie Lee Carlisle.

(See Food Stamp Application for Full Details).

Date certified: 7-24-67-16 in household throughout record.

Income	Recertified	Semimonthly stamps		
		Date	Purchased	Total ¹
\$166.16		Sept. 5, 1967	\$16.50	\$71
\$166.16		Sept. 19, 1967	16.50	71
\$166.16		Oct. 9, 1967	33.00	71
\$166.16		Oct. 23, 1967	33.00	71
\$166.16		Nov. 6, 1967	33.00	71
\$166.16		Nov. 21, 1967	33.00	71
\$166.16	Dec. 1, 1967	Dec. 1, 1967	33.00	71
\$166.16		Dec. 18, 1967	33.00	71
\$166.16	Jan. 8, 1968	Jan. 8, 1968	33.00	71
\$166.16		Jan. 23, 1968	33.00	71
\$208.66	Feb. 5, 1968	Feb. 5, 1968	37.00	73
\$208.66		Feb. 19, 1968	37.00	73
\$234.66	Mar. 5, 1968	Mar. 5, 1968	41.00	75

¹½ of purchase.

7-24-67—Income was verified as \$95.89, plus Mr. Carlisle's employment from the City of Uniontown at \$70.27, for a total of \$166.16.

1-8-68—When the recipient came in to the office it was stated that four (4) of the older children were seeking employment and the certification was made for one month only.

2-5-68—It was found that one child was working, classified as boarder with contribution to household of \$42.50, bringing total household income to \$208.66.

3-5-68—When recipient came in, oldest daughter, Ruby Mae Carlisle, was pregnant. It was also stated that she was receiving \$26.00 per month from the father of four of the children (father lived out of home). This brought total monthly income to \$234.66. Household purchased on that date, but has made no further purchases.

Farm income was calculated at \$95.89; however, in clearing with the ASCS Office today, it was stated that the applicant would not farm again this year. The applicant reached an agreement with the landlord that they would not plant cotton during the 1968 season. The landlord agreed to allow applicant to remain in the house in which he lives and pay rent of \$5.00 per month. It would appear that if applicant re-applies his purchase requirement would be lower.

The Carlisle's youngest son suffers with epilepsy. Medical services and medicines have been provided free of charge to the family from the Crippled Children's

Clinic in Birmingham. The Hale County Department of Pensions and Security has raised funds for transportation to the Clinic on several occasions.

The oldest daughter, Ruby Mae Carlisle, has six children but there is no record of marriage. She has a record of leaving home on a number of occasions and has returned home pregnant. When she was in the office the last time on 3-5-68, it was evident that she was pregnant. Records indicate that she attended a prenatal clinic on 2-16-68, but there is no record that she has been back to the clinic and there is no record of birth. Miss Carlisle came home at Christmas 1965. Law officers from Connecticut came to Greensboro and arrested her and took her back to Connecticut where she was placed in the Fairfield County Jail, 1106 North Avenue, Bridgeport, Connecticut, where she served a sentence of four months. The sentence was given her for the theft of \$3,000.00 worth of jewelry. She was sent home from the prison because she was found to be pregnant and her youngest child was born 9-17-66.

Secretary FREEMAN. May I say that this is a good example of the lack of objectivity and the misinformation and the carelessness that was evidenced throughout the CBS show. They could have picked up the same record and could have checked it. The poor woman did not know any better. She was talking about relief with the man-in-the-house rule. That does not apply in the food program. Anybody who has had any exposure to this program ought to have enough sense to know that. This is true of more of the other cases they had, where they brought people on who did not know better, who made statements that were not true, made no effort to check those statements, and the result has been a confusion that is intolerable and a standard of reporting that is a disgrace to a big national reporting chain.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. May?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Secretary, first of all, I would like to thank you for your statement.

Mr. Belcher asked you about this, and in answer to one of his questions you said you had about 950 employees in the food stamp program now?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mrs. MAY. With the proposed expansion of the program, how many more employees would you think you would need?

Secretary FREEMAN. With an assumed \$100-million increase in funding, the number of new counties that would be coming into the program as outlined in my presentation, my estimate will be around 300 more.

Mrs. MAY. You asked for 616 more this year, as I understand it.

Secretary FREEMAN. I have forgotten that—I could not respond to that.

Mrs. MAY. There is an item in my own files from one of the Washington, D.C., papers, where they refer to the fact that there will be significant expansions in food activities. From this article I gathered there would be an additional request of 1,062 employees for the Poultry and Meat Act and 616 employees to man the expanding food stamp program.

Secretary FREEMAN. This would include both the food stamp program—section 32, and it could include a variety of different things that would be involved in it. You would really have to check that pretty well.

Mrs. MAY. I thought that you could present that figure for the record.

Secretary FREEMAN. The increase on the food stamp program that we asked for 1968-69 was 358.

Mrs. MAY. 358. Then, this reported figure of 616 is in error in the newspaper?

Secretary FREEMAN. It must be.

Mrs. MAY. Yesterday in conversation with Congresswoman Sullivan on the future development of the food stamp program, I said that perhaps the operation that is now under your Department should go to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As you have told me before, you do not think that this is a sound idea. But I maintain it is a welfare program, and it should be in the Federal Department which handles welfare programs.

Secretary FREEMAN. First, I do not have any great emotional feelings about this and no proprietary feelings about it. It should be where it can be operated the most efficiently and effectively. This whole question was reviewed within the administration by the Bureau of the Budget, by the respective agencies in terms of administering it, and it was felt that it would involve duplication and additional and unnecessary costs if the program were transferred, unless you also transferred the so-called surplus food program which is related to the operation of our farm program and importantly so. So, this is just as logical a place administratively for it to be, and there is complete agreement on that within the administration and within the respective agencies. I do not think any case has been made for changing it other than bowing to criticisms about the administration which are unfounded, I think, whether made by the poor people down on the avenue or by CBS.

I want to say that I think Mr. Davis and his coworkers have done an excellent job in administering a program that is hard to administer, that started way behind the eight ball, because of the experiences of the early forties, and, instead of getting cut up, they ought to be commended. I see no basis for this criticism.

No. two is that fundamentally the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare people do not believe in this program, and if they had it I do not expect that they would carry out the wishes of Congress, other than what they believe in a relief program. They believe in giving people money and letting people buy their own. Most people in Welfare do not believe that people should have to put in what they have been spending for food, but that is a sound principle, in my judgment, that this committee wrote into the law, for obvious reasons.

So, I just think that, both in terms of understanding and sympathetic understanding of administration, it could not be handled in HEW as well, and I do not see any reason, administratively, for it being transferred out of the USDA.

Mrs. MAY. There is one question that I would like to make the record very clear on. I agree with your comment on Mr. Davis' administrative ability. I would say that he certainly has done a very fine job, and I would contemplate that if the program were transferred then Mr. Davis and the rest of the staff would be transferred also.

You said earlier, in answer to a question, that you have changed your mind on the urgent need for the food stamp program. That recent experience has given you a different viewpoint. Do you think that if this program had been administered under the Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare that the urgent need would have become more apparent?

Secretary FREEMAN. I see no reason to think so. The chairman of this very committee, as you know, who has been sitting on that for a long, long time, felt that the food programs, the operating programs, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be less effectively administered, much slower to respond to need, and I defer to his judgment. I think it is in the record of that committee.

Mrs. MAY. But the food stamp program is basically oriented to helping people in need, income- and food-wise.

Mr. Secretary, at anytime, has anybody in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare presented to the executive or to your Department the facts about malnutrition throughout the country?

Secretary FREEMAN. I do not think they knew as much about it as we did.

Mrs. MAY. This includes the health services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Secretary FREEMAN. To the best of my knowledge.

Mrs. MAY. That brings me, then, to another question.

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me say this, as a part of what has been said here in connection with this, in response to Congressman Belcher's inquiry, two things have become of more awareness. I think there has been an increased awareness that there are a lot of hungry people, and we have gotten down to the real poor people. It is not only food. When this administration declared war on poverty, and when we reached a level of national affluence where we could afford some things, there were those that we were not reaching so far as food is concerned. We have developed and have had experience in this food stamp program where we think we can do something about it, not only that, but do a very effective job. That is why we have moved more rapidly than would have seemed to be the case a year ago.

Mrs. MAY. Speaking for myself, I remember when our former President John F. Kennedy said that there were several million people going to bed hungry every night. That comes as a shock to one who has an interest in American food production and distribution. It raises questions on how well we have been handling these programs. Food programs are costing a lot of money and yet many now claim these programs are not feeding the people who need food.

Secretary FREEMAN. They are reaching 6 million people, and we want to reach some more.

Mrs. MAY. There was a mention of a figure of 30 million?

Secretary FREEMAN. The 30 million figure has no real validity. I do not think that is worth the paper that it is written on. We do not know. That is part of the problem but, again, it is not a food problem. Fundamentally, it is a poverty problem.

Mrs. MAY. The point I made yesterday in my colloquy with Mrs. Sullivan was the difference between the food stamp program and the direct distribution program. Mrs. Sullivan made the statement that if the food stamp program was put in HEW, then maybe the surplus commodity program should not be in Agriculture. But I don't agree. The surplus distribution program was set up years ago in

USDA to help stabilize the income of farmers. Or is this an exercise in semantics?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think it is a very important consideration. Section 32 is the so-called surplus commodities, which is the rifle, and the food stamp program is the shotgun. The food stamp program increases the demand and has a direct benefit to American agriculture. We are creating demand in this program, and we will create a lot more.

Mrs. MAY. The point I was trying to make when we were discussing this is this: Your Agriculture Department has the responsibility, first of all—I do not think there has been a change—of trying to help the farmer stay on the land so he can raise food that all American people require. Over the years, the Department has put emphasis on this.

Now, as I understand it, the USDA goal is to have a food stamp program in every single county in the United States.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mrs. MAY. What, then, about the section 32 program?

What would happen there?

Where would we channel those surplus commodities?

Secretary FREEMAN. Nothing, really. It would be operated the way it is, because the great majority of section 32 that has an immediate impact, the rifle impact, to follow up my analogy, is in perishables, and we do not put them into the family feeding program there, anyway, and this is how it is used flexibly where you have these fluctuations based on weather conditions. In other words, there is not much difference in terms of our storables and the like, but for those the food stamp program contributes to the overall demand.

Mrs. MAY. I assume that there would then be no more direct distribution programs?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would not have both.

Mrs. MAY. Where would the food go, outside of the institutions?

Secretary FREEMAN. Presumably, it would be commercial—it would be the commercial demand, instead of the concessional demand—probably more of it.

Mrs. MAY. In other words, there would be no reason to use this program in areas where we have commodity surpluses, because you think food stamps would soak up the surplus and there would be no more surplus?

Secretary FREEMAN. Actually, there would not be any more surplus. It depends on how successful we were in supplying it, but you would have the same demand transferred into the commercial market through the medium of the food stamps which you have through direct distribution: so, really, it would not make much difference, and we would still have the rifle to use where the perishables are concerned, and there would be considerable volume that could move in on our institutions and schools as we are doing today.

Mrs. MAY. Am I correct in understanding that you think that in the direct distribution program, such commodities like flour, butter, dried milk would no longer be in surplus?

Secretary FREEMAN. They would be purchased, presumably, commercially. Your total demand would not be affected. You do not buy those things in volume, anyway, as effective in regard to immediate market practices as you do in the perishable commodities. So, I do not think this would make any basic difference.

Mrs. MAY. I am not sure that I can follow your thinking or logic in this regard.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dow?

Mr. Dow. Mr. Secretary, I heartily approve of the general thrust of your efforts here. I think that you ought to be complimented for a fine statement and understanding in doing this job.

I have a couple of fairly technical questions to ask you. One of them relates to the statement on page 6 where you say: "The minimum purchase requirement was being reduced from \$2 per person per month to 50 cents."

Now, apparently this purchase requirement varies from county to county, as I understand it, in different parts of the country; that is, an individual or a family would have to pay more than 50 cents. Is that correct?

Secretary FREEMAN. It varies a little as between different parts of the country, based on the price of food and the standards of living in the respective area but, mostly, it varies according to the income of the family and the number of people in the family. There is a formula. It says that if your income is \$100, to be hypothetical, and you have been spending \$20 a month for food, you must continue to spend \$20 a month for food through the medium of buying these stamps so that you put in \$20 and you get \$100 worth of stamps. I may have the numbers mixed up. What you have been spending for food, you continue to spend for food through the medium of getting the stamps. How much you spend varies with the family, and then that is also adjusted on a formula basis in accordance with the income. And that is the amount you put in, and x stamps you get. So, it fluctuates.

Mr. Dow. The reason why I raise the question is that I have heard a number of times that when it gets right down to the nub of the matter some families do not have the aggregate amount required to contribute when they go to the store. Along that line, let us suppose that there was a family and they had to pay, say, \$2 a head per month for six children—that is, \$12—do they ever get into a situation where they go to the agency to get the stamps and they may be expected, we will say, to put up 6 months in dollars for the stamps, or did they only buy the stamps in increments of once a month?

Secretary FREEMAN. Once a month or less. In some places it is as little as getting them each week. That is based on the local situation.

Mr. Dow. Is there any way to get a notion? Would you have any figures to indicate the average actual gross sum that a family puts in at the counter when they go in to secure the stamps, across the Nation, or even in your lowest category?

Secretary FREEMAN. The lowest category would be a family that is in the lowest income group, up to say \$30 a month—there would be a maximum, no matter how large a family would be, of 50 cents per person or \$3. So that if you have 15 kids and you made \$30 a month, all you would have to do is to put in \$3 and you probably would get \$200 worth of stamps.

Mr. Dow. That would be the family at the lowest end of the scale?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is right.

Mr. Dow. What would be the average of, you might say, the gross figure that a family puts down on the counter across the Nation or in some area?

Secretary FREEMAN. There would not be any, because you see the amount they put down in each income bracket will vary with their earnings and the size of their family. So, you can do this by brackets. Otherwise, it would not be very meaningful, how much was distributed in food and how much otherwise. Say, you put in X amount and you got Y amount. Mr. Davis tells me that the national average of what people put in is \$10 per person, and the national average of what people get out is \$16.50. That is lumping the whole thing.

Mr. Dow. Is that monthly?

Secretary FREEMAN. Monthly.

Mr. Dow. \$10 per person. I should think that would be pretty difficult for a family of six that did not have a father.

Secretary FREEMAN. We are talking about averages, you see, now.

Mr. Dow. I know. There is a persistent recurrence of this statement, that the actual down payment, when it comes right down to the crunch, is too hard for these people to meet.

Secretary FREEMAN. Presumably, they have already been spending that amount of money for food. Now, we are reviewing, analyzing this formula and studying it and researching it right now, and this allegation continues. And, also, the contention is made that in some cases people are, actually, spending as much as we think they are. So, we are working on that. But, fundamentally, people should put in what they have been spending for food.

Mr. Dow. Another question, Mr. Secretary.

Is there any control on this, such as when people come in to buy a product in the store that they always buy food, or could they buy pencils?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, they have to buy food.

Mr. Dow. Is that simply because the storekeeper is a watchdog and he makes sure about that?

Secretary FREEMAN. He knows what the stamps are to be used for, and if he allows their use for anything else, he is violating the law.

Mr. Dow. There is not an easy way to check up on them, is there?

Secretary FREEMAN. Not an easy way, but considering the volume of the program and the number, the amount of cheating has been minimal, and we are trying to be pretty strict on those people that do not follow the regulations.

Mr. Dow. I have just one other question, which is maybe an indication of my lack of knowledge. I have read somewhere recently there were some funds—I do not know whether it is a food stamp fund or some other fund—in the control of the Department of Agriculture that apparently was used for welfare or food stamps or something, but not used up to the amount of the availability, and that this fund was then turned back by the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Treasury—are you familiar with that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, indeed, I am. This is the allegation that money that could have been used for something else than for food stamps was actually not used and was turned back to the Treasury, which is simply not true. We do have certain funds that are made available automatically through section 32. They come as a percentage

of the tariff. That goes back some 30 years. However, the same funds are accountable under normal budgetary procedures as an expenditure, as is any other fund. Further, they cannot be used for any of the school lunch programs, and they cannot be used for the food stamp program. Their use is sharply restricted. They can only be used for commodities. Therefore, the fact that all of these funds were not actually used meant only that we did not buy a greater variety of commodities, and that is the only thing that the fund could be used for.

That judgment as to the variety of the commodities was one that had to be made in terms of studying priorities with other expenditures, such as loans for small farmers, such as programs for small properties, such as migratory housing—a whole host of other things—on that basis, within the budgetary limits, and these judgments were therefore made, and certain of these funds were not actually expended because there was not, within the uses permitted for them, the use that commands the priorities vis-a-vis other things. But the result was—and again this is a product of some of the things discussed here, to say that there was a lot of money laying around in the Department and we refused to spend it when there were hungry people, that is not true.

Mr. Dow. Could you expand on the variety of uses of that money?

Secretary FREEMAN. It could have been used for a greater variety of commodities.

Mr. Dow. I think that somebody might like to raise the question as to why that was not done.

Secretary FREEMAN. As I have tried to say a moment ago, it has been done now. At the time that the question came up, it was \$60 million that was involved in such an expansion. We are already distributing 16 different items which provide, if properly used, a rather significant food availability supplementing other food income in most cases. But we were within a budgetary limitation. You have the question of using this for housing loans, for migratory workers, and for operating loans. You take it for those things where you have to make a decision in connection with your priorities? That was the decision. If that money had been available for children that were not getting free school lunches, or for food stamps there would have been a different priority set for it within the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Dow. The \$60 million then might be disposed of, according to the judgment of the USDA?

Secretary FREEMAN. As a part of the budgeting process.

Mr. Dow. What is the intention respecting the \$60 million for the next year? Where will that be applied?

Secretary FREEMAN. It will be applied throughout, wherever there is a direct distribution program with an additional six commodities added to it.

Mr. Dow. You think that the \$60 million will equate through the six additional commodities?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is right.

Mr. Dow. And there was not any question of a fund in addition to the \$60 million?

Secretary FREEMAN. There are more funds in section 32, you see, that are not being used. This has been the way every year. And we use this vigorously as we can, consistent with prudent, sensible, operating procedures.

Mr. Dow. Supposing that more than \$60 million was there, what would you do with that?

Secretary FREEMAN. There is not, but we are spending it as of now.

Mr. Dow. You are spending \$60 million?

Secretary FREEMAN. More.

Mr. Dow. More?

Secretary FREEMAN. More.

Mr. Dow. By virtue of these six additions?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. Dow. But that is not necessarily going to take up all that would be available?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. Dow. Do you think that there would be any merit in applying more than the \$60 million?

Secretary FREEMAN. We cannot. There is no place to spend it by law.

Mr. Dow. I am a little baffled. I do not want to take the time now.

Secretary FREEMAN. The thing is that it is as simple as can be. That money is made available for certain sharply limited purposes. That explains what they are. It cannot be used for other purposes, unless the law is changed. The law that is pending and passed the Senate—in that there is a provision that they could be used for some other purpose. If that passes, we can use some of them for other purposes, such as the school lunch program, and the child nutrition program. We could not use for the stamp program, because there is a direct prohibition where the stamp program is concerned. So that the use of these funds is sharply limited to only a very few purposes.

Mr. Dow. All right. Do you know, Mr. Secretary, what bill that is and what Senator is familiar with it?

Secretary FREEMAN. It passed the Senate. It is in an appropriations act.

Mr. Dow. In the appropriations act?

Mr. FOLEY. It is Senator Javits.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think he offered the amendment. There was quite a fight on it on the floor. It passed the Senate by one vote.

Mr. Dow. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. A great deal has been said this morning about the Columbia Broadcasting System's television documentary film on hunger. I am wondering if you are familiar with the report "Hunger—U.S.A."?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. WAMPLER. Do you feel that this report, "Hunger—U.S.A." accurately portrays conditions of hunger and malnutrition in the United States?

Secretary FREEMAN. No.

Mr. WAMPLER. I hold here a facsimile of a story that appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sunday, May 26. As you may know, this probably is the most influential paper published in Virginia. There were 14 counties in Virginia designated by the study "Hunger—U.S.A." as being areas where there were hungry people. Apparently, this newspaper came to the conclusion that there was some question as to the accuracy of the study. One of those counties cited happens to be in my congressional district. I am not prepared this

morning to say whether hunger is common in this county or not. It seems to me that there is a difference between hunger and malnutrition and starving. Do you agree to that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir, there certainly is.

Mr. WAMPLER. I think I am in the same dilemma that some of my colleagues are in or soon will be. On next Wednesday, we, according to the announcement of the leadership, will be called upon in the House to vote on the so-called surtax bill. We have not had too much guidance from the administration as to what the priorities are, or what areas will be cut.

Do you not think that feeding hungry people should be at the top of any priority list?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. WAMPLER. I want to distinguish between the question of feeding hungry people—people who are disabled or infirmed and cannot work—and people who are simply shiftless. I want to do everything reasonably that I can to help eliminate hunger and malnutrition. I would like to read one short paragraph from this story in the Richmond Times-Dispatch. This reads as follows:

Virginia is not Utopia. What was found was: hunger to some degree at times, plenty of low-income families, malnutrition to some degree in all economic brackets, irresponsible parents—one or both—with a drinking problem, seasonal employment, a need for more industry in some counties, and laziness.

Mr. Secretary, I would like to commend you for some of the recommendations that you have made on page 9 of your statement. I believe we must find better ways to implement the food stamp program. There is apparently much work which needs to be done in the field of nutritional education. My inclination is to vote against the proposed surtax on income, but I realize we have many needs which must be met. I would appreciate a little more guidance from the administration on matters of priority in spending.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think what seems to be happening, and I am not handling the tax bill, so my remarks will be reserved unless I create more confusion for my colleagues in the Cabinet who I am sure would be happy to review the information for you. If the Congress says that there should be a cut of \$6 billion, we will go through a tortuous process of establishing priorities. For my part, the expansion, which I have urged here in this area, ought to be made, and I will so use every resource at my command for that.

Of course, the Congress, in increasing the authorization, that does not mean that the administration will recommend it for an actual appropriation. And even if the Congress makes the appropriation, even as a last resort, it does not mean that the administration will spend it. This is the first step. And because of the tax and budget problem, it is more confused now than ever.

Mrs. MAY. Will you yield for one question?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Secretary, I certainly agree with your emphasizing the need for education, tied in with the administration of the food stamp program. Has your Department been doing some of this with the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. we have been doing a great deal.

Mrs. MAY. What part of the Department of Agriculture have you been using in this?

Secretary FREEMAN. Primarily, the Extension Service—a good deal through the Consumer and Marketing Service, and, in part, the Farmer's Home Administration, as well.

Mrs. MAY. In other words, there are three departments that involve themselves in education?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is right.

Mrs. MAY. Is there enough staff at present to take care of education programs when all of the counties start operating a food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. No.

Mrs. MAY. When we talk about a realistic figure for what will be necessary to implement this program, then it must include enough staff in the educational area. Is that covered in your request for 358 people?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mrs. MAY. In other words, 358 people would be just working for the food stamp program in several areas?

Secretary FREEMAN. Let me put it this way: We are going, as I said earlier, to set some internal priorities in education. Perhaps, we will not have as much staffing in one, having more for this real subpoor work, the kind of people that come through the homemaker part. We do not envision additional staff for the other. We may try, and we are training now subprofessionals who work with the distribution programs, in helping people to understand how to use these foods.

Mrs. MAY. But not the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. We are trying to work with them in the food stamp program as well, through the Extension. You just cannot put all of this in rigid categories. We are trying to help them all across the board through Extension, and in some programs we have more flexibility under section 32 in this respect, for having subprofessional people.

Mrs. MAY. The food stamp program, if I understand it, requires at least one person per county?

Secretary FREEMAN. To do an optimum job, you should have one person per 100 families.

Mrs. MAY. And there are some 3,000 counties in the United States, and basic needs for administration, would be around 3,000 people.

Secretary FREEMAN. No. We are talking about apples and oranges now. You were talking initially about the people to be used for educational purposes.

Mrs. MAY. Yes.

Secretary FREEMAN. Now you are shifting over to people who are administrating.

Mrs. MAY. I started with that. But then you will need additional people in the educational part?

Secretary FREEMAN. I cannot answer that.

Mrs. MAY. I am sorry. Thank you.

Mr. WAMPLER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. There are still other members who want to be heard.

Mr. Foley is recognized, and I am not going to let Mr. Foley yield to anybody.

Mr. FOLEY. I will not. I congratulate you, Mr. Secretary, on both your statement and your recommendations to this committee.

You stated, and I do not know whether you took it out or not, that there has been a lot of emotionalism in the discussion today. I assume by that, that you refer in part to the problems of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

Secretary FREEMAN. There is a lot of emotionalism. I do not decry that fact. In fact, I share it.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it not a fact that there is a lot of emotionalism on both sides? There are some people who are emotionally blind in thinking that there may be poor hungry people in the United States who are not getting adequate diet?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that is true; yes.

Mr. FOLEY. And is it not true that one of the great barriers of participation, as Mr. Kleppe has mentioned, has been the failure of some officials in some of the poorest counties of our country to authorize the distribution and the poor food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. This is true.

Mr. FOLEY. Has that not been in the face of a rather obvious need?

Secretary FREEMAN. Many of them would be, in my judgment; yes.

Mr. FOLEY. And it has been only because of the persuading that you have been able to apply recently that you have had any success in any of these areas—the bringing in of the Federal Government directly?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think this is a bit of an overstatement. We have been a little bit persuasive, I hope. I have always believed in trying to use a carrot before the stick.

Mr. FOLEY. Let me ask you this: Since you began the policy of announcing that the Federal Government will, in fact, go into the counties directly, have the number of these poorer counties agreed or recommended or requested participation?

Secretary FREEMAN. Some of them have come in. They, perhaps, might not have come in if they did not know that as a last resort the Federal Government would.

Mr. FOLEY. As a matter of fact, since that policy began, since it has been announced that it would come in, there has been, interestingly enough, a number of these poorer counties requesting participation, has there not?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Now since it has been suggested by some people that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare handle this program as a welfare program—which I do not agree with and I think you stated that it would be unwise to do that—we have certain programs that are in the Department of Agriculture, such as Public Law 480?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. How much do we spend on foreign food distribution under Public Law 480 and related programs?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I, just estimating again, would say that we spend about \$500 million under title II, which is direct food distribution to needy people, and we spend another, roughly, \$1.2 billion on sales for foreign currencies.

Mr. FOLEY. From the standpoint of the United States, that means more or less donated assistance? That is not a question. In the minds

of many people in Congress and elsewhere, these sales are, in fact, foreign assistance programs?

Secretary FREEMAN. In the minds of many people, they are; yes.

Mr. FOLEY. So that about \$2 billion would go in one form or another in food assistance to people living outside of the United States?

Secretary FREEMAN. Roughly, say, \$1.8 billion now in terms of total food programs, that is, Public Law 480.

Mr. FOLEY. That is more than you suggested as the cost of absolutely bringing the food stamp program up to final implementation throughout every county in the United States?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is right.

Mr. FOLEY. And it is about 10 times the authorization for the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. For the food stamp program: yes. We are spending so that we may have in-balance, roughly, \$1 billion a year for the total food programs, including the school lunch program, the school milk program, the food stamp program and direct distribution.

Mr. FOLEY. But those are not direct to the people who cannot afford the food. They cannot all be classed as poor.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Those are really low-income families in the United States who are not receiving adequate diets because of the inability, particularly their financial inability, to acquire—would you say it is fair to say—four or five times as many?

Secretary FREEMAN. A combination of direct distribution and food stamps now, I am sure, with the child nutritional would run more than \$500 million, and I would say that it may be one-fourth. If you take the total figures.

Mr. FOLEY. About one-fourth of what we spend, to feed people outside of the United States?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOLEY. In looking at these problems which are complicated and difficult, one of the problems we have is that we simply do not know what all of the facts are about malnutrition and hunger; is that not correct?

Secretary FREEMAN. Absolutely true.

Mr. FOLEY. This is a problem that concerns your Department and every department that deals with the problem.

Secretary FREEMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Secretary, I would hope that—and I have not taken sides on the Columbia Broadcasting System issue, but I would hope that such an issue as important as it is to the welfare of so many Americans, as you have expressed, could be more fully and adequately debated before the people of the United States. I would hope that the Columbia Broadcasting System, if it is going to run the program again, would give you an opportunity to express your views on the subject, so that the matter can be placed not only in perspective with all of the facts brought out, but with the widest publicity given to it.

And I agree with you that one of the greatest priority needs in this country today is feeding hungry Americans. I thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Reference has been made to the cost of Public Law 480. This cost should be charged to the foreign aid appropriations rather than the Department of Agriculture. Am I correct about that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Most of it, certainly a good percentage of it, should.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Thank you, sir.

Now, second, should this or subsequent Congresses decide to pass the guaranteed annual income, would there be a need for the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would think not. It could be sharply curtailed, in any event, because the people would have funds to buy their own food.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Secretary, I commend you for the manner in which you have set the record straight in regard to the release that was put out by the "Hunger—U.S.A." group, as well as the Columbia Broadcasting System's so-called documentary. You have shown that there was distortion in this report.

Here is a letter, Mr. Chairman, that I wrote to each of the physicians in three counties. There were four counties listed for the State. Three of them happened to be in my district. In my letter I stated:

This Board found "concrete evidence of chronic hunger and danger of malnutrition" from the study of "factors":

- (1) A high incidence of poverty;
- (2) A high incidence of postneonatal infant mortality (from 1 month to 365 days of age);
- (3) A low participation in welfare; and
- (4) A low participation in food distribution programs.

I received about 75 to 80 percent replies from these three counties that I wrote to.

Here are some of the views of the physicians. My home county was one of these "hunger" counties, and here it is:

Dr. Kennedy says this:

A month or so ago I chanced to be fishing at the Dollar Hole at Brinkley's Store near Hughes, Ark., and the schoolbus carrying poverty-stricken Negro children home stopped at the store, obviously in a ritualistic manner, so these children could refresh themselves. It was a picnic, believe me. Those kids piled off that bus and swarmed into that store and for a few minutes, Mr. Rivers and two clerks were really jumping there to uncap Coke and RC's and hand out candy and cake and money for and from those kids. They were as happy as any kids I have ever seen anywhere.

That is my home county.

Now we move to another county here, Mississippi County. This is from Dr. Massey, Osceola, Ark., and he states:

I have made an effort to speak to the ministers of the Osceola area and the ministers tell me that we have had no question on the fact of anyone being hungry in this area; they have not had a call through the Ministerial Alliance for help relative to food and care in this area.

Here is a letter from an implement dealer :

In my opinion, until the Government comes up with some better control over their dole system and encourages these people to work, the above situation will not improve.

And he further states :

No doubt, there are exceptions in cases where parents have used their Government checks to buy wine and whisky and not for food for their children.

One other question that I asked them to comment on was as to infant mortality in Mississippi County. This has been prepared by them. This was in 1967. That figure is about the national average.

Now here is a physician, Dr. Jones, who says :

In 5 years of practice, I have yet to see a case of primary malnutrition.

Dr. Hays says this, in his letter to me :

In reply to your letter of a few days ago regarding the poverty in Lee County, Ark., I have questioned several people, including the welfare organization, and I can find no evidence that there is extreme poverty or hunger in Lee County. We have the welfare organization well under control, and anyone who is hungry can go to the courthouse where we have the food stamp program in force, so there is no excuse for anyone to be hungry in this county.

Dr. Dozier states :

In reply to your letter regarding hunger and malnutrition, it is true that hunger and malnutrition prevail here, but it is not confined to the poor people or any one particular race. There are many reasons and they will not be corrected by giving more money to them.

The reasons are :

1. The lack of knowledge of the necessary foods to prevent hunger and malnutrition.
2. The frivolous waste of money on gambling, drinking of alcoholic drinks, and other unnecessary frivolities.
3. The desire not to work if the Government will support them.

There are many others, Mr. Chairman, but I would just like for the record to show some of the replies I received.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. I think there are times when we are inconsistent, and I include myself in that group. Some months ago this committee considered a bill that was similar to the CBS film that we have been talking about. It came over from the other body. Somebody conceived the idea that in the Southeast there were people who were starving. As I recall, the chairman of the committee asked organizations and individuals to come in and testify on that bill. Nobody testified but your Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and both said at that time that if these pockets of poverty existed, they knew nothing of it, and if they did exist you would have the funds and the authority to go ahead and correct them. Do you recall that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Certainly. As I recall, it was referred to a number of counties, and we found no such evidence at all.

Mr. GOODLING. Do you remember that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. We will get the testimony on that.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOODLING. I do not think you were here, but someone from your Department was. The bill called for an expenditure of \$75 million. We were told, as I said, if this condition existed, you had the authority and the money to go ahead and correct it.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that refers to—now that you have identified it—whether we had the resources to put into effect a direct distribution program in the counties, and the answer was then, and the answer is now, “Yes. We always have, and we have been doing exactly that.” That is not particularly germane, I do not think, to the issues before this committee this morning.

Mr. GOODLING. We asked further that a report be made to this committee in 6 months as to what you had done. We asked you to determine whether this condition did exist, and to report back to us in 6 months. To the best of my knowledge, we have never had a report.

Secretary FREEMAN. I do not think it has been 6 months, because it is clear from what I have seen this morning, that I do think that there should be a food stamp program in every county in the United States, because there is hunger and malnutrition, and there are poor people in every county in the United States. And so I do not think that that is any secret. I think everyone on this committee will agree to that.

Mr. GOODLING. Another question. You said that there are a lot of counties applying for admission to this program. If a State or a county had to share in the cost of this program, do you think that the same number would be applying?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, I do not.

Mr. GOODLING. Do you think that the State should not share in the cost?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that the State should not be asked to share in the program to any greater extent than they share in the program now; no.

Mr. GOODLING. They are not sharing in the program financially now; are they?

Secretary FREEMAN. They are paying the cost of the administration now, which is not inconsequential.

Mr. GOODLING. We had an amendment when the same bill was up a year ago, trying to insist that States pay for part of the program.

Secretary FREEMAN. To pay for part of the stamps, that is correct. There was such a discussion.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. May I, in relation to the question raised in the testimony, state that the testimony referred to was on October 5, 1967, where the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. All right. That is what I am asking.

What can you do with this bill that you cannot now do? What will the bill do?

Mr. LEONARD. With the bill, within the timespan provided here we would select five or six areas for intensive research on nutritional problems, the adequacy of a nutritional diet among the low-income groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not have that authority now?

Mr. LEONARD. We have the authority now. The point is to make some intensive surveys in which we are trying to get a better picture of the nutritional characteristics of the low-income families.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have the authority to study those things now?

Mr. LEONARD. Yes, yes, we do.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You have said that you would not need any additional money. You have the money and you have the authority now. Why do you need the bill, then?

Mr. LEONARD. Mr. Chairman, we did not request the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I understand from your testimony that you are here in support of the bill.

Mr. LEONARD. Yes, we would support the bill.

I think you have to look at this from two points: (1) the research side of it—
The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am looking at right now. Let us look at the research part of it.

You have the authority to conduct the research now.

Mr. LEONARD. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the money to conduct the research now.

Mr. LEONARD. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Now, then, let us look at the other part of the bill.

You have the authority and the money to do all the research. So that you do not need the bill from that standpoint. Just do not nod your head. Say "Yes" or "No".

Do you need it?

Mr. LEONARD. We do not.

There is more of it, and it is rather difficult to find all of this testimony here in an instant, but I think it is clear from the testimony that both the money and the authority were available.

Here it follows on page 6 of the same testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. But you told us you would not spend any additional money. Mr. LEONARD. We would spend additional money; we would not ask for additional authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not ask for additional authorization, but you have the money?

Mr. LEONARD. We have the money.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the money. You have the authority. I do not know just what this Congress can give you if you have both the money and the authority now. That relates to research.

Mr. LEONARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this bill place any limitation on the people to be fed so you can feed only the indigent people?

Does not this bill allow you to feed anybody you want to feed?

Does not this bill allow you to feed me, for example, and to feed the population as a whole anywhere you want to feed them?

Mr. LEONARD. I expect that it would, yes.

It seems to me that it is pretty clear that we did have the question up before us, and that your Department said that you had the authority.

Secretary FREEMAN. This does not have anything to do with the food stamp program.

The CHAIRMAN. No, not with the food stamps, but I noted from what Mr. Goodling was talking about, the bill was up last fall.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think what he had in mind was that this whole business has gotten kind of fuzzy, when the bill came over here that was kicking around over in the Senate, exactly as to what it would do and how it would do it. It was kind of mushy, and I think that there was a good deal of confusion on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Secretary. We appreciate your attendance here. If there has been any misunderstanding, I am sorry and I hope that we will have a minimum of it in the future. That is a quorum call.

The committee will stand in recess and meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning to complete these hearings.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., a recess was taken until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 13, 1968.)

Mr. Lusk: Yes, we would support the bill. I think you have to look at this from two points: (1) the research side of it — the University. That is what I am looking at right now. Let us look at the research part of it.

Mr. Lusk: You have the money to conduct the research now.

Mr. Lusk: Right.

Mr. Lusk: Then let us look at the other part of the bill. You give the authority and the money to do all the research. Is that you do not need the bill from that standpoint. There is not your head say "yes."

Do you need it?

Mr. Lusk: We do not.

There is more of it, and it is rather difficult to find all of this research money here in an abstract, but I think it is clear from the testimony that both the money and the authority were available.

There it follows on page 6 of the same testimony:

The Chairman: But you told us you would not spend any additional money.

Mr. Lusk: We would spend additional money; we would not ask for additional authorization.

The Chairman: You would not ask for additional authorization, but you have the money?

Mr. Lusk: We have the money.

The Chairman: You have the money. You have the authority. I do not know just what the Government can give you if you have both the money and the authority now. That relates to research.

Mr. Lusk: Yes.

The Chairman: Does this bill give any limitation on the people to be fed?

Mr. Lusk: You can feed only the indigent people.

Does that bill allow you to feed any body you want to feed?

Mr. Lusk: Yes, that bill allows you to feed any body you want to feed.

Does that bill allow you to feed any body you want to feed?

Mr. Lusk: I repeat that it would not.

It seems to me that it is pretty clear that we did have the question up before us, and that your Department and that you had the authority.

Secretary Bessie: This does not have anything to do with the food stand program.

Mr. Lusk: Yes, not with the food stamps, but I voted from what the feeling was about the bill was up last fall.

Secretary Bessie: I think what he had in mind was that this whole business has gotten kind of fuzzy, when the bill came over here that was kicking around in the Senate, exactly as to what it would do and how it would be. It was a lot of money, and I think that there was a great deal of confusion on the subject.

The Chairman: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Lusk: No further questions, we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. Lusk: A moment ago we were here. It has been very interesting. I am sorry and I hope that we will have a similar thing in the future. That is a good one.

The Chairman: Will stand in recess and meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Adjourned at 12:30 p.m. a recess was taken until 10 a.m. Thursday, July 13, 1956.

AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Abernethy, Abbitt, Jones of Missouri, Stubblefield, O'Neal, Foley, de la Garza, Jones of North Carolina, Dow, Montgomery, Belcher, Teague of California, Mrs. May, Dole, Wampler, Goodling, Miller, Mayne, Zwach, Kleppe, Myers, and Price.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; William C. Black, general counsel; Hyde H. Murray, assistant counsel; L. T. Easley, staff consultant; and Fowler C. West, assistant staff consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

The committee is met this morning for the further consideration of the various proposals as to the food stamp program.

We are honored to have with us today our colleague Mr. David T. Martin of Nebraska. We will be delighted to hear from you first, Mr. Martin. I understand that you have to catch a plane in about three-quarters of an hour.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID T. MARTIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I will be brief in my testimony with regard to the legislation that you are considering at the present time concerning the expansion of food stamp program.

I was out in my district about 10 days ago and was informed by a reliable source that college students in my home town—and we have a college there of approximately 5,000 enrollment—were going to the welfare office and were being issued food stamps. I checked into the matter, and I would like to read an article sent out by the Associated Press from Kearney, Nebr., my hometown, where the college is located, and I quote from the article—this was printed last Friday, June 7:

Low-income Kearney State College students have been allowed to purchase Federal food stamps if they are eligible, a Buffalo County Welfare Department official reports.

Assistant Director Bess Simmerman estimated Thursday that approximately one-third of the 57 food stamp cases, handled during May involved students.

A previous statement by the Buffalo County officials said there are no provisions to exclude students from the program. They said the qualifications for eligibility included only family size, income and residence in the county.

Third District Congressman David Martin told the House of Representatives Tuesday that the use of food stamps by low-income students "undoubtedly is a misuse of the program."

The welfare officials countered by saying, "They're people just like us."

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, we are having an investigation conducted in other communities in Nebraska where colleges and universities are located to ascertain if this is widespread throughout the State.

I am certain that this is not the intent of the Congress, to make the food stamp program an aid-to-education program, and that is, obviously, what this is coming to be, at least, so far as students are concerned.

If college students can go to the welfare office and show that they have very little income, when they work part time and have a job in the summer and, as a consequence, qualify under the rules and regulations to receive these food stamps, such, I believe, is contrary to the wish of Congress. These people, these students, are assisted by their parents to attend college, and, as a consequence, the cash income they receive, so far as that is concerned, is not shown in the statement given to the welfare director. I think and believe that your committee should look into this matter. Perhaps, it is widespread throughout the entire country among college students and perhaps not—we do not know, but I think this should be investigated. I firmly believe that an amendment to the law should be adopted which would preclude this sort of activity. You perhaps have had some witnesses who have testified where strikers are receiving food stamps.

Let me give you a couple of examples on that. This is from the Detroit Board of Commerce.

During the Ford strike of last fall, 3,809 families in Detroit, representing 16,970 individuals, were given \$273,171 worth of food stamps in the month of October. A second Government office had to be set up to handle the volume of business in a strike lasting 46 days.

And here is a quote from the Wall Street Journal of October 13, 1967:

Food stamps are making a tremendous difference in our ability to hold out, the financial secretary of the local union stated at the Ford assembly plant. He estimates that as many as 75 percent of Local 4700 members will make use of food stamps before the strike ends.

Now, this is being used here as a weapon in support of labor and strikes. I do not think it was the intent of your committee nor the intent of the Congress to have this sort of use made of the food stamp program.

To go back to the students in Kearney State College, you will note that the assistant director for welfare of Buffalo County, my home county, stated that approximately one-third of the 57 cases named were college students who were receiving food stamps.

I received a letter this morning which I am quite certain is accurate because figures were given to me in regard to a young man who is a student at Kearney College who owns an automobile and has over \$1,000 in cash in the bank, has an assessed evaluation on his personal property of a considerable amount of money. I also have figures in

regard to the personal cash in the particular county in which they reside of his parents and of his grandparents who are sending him to college. He is a young married student, and yet he went to the welfare office, applied for the food stamps and received food stamps.

I feel that this is making a use of the program which is not the intent of the law, and I hope that your committee will check into this matter and make amendments to the present law that will prohibit this sort of activity.

That is my statement, Mr. Chairman. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have had you with us. I think that you have brought us something that is very interesting and disturbing as a practice. Certainly, I am sure that the committee has never had in mind providing food for college students. There are other people in the United States who probably have that in mind, too. We certainly will look into it. We appreciate your bringing this to our attention.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I really do not have a question. This subject was brought up yesterday when Secretary Freeman was here and he was asked about it, and he said that he did not know much about it. I do not feel that we received a very satisfactory answer, but I, too, join the chairman in thanking you for bringing this to our attention, and I know that those who voted for the food stamp program, most of them anyway, would not approve of this use being made of the program.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions of Mr. Martin?

If there are not, you can assume that the silence of the audience is an acceptance of your views.

Mr. Dow. I suppose that silence might indicate acceptance. I might say that I did not hear the testimony, but I will say that if I am a part of the audience—if it is being stated here that this audience is being convinced, let me say that I am not.

Mr. BELCHER. I will say to the gentleman that it takes a whole lot to convince him then. I have been trying to do that ever since he has been on this committee, and I have not been able to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further comments, thank you, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us go off the record.

(Discussion was had outside the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. Back on the record.

It appears that our colleague who desired to testify has not yet appeared nor has he sent any word, so the committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the committee arose.)

EXTRAORDINARY SESSION

(Whereupon, at 10:30 a.m., the committee reconvened and the following occurred:)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee had adjourned when Mr. Saylor came, but most of our members are here, and I am going to call the committee into extraordinary session.

The Committee on Agriculture is now in session for the purpose of hearing Mr. Saylor.

We are glad to hear you, Mr. Saylor.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

MR. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first, I apologize to you for not being here at 10 o'clock. I happen to be the ranking member on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and our rules call for us to meet at 9:45. Believe it or not, at that time we had a quorum and commenced deliberations, having several motions pending. I became ensnarled in parliamentary procedure and could not leave. I appreciate the fact that you have called this session of the committee into extraordinary session, after having adjourned, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have you with us.

MR. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my mind goes back to the time when our distinguished colleague, Mrs. Sullivan, was elected a Member of the Congress to succeed her husband with whom some of you older members of this committee served.

It was my pleasure to have known her husband and to have served with him and with Mrs. Sullivan since she has been a Member of the House.

At the time Mrs. Sullivan attempted to have the food stamp program initiated, it did not receive much support. In fact, she obtained very few votes for her amendment on the Democratic side, and I happened to be the only individual on the Republican side who stood up and voted with Mrs. Sullivan. I favored this proposal because the food stamp program approach appealed to me as a means of solving a very, very difficult problem.

At that time, the district which I represented was classified by the Department of Labor as class F surplus labor area, the highest unemployment category recognized by the Secretary of Labor. In fact there were only four such areas in the United States, two in Pennsylvania and the others in Puerto Rico.

The people in my district were receiving surplus foods. There was absolutely nothing wrong with the commodities being received—the people were grateful for them—but the recipients, unfortunately, did not have some of the equipment necessary to preserve it, and a great amount of food was wasted and spoiled. Others acquired it and, very frankly, misused it. I saw many, many pounds of butter actually thrown away because it became rancid with no refrigeration. I saw huge blocks of excellent cheese go to waste because there was no refrigeration. Believe it or not, I saw cornmeal thrown on dance floors because they had no wax. And there were other instances of abuse when there were no means of keeping the cornmeal and other products distributed. It was just thrown out. This waste of foodstuffs incensed me and it bothered the relief people in our community.

When Mrs. Sullivan used this approach, I thought that at least this was a new idea worthy of a try—something that might eliminate the waste of food and give the people an opportunity to obtain a better and more balanced diet. I was delighted when the House of Representatives

and the Members of the Congress who serve on the other side of the Capitol saw fit to initiate the food stamp program. My home county of Cambria in Pennsylvania was one of the first counties in the Nation selected as a demonstration county.

Members of this committee know that I have presented to this committee statements from the head of the welfare program in my home county stating that if there was any one program of the Federal Government which has been of assistance to the people on relief under his jurisdiction, it has been the food stamp program.

Information has come to my attention, and I am sure the members of this committee have been so informed, that there are some abuses. I do not know of any program in the United States that is remiss of abuses, but merely because there are a few in the food stamp program is not sufficient reason to cut out the good legislation this committee has offered. Last year, when those of us who supported this program came before this committee, we pleaded for a perpetual authorization. This committee, in its wisdom, determined that there should be a 1 year extension. The Members of the Congress on the other side of the Capitol determined that it should be a 3-year program, and I need not remind you of the long period of time ensuing before the conferees agreed to an extension of 2 years.

Early in this session, some of us who were in favor of this program got together about what we might do to improve it, and so we cosponsored legislation which is before you at the present time which calls for an authorization, as you know, for the next 4 years. Very frankly, as a challenge to this committee, we made this an open ended authorization, stating that the Appropriations Committee might be the one which would determine the amount of money to be placed in this program.

The chairman of this committee has introduced a piece of legislation similar in nature which would continue it for another year and increase the amount of the money.

To the members of this committee who have the primary responsibility of determining whether or not this program should be continued, I plead with you today to take a good look at this program. Even though you may feel it has not been efficient, I can say that it helps you who come from agricultural areas in a way that you might not have thought of; that is, some of us who come from areas which are not primarily agricultural are much more inclined to look favorably upon some of your other programs because of the food stamp program.

My only plea to you today is that you, in your best judgment, increase the amount that might make this program available to more counties. If you want to impose limitations which might strike at the abuses, I am sure I cannot object. I do not want to see those that misuse this program benefit from it; neither do I want to see the people who are benefited be deprived of this program.

I would just like for you to come to my home county, announced or unannounced, and go with me to see the members who have charge of the relief programs in Cambria County and see how the people, and particularly the older people, are enjoying and benefiting from this program, in contrast to what you will find in counties that you can go to where surplus food is being distributed.

Do not forget that when surplus food is being distributed in our home counties or in a county that does not have the benefit of this program, it is distributed on a certain day at a certain hour, and those who are on retirement many times do not have the means of transportation. With this program, they can take their stamps and they can go to their stores, a store of their choosing, at any time, and buy the amounts of food that they want.

I have had people come to me who have been and are on relief. They do not like to be on relief, but they are not ashamed because of things that have happened that have not been their fault. I have actually had people come in to see me and cry because good food was being wasted under the surplus food program. These people actually cried about it.

Do not forget that one of the reasons we have trouble in this country today is that many of the programs that the Government is installing strikes at human pride. And let us not talk of just the black people losing face. The white man is also guilty of losing face. We do not like to lose face. You can tell what happens when somebody downtown in the Agriculture Department or in some other agency who is a grade 9 or grade 10 or grade 11 makes a decision which is approved up along the line, how difficult it is to get him to correct that mistake not because it is a mistake but because the people who have made the mistake do not like to admit they are wrong.

And I hope that this committee will not be wrong, by cutting off this program and trying to limit it in any way.

Once again, I thank the members of this committee for having stayed and listened to my pleas for this program.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. Saylor. We are glad to have you with use.

I would like to ask if you have in mind an amount to be appropriated for this program?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That seems to be the crux of the present difference of opinion.

Mr. SAYLOR. No. Every piece of legislation that comes out of this committee is a matter of compromise, and I am perfectly willing to have you put a ceiling on this as to the amount of money involved. But I would hope that you would increase the ceiling above what it is at the present time. The men and women on this committee are more familiar with the problems of agriculture and the problems of the Department of Agriculture than the members who are not assigned to this committee. One of the great advantages of our committee system is that the members on the respective committees do their homework, and I commend the members of this committee for their attention. You become experts in your field, and, very frankly, when problems affecting agriculture come before me, I look to the members of this committee for guidance when someone in my district asks me about the problems. So, if in the wisdom of this committee you decide that you want to put a ceiling on it, I will abide by your decision.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Saylor.

Are there any questions? Mrs. May.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Saylor, first of all, about your final statement that you hoped that this committee would not try to cut off the food stamp program. May I say for the record that I am not aware that there has ever been any suggestion in this committee to do anything of the kind.

What the Chairman has just been discussing is that we should develop the proper facts on the program on which we can make a basic decision as to how far the financing must go, looking not just to the immediate future but the intention to implement the program someday into every county of the United States. This, I understand, is the goal of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, so that the program would sometime in the future completely eliminate the direct distribution program.

We have heard here that the ultimate annual cost based on a formula with which I am not too familiar, is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$600 million. I do not know if this projection is based on making food stamps available not only to poor people, but to college students and other categories. That is one of the questions that I am sure that the committee will go into. How many people under what circumstances should qualify for the food stamp program. And we must know this so we can fulfill our information responsibilities to our colleagues in the House of Representatives when they ask us to present projected cost figures on doing our homework.

In my colloquy with the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday I had some questions that I think must be answered. There seems to be some confusion. There have been statements made that the food stamp program now has some 1,915 on its staff—I think that is the figure. And at one point we were told that they had requested an additional 600 employees. Yesterday, as the Secretary expressed it, the figure was about 300 requested. However, there still remains some confusion, because this does not give us any idea yet of what the staffing of the other areas in the Department of Agriculture must be in connection with this program. The Secretary recommended, and I think quite rightly, that there must be more emphasis on educating the recipients of this program on how to buy, and how to use the food better. For this education program we are going to use the extension service, as I understand it, and other agencies, within the USDA. And this, conceivably, could mean an increased staffing in those areas.

All I am saying is that these are questions which this committee must find some answers to before we can come up with the proper bill if that is what we decide to do. This is why there has been some question on the open end authorization. Can we recommend open end appropriation to the House, without having some idea of what they are going to get into as to the present and future cost of the food stamp program.

I want to ask this question: You said it had come to your attention about abuses of the food stamp program. Very frankly, I have not had any official report on the abuses. I have had a few letters.

What kind of abuses have been complained about in your area?

Mr. SAYLOR. There have been no abuses in my area that have come to my attention.

Several days ago, members of the committee will recall, Mr. Martin of Nebraska got up on the Floor of the House and commented upon certain abuses that came to his attention.

Mrs. MAY. About food stamps being given to strikers?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right.

Mrs. MAY. And to students?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes. This committee must realize that there may be some challenges that go out to people who are just not in the Department of Agriculture. The people in our community have been so enthused with this program that our local newspaper and also one of our large radio and television stations have cooperated with the electric and the gas companies and the people that they have in their departments to conduct schools open to anyone with no charge whatever to come in and to teach the people how to use some of the foods available, teaching them how to buy, et cetera.

Mrs. MAY. Is this a program that is through voluntary effort on the part of your people?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is in cooperation with the school district, the radio and TV, the newspaper, and our public utilities.

Mrs. MAY. Getting back to the subject of abuses, there are penalties in the law for improper use by retail merchants and by the recipients of the food stamps which violations are punishable. I have understood wherever this has happened they have been prosecuted—that the offenders have been punished.

You are not talking about them?

Mr. SAYLOR. No.

Mrs. MAY. Improper administration and improper use.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is correct. And, Mrs. May, I want to say to you that the merchants in our district—in my district—have been most appreciative of this program, and in several cases, where there has been a suggestion of misuse, the first people who went in to check on it were people of our own organization, to warn the merchants if there was any abuse they would be cut off completely and just taken off the list.

Mrs. MAY. As I understand, in Pennsylvania and every place else, the local public assistance people do the screening of who shall be eligible and who shall not—they do not have to be on public assistance to qualify.

Have you familiarized yourself with the work in your own area on this, and are you satisfied they are doing a good job of seeing to it that nonqualified people are staying out of the program but that it is flexible enough to bring in those who are truly in need?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes. Mrs. May I want to say to you that the relief agencies in my area have done an outstanding job, and they have done it still allowing the people their dignity, which is the thing which the ordinary handing out of surplus foods deprived the people of. In other words, I do not hesitate to tell you that one time it depended upon your political party when surplus foods were handed out as to whether or not you got certain commodities. This is gone.

Mrs. MAY. It has been stated that there might be the possibility of embarrassment for the recipients in the grocery stores, when they pay in food stamps as compared to those who pay in cash. Have you had any complaints in that area at all?

Mr. SAYLOR. None whatsoever. And, very frankly, not long ago in one of the chain stores that I was in with my wife, doing the buying, a woman ahead of us was the possessor of some food stamps, and she did not have quite the exact number of stamps or change. As I recall it, the stamp was more than she needed at the time. The clerk looked at her and said, "We would be delighted if you would take this note and go over to the manager—he will change the stamps." And he did, so she could get the right number of them, so that she would not have to worry about it.

The people are cooperating tremendously.

Mrs. MAY. Just one more question of Mr. Saylor.

You did state that in the food stamp program, in some banks they did handle the stamp distribution on just certain days. And I suppose this varies from State to State. You spoke of that, but you did mention that it was difficult for elderly people to get to a certain place at a certain time.

Have you had any complaint on the part of those who buy stamps that the banks are open only on certain days and this makes it difficult to buy the food stamps when needed?

Mr. SAYLOR. I can tell you this: Our banks have cooperated in the program and have a special window, even at their branch banks, and those windows are available anytime the banks are open.

Mrs. MAY. They do not have special days for it? We visited in your State some time ago, and at that time one bank had 2 days—1 day or 2 days a week, I am not sure—at which the exchange was made, but your banks in your district make the food stamps available any day of the week they are open, you say?

Mr. SAYLOR. Anytime the banks are open.

Mrs. MAY. Thank you. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gathings?

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say to the gentleman that his talk this morning regarding this subject has been enlightening. I did know that there had been waste but not in any such quantity as you have suggested with respect to the way these foods have been handled. Here is an advantage in having the food stamp program: Participants can buy whenever they want to buy, when they need the food. They can go to their nearby store and get a balanced ration.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you have any people who object to buying these stamps?

Mr. SAYLOR. When the program started originally, there were some people who said that the amount of the money which they had to lay out in the first instance was more than they had been accustomed to laying out at any one time, but once they were over that first hurdle of buying the stamps for the first time, then we have had no complaint about it since that time.

Mr. GATHINGS. It was stated by the Secretary that it is difficult sometimes to sell the program to the people, pretty hard to get it over to them, the advantages of the program. I just wondered whether or not you had run into that problem?

Mr. SAYLOR. We, in the first instance, did, because the stamps were available, and I do not recall right now the amount of the money that the people had to put up in the first instance, but when the people

found out what they got in return for their money, they began to adjust themselves to this type of buying, and we have had no problems from that time on.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to commend the gentleman on his statement.

You have not at all been critical of this committee. We appreciate that. It is somewhat different from testimony we have received earlier.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me say to you, sir, having been here in the House for 10 terms, I realize the problems that every committee has had presented to it, and none of them are easy. The easy problems sort of take care of themselves; they do not have to come to Congress for solution, and when this committee, in its wisdom, makes up its mind, and they have, purportedly, done it because they thought that it was conscientiously right. I may disagree with people in the conclusion they arrive at, but I never criticize any committee that does what they think is right. And, as I say, I certainly do not want to criticize members of this committee who are opposed to this program. This is their right and this is their responsibility. So, I certainly, am not going to criticize the committee because of what they have done. I am not going to criticize if I do not get everything out of this bill that I want. I am going to think that you people, who are experts in this, know more about it than I do. I am going to abide by your decisions.

Mr. GATHINGS. I appreciate that. In my 20 years of association with the gentleman, he has shown me that he is zealous, effective, and a good legislator.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wampler.

Mr. WAMPLER. I want to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania for his appearance here this morning and for his testimony. He and I have discussed this matter informally many times. We both have an interest in this legislation.

I was interested to hear him say that apparently the food stamp program has been very well accepted in his district. I might say for the record that last year when the food stamp bill was before this committee I wrote to every merchant in my district, who was certified by the Department of Agriculture to accept food stamps, asking for their frank criticism or suggestions concerning the working of the food stamp program, and, without exception, I think everyone who responded, responded favorably, because the program is a part of the regular commercial channels of trade.

The point I want to make is that I have had an opportunity to observe both the direct commodity distribution and also the food stamp program. I think, without exception, the food stamp program is far superior to the commodity distribution program, for some of the reasons you have indicated in your testimony and those in the testimony of other members.

I want to assure you that we will take your testimony into consideration—careful consideration. It has been very helpful. I know of your interest in this legislation and your desire to see that every worthwhile and needy American has an adequate diet. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Wampler, the thought comes to my mind, having been suggested by the colloquy with Mrs. May: I do not know whether or not it is going to be necessary to extend it to every county in the

United States. The most needy counties, those counties with the highest percentage of unemployment, are those with the lowest income, I think, and have already qualified in this program; therefore, this is one of the things that this committee, when you decide as to how broad a base you are going to make for the future, should take into consideration.

Mr. WAMPLER. This is well put. There is some correlation between need and the application of the program.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. WAMPLER. I think that these areas that do not have this program should be carefully investigated for need before being certified. I agree with you.

Mr. SAYLOR. I think this is correct.

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you very much. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foley?

Mr. FOLEY. I want to compliment you on your testimony, Mr. Saylor. I think you have proven that over the years this program has been in existence through occasional authorizations by this committee and by this Congress, your support has not only been one of initial support of this program but has continued, and it has been thoroughly consistent. To put it in other words, you do not completely abjure all of your rights to support amendments on the floor if amendments are offered, in consideration of the bill. I am sure you reserve that right as a Member of Congress.

Mr. SAYLOR. I reserve that right. And if I win, I am perfectly happy to win, and if I lose, I am not one of those who thinks, because I lost, the world is going to stop.

Mr. FOLEY. You accept the decisions of the committee and of the Congress in good faith.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right, because the superior committee of all of the House committees is the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and that is the one that finally works its will and one of which we are all members.

Mr. FOLEY. One further question: We have had the pleasure of serving together on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, and I think that our committee has passed probably more legislation, except the Committee on the Judiciary, and has authorized larger sums than any other committee of the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. It does not authorize as extensive funds as this committee authorizes when we look at the total section of its responsibility such as Public Law 480 and the commodity programs in agriculture, the watershed programs, et cetera. I think that they total among the highest in the House.

Yesterday, I asked the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture what we are spending abroad to feed hungry people of other lands. He told me that we were spending about \$500 million in direct assistance and about \$1.5 billion in concessional sales for foreign currencies which many people feel are really donations on the part of the United States—a total of \$2 billion.

Now do you think that, considering that amount which has been authorized by this committee and by the Congress, \$2 billion to feed foreign nationals out of the generosity of the American taxpayers, that

it is out of the question that we should not expand this program by \$100 million for people in the poor counties in the United States; citizens with inadequate diets who are poor and unable to feed themselves?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not. In other words, I appeared also yesterday before the House Ways and Means Committee, and at that time I said that I was perfectly willing to assist other nations in trying to raise their standards up to our standards, but I was not willing to be a party to lowering the standards of the citizens of this country to the standards of the citizens of foreign countries.

Mr. FOLEY. For my own part, if we do not have sufficient resources in this country to feed both the poor in America and the poor abroad, I am not for feeding those abroad.

Mr. SAYLOR. I think that it is absolutely impossible for us to feed the world. We just cannot do it. I think that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture would be doing a great deal more benefit to other nations if they spread expertise in teaching them on how the American farmer has learned to produce.

Mr. FOLEY. I do not want to suggest that I do not support Public Law 480. On every occasion, I have considered the priority of this program as very high.

May I ask you one final question?

You have introduced legislation that many members of the committee describe as open-ended which has an authorization for 4 years. I think that your suggestion is that, though you will not quarrel with the decision of the committee, you are urging it to give serious consideration to that extension and the so-called open-end?

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to see it have a ceiling that is high enough to take care of some of the needs which the Secretary testified to yesterday.

Mr. FOLEY. The records of this committee will show that Public Law 480 has a ceiling on the obligational authority of \$2.5 billion which has never been exceeded, so far as I know, in the actual operation of the program and in the commodity supports of wheat, feed grains, cotton, and wool where the cost exceeds \$3.3 to \$3.5 billion—a 4-year program which is also open ended.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Myers?

Mr. MYERS. In your remarks you mentioned about the responsibility of Government to provide the opportunity for people to save face, or words to that effect.

I do not quite understand what you mean by that.

Mr. SAYLOR. So many of the programs which we have almost call upon people to declare they are impoverished, that they are in poverty, or that they are poor. In other words, so many of the programs which we have passed require people almost to come with hat in hand to get a decent living, and I just think that just some of these things that are happening tear down the person's pride. You know, the thing that keeps people living, the thing that keeps people going today more than any other thing is pride, personal pride, and when you do not have it, you do not have any pride in the country.

Mr. MYERS. However, what do you suggest that we might do, write something in here that would provide that people who are college

students should not be given this type of assistance? How can we prevent this if we do not have something in there about that? There has to be something like that.

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not say that you should not have a need base. This, I have not objected to. People do not hesitate to come in and say that they need it. If the local people will do it in the right manner, all right. Much of the difficulty is the failure of the local people in their handling of relief cases.

Mr. MYERS. We will agree with that.

Mr. SAYLOR. So, allow people to have pride. Sometimes the complaint has come to me, even though we have in Pennsylvania a pretty good system, that some of the new people who get on become impressed with their own importance, and they begin to swell up, actually, and that has an effect on the people who come in. The human element is a difficult thing for this committee or any other committee to handle.

Mr. MYERS. I think you are right. I think what you are speaking about is a social problem that develops through the years. I do not think that we in the Congress have the ability to legislate self-respect one way or the other, for or against.

Mr. SAYLOR. You cannot legislate self-respect. The only thing we can do is to ask that those who have charge of the program should realize that these people are not coming because they want to come, they are coming because they have to.

Mr. MYERS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington for a "yes" or "no" answer to a question, if he will yield.

In your colloquy a while ago with Mr. Saylor, you mentioned that yesterday the Secretary said that about \$500 million was in direct assistance and about \$1.5 billion was in concessional sales for foreign currencies. Would you support a motion that would take away from the foreign assistance programs equal amounts to be added here to food stamps?

Mr. FOLEY. I would say "Yes, if it is necessary." But, frankly, I think both programs have higher priorities than some other programs. I would be opposed to doing that without, first of all, looking at some other items. I do not think that we need to build a new Senate Office Building. We have some buildings in our district which are under construction which do not need to be built. I think we can suspend that operation at the moment. I think that we can suspend the spending of a tremendous and substantial amount for military programs, as in Southeast Asia, such as building tennis courts and swimming pools. There are a lot of ways where we can cut without hurting the people here and abroad.

Mr. MYERS. I yield back. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I would like to ask Mr. Saylor for some information about the operation in his district. Have they discontinued the direct commodity distribution program?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, sir; the direct commodity distribution program has been discontinued in my district.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. In its entirety?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do not know how you handle that with indigent persons.

Mr. SAYLOR. Through our relief program in the State, checks are given to these people, a check for rent and a check for food, a check for clothing. It is one check. There is a cash distribution.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It is a State welfare program?

Mr. SAYLOR. A State welfare program; yes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. How about the unemployed in dealing with income? If he is unemployed, he has no resources, he is without money. How would something like that be handled?

Mr. SAYLOR. We have a fortunate situation, at least as far as our major industry is concerned. Our major industry, in my district, is the steel business. The unions and the companies have agreed by contract, a number of years ago, that if a member of the union and an employee of the steel company is laid off, in addition to the unemployment compensation check which he is entitled to receive as the result of being out of work, he also receives from the company a check called sub, which may be a nickname for it, but it is a substitute payment, so he gets much more than he would just by being on unemployment compensation.

For the past number of years, my district, up until quite recently, when there was an influx of a number of steel products from foreign countries coming in, causing some of the unemployment in my district, this has been able to take care of almost every situation. Some of the other companies have followed the pattern of the steel companies; the aluminum companies, the glass companies, and the rubber companies in my district have all come up with substantially the same type of arrangement. So that what might be an unemployment situation in some areas have not vitally affected us.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You are very fortunate.

Mr. SAYLOR. We are very fortunate; yes, sir. I think the people in my district appreciate the fact that they are fortunate. Of course, they are very viable Americans. They are not afraid to show their patriotism.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Neither are mine.

Mr. SAYLOR. And they are proud of the fact that they are permitted to live in this country. They love it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Except you have high employment and I have high unemployment. But, in spite of the unemployment, they are still very American and very patriotic. But there are those who demonstrate.

Mr. SAYLOR. I think that if that would happen in my district they would probably be run out of town on a rail.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Are there any other questions of Mr. Saylor?

If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you. We are always glad to have you come to our committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a privilege always to come before your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

I want to ask unanimous permission to insert a letter from the National Farmers Organization into the record.

If there is no objection, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The letter referred to, dated June 10, 1968, and statements and letters also submitted to the committee, follow:)

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION,
 Corning, Iowa, June 10, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM R. POAGE,
 Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
 House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: The National Farmers Organization supports the bill H.R. 17721 that amends the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

We believe this is a sound, sensible step to assure not only some continuity for a program that has worked well, but a degree of flexibility in administration and operation that can make the program responsive to changing situations.

We have always thought that there should be a greater distribution of America's agriculture abundance.

There is no question that the food stamp program offers the best answer yet devised for improving nutrition among our low-income families. It offers the best answer yet devised for improving the consumption of farm products by these families.

The food stamp program is not a welfare program—it is a food assistance program. It is not a handout—it is a self-help program. Look at the hundreds of thousands of people participating who aren't on any kind of welfare program. The retired, living on limited pensions—those working part-time or for low wages—but working. One and all, they pay for food coupons. One and all, they must make a decision that they will budget their limited means in order to buy food stamps. These are the people who not only need improved nutrition but know they need it and who take pride in helping themselves.

These people have to pay rent and utilities and buy clothes and have a little something for emergencies—but still, they put up their money month in and month out to stay with the food stamp program.

The requirement that the Secretary submit a report to the Congress on or before January 20, of each year is a good requirement and a sensible requirement that will provide the Congress with a basis for judging program needs and trends. It will give the members of Congress the time and opportunity to review program operations and proposals carefully—to make their own judgments—to raise questions—to demand good answers.

We see this approach as a truly cooperative one between the Congress and the Executive. It provides the essential Congressional prerogative of oversight while permitting a reasonable degree of flexibility for the administrators to adapt or adjust the program to changing needs and changing situations.

The proposal, we believe, will reduce to a minimum the chances of a situation developing such as occurred this year when a number of counties had to defer opening a program that they wanted and needed because funds were not available to bring them into the program.

A four-year extension of the program will permit sound, rational advance planning on the part of communities, counties, states and the Federal Government. This is a most important consideration in reducing uncertainties as to what the rules may be from one year to the next.

The program is not perfect—no program is. But it is a program that does command widespread acceptance and respect. Participants, community leaders, the business community, churchmen come together in this program because it provides food assistance with dignity.

The Food Stamp Program brings farmers and consumers together to the benefit of both. The cost of administering the program is relatively low leaving a greater portion of the funds provided to benefit the families that need it.

We again urge the Committee to report out the four-year extension, and other proposals of this bill.

We want to thank the Committee for giving us the opportunity of expressing our views and we respectfully request that this statement be made a part of the record of the hearing.

Yours truly,

LLOYD J. FAIRBANKS,
 Legislative Representative.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF ILLINOIS

I strongly support the Food Stamp Program as an effective program to assure poor or low-income families the opportunity to eat properly and enjoy nutritious diets. The Food Stamp Program operates in Cook County, Illinois, and has been very successful in improving standards of nutrition for all of the families participating in the program.

This program should be expanded. I think it should operate in every county in the country, because no matter how rich a community or a county might be, it is very likely that there are still poor families living in those areas. People on social security need this program, in many cases, in order to be able to stretch their monthly benefits to cover the purchase of sufficient food, or the right kind of food. Often they need special diets which they cannot afford without this kind of help.

Then you have the families where the wage earner working a full eight-hour day and a forty-hour week at low pay just cannot earn enough to feed his family properly. The point I'm trying to make is that this program does not just go to those on public assistance—who, of course, are eligible and do need the program—but to many additional families who are not on any form of welfare but need additional food purchasing power made possible under this law.

There is general agreement in the House of Representatives that the Food Stamp Program is the most effective program we have to combat malnutrition. But it only operates in about one-third of the country. These are not all, by any means, the areas with the greatest degree of need. But you can be just as hungry if your income is low, no matter where you live. So I feel very strongly that this program should be permitted to expand into every area of the country which wants to have it.

I also feel that sufficient funds should be made available for this program in the areas where it now operates so that further adjustments can be made in the purchase requirements in order to bring more families into the program. I have heard a lot of complaints that the people have to spend too much of their own money to obtain the food stamps. I am sure that many of these complaints are justified. But we will never solve that problem without appropriating enough money to increase the proportion of bonus coupons compared to the amount the family has to spend of its own money, and obviously we cannot appropriate more money unless the present ceiling on appropriations is substantially increased or, as proposed in the legislation I have co-sponsored, the ceiling is removed.

If we take off the \$225,000,000 limitation on the appropriations for the coming fiscal year, that would not mean that the President or the Secretary of Agriculture could spend unlimited amounts on the program. Every cent would have to be appropriated by Congress, subject to careful review by the Congress. However, if we felt that \$300,000,000 should be appropriated for the new fiscal year, we could provide such an amount, using that just as an illustration. Under present law, we cannot do so. We can only appropriate \$225,000,000. That is not enough to meet the need.

Let us not argue over the number of needy people in the United States who are going hungry. We know that the number is very large. We know that it is too large for a rich country like this to tolerate. Hunger in the United States is intolerable. Let us end it by supporting this program.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present my views to your Committee on legislation I am sponsoring to open up the Food Stamp Program to all areas of this country which want and need it. Expansion of this excellent program can only be accomplished by removing the current ceiling on the amount of money Congress can appropriate for fiscal 1969 and subsequent years and permit us to appropriate the amount that is needed.

As Representative from Lucas County, Ohio, which had the benefit of having a Pilot Food Stamp Program in 1962, I feel qualified to speak in behalf of the Food Stamp Program and urge its expansion to reach all needy Americans who wish to participate. To me, this program blends the best elements of dignified aid to the poor and self-help with the best of urban-farm interests.

At the present time there are approximately 20,000 citizens in Lucas County, Ohio, participating in the Food Stamp Program. These participants are either on welfare aid, living on Social Security payments or have incomes so low that they need this additional help to be able to eat properly. The participants in Lucas County pay approximately \$2,400,000 for the food stamps and are able to purchase \$3,603,000 worth of food. In other words, they get \$3 for every 2 they invest and there is an average increase in purchasing power of about \$6.60 per month per person.

The Toledo Blade has described food stamps as "Toledo's Biggest Grocery Bill." And the former Welfare Director who is now the Mayor of Toledo has said "People using food stamps are eating better and more, and the program establishes a better foundation for what our ultimate aims are—to get people off welfare and back into productive society."

Of no small importance is the fact that in addition to helping feed people who need it, the Food Stamp Program has expanded farm markets and has stimulated the overall economy in every area in which it operates.

Mr. Chairman, very recently I have received a tremendous volume of mail from my constituents expressing anger and concern at the widespread prevalence of hunger and malnutrition throughout the United States. Their expression of concern apparently was prompted by the CBS television program "Hunger in America." While that program was certainly valuable in calling attention to a problem of urgent importance—and in my view a national disgrace—the pity is that the program did not focus more attention on existing programs which, properly funded, can more effectively meet the problem. Only if people are informed can there be support for broadening programs to reach more people. The Food Stamp Program is a prime example.

When Secretary of Agriculture Freeman initiated the Pilot Food Stamp Program in 1961 I was successful in getting my District included. This program can be expanded to reach other hungry Americans who need additional help in food purchasing power. It is not the whole answer but it has been part of the answer and can be a great deal more.

I believe we have an obligation to help assure the poor people of this nation to a decent, nourishing, adequate diet and we can accomplish this objective by first removing the arbitrary authorization ceiling for the Food Stamp Program. We will then be able to appropriate enough funds so that every county in the United States which wants to participate can do so.

I most strongly urge your Committee's favorable consideration of this legislation to help accomplish this national goal.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD P. BOLAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a privilege for me to have the opportunity to appear before this Committee and express my views on the food stamp program. The scheduling of these hearings is an indication that members of Congress recognize the deep public interest in expanding the food stamp program at this time. But I would maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed increase of \$20 million in authorizations will not be sufficient to meet the pressing food needs of this Nation. I therefore wish to voice my support for the alternate proposal, H.R. 17720, which would eliminate altogether the authorization ceiling on appropriations.

During the past year, the nutritional problems of the Nation's poor have received much attention. When those examining the needs of the poor find inadequate diets, hunger, and malnutrition widespread among children and adults, they naturally inquire into the performance of those food programs which purport to help low-income persons. Both the food stamp program and the commodity distribution program are designed to feed needy, hungry people. But statistics show that these two programs fail to provide assistance to about 24 million of the Nation's 30 million poor.

As public officials across the country have become aware of the conditions of hunger, many have expressed interest in establishing food stamp programs in their communities. But the current level of funding is not high enough to permit the operation of programs in all of the counties which have requested them. I would like to see the food stamp program in every city, town, and county where there are needy people. I consider a minimum diet a basic right of every American citizen. Every person who is eligible should have the opportunity to benefit from the purchase of bonus food coupons.

My home State of Massachusetts has been participating in the commodity distribution program, but officials in a number of Massachusetts counties would like to establish a food stamp program to replace it. The food stamp program has many advantages over commodity distribution. It gives the individual consumer the right to choose the foods he wishes to purchase instead of limiting him to those items which happen to be available through the surplus food program. Often the place where the surplus commodities are distributed is inconvenient and requires transportation not available to many poor persons. The food stamp coupons may be used as money to purchase food in most neighborhood stores. But although these counties want to start a food stamp program, lack of Federal funds prevents them from doing so.

It is my understanding that when the Congress enacted the Food Stamp Act in 1964, it was not intended as a pilot project, only to be put into operation in a limited number of places. At that time, many thought it should entirely replace the commodity distribution program. The legislation places the responsibility for requesting and setting up the program with the local government. But now we are in a position where funds are not sufficient to allow those programs now in operation to provide stamps to every eligible citizen, or to encourage programs to be started in other places where there is proven need for them.

The time for action is now. We need not wait for further surveys, studies and reports. We do not need new legislation, requiring extensive hearings. We have a fairly successful program already in operation—the food stamp program. I can see no reason why it should not be expanded so as to be available to everyone.

At the present time only 2 million persons are able to take advantage of the food stamp program. For these relatively few, the program has been most helpful. During fiscal year 1967, coupons costing about \$105 million were purchased and used to obtain food worth almost \$300 million. The program has been successfully expanded, with the number of projects increasing almost 20-fold from 43 in August 1964 to 838 in June 1967. The number of participants likewise rose, from 350,000 at the beginning of the program to 2 million at the present time. There is every indication that this trend would continue, with more and more counties establishing programs, and increasing numbers of persons benefiting from them. But one obstacle stands in the way of this—the ceiling on appropriations which may be spent for this purpose. I believe it is the duty of this Committee to respond to this problem with a favorable report on H.R. 17720, which is being sponsored by one-third of the members of the House of Representatives, from both sides of the aisle.

This is a compassionate Nation. It is also an affluent Nation, one which is fortunate enough to have the resources to provide all of its citizens with a decent minimum standard of living, including adequate food. Our compassion cannot allow us to ignore the plight of the 30 million poor in our midst, or the 10 million who are malnourished.

I therefore urge this Committee to give immediate and favorable consideration to this proposal. Many members of Congress would like to have the opportunity to vote on this bill during the current session of Congress. We would like to be able to assure the country's needy that each and every county will be able to have a food stamp program at the earliest practicable time.

STATEMENT OF HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 17725 which I have the pleasure of co-sponsoring in the House. As you know, this bill would eliminate the present dollar limitations on appropriations to the Food Stamp Program for fiscal 1969 and would provide authorization for appropriations for the three subsequent fiscal years.

Since its birth in 1964, the Food Stamp Program has helped over 4 million needy people in the United States. By the end of fiscal 1967 *alone*, the Food Stamp Program will have aided nearly 2 million Americans—approximately half of the total number of individuals assisted by the Program since 1964. Moreover, whereas the Program had only 22 member states at the beginning, it now has 41 participating states plus the District of Columbia. In August, 1964, the Food Stamp Program was servicing only 43 areas in the participating states; by June, 1967 the number had jumped to 838 areas in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, these figures speak for themselves. They dramatically demonstrate the increasing need for the Food Stamp Program and the increasing value of this Program wherever and whenever the need is met. Unfortunately, there is no indication that the need for this Program will decrease in the coming years. In fact, every reliable indicator points in exactly the opposite direction.

The distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, has emphasized that we must have more adequate tools and money if we are to eliminate hunger and malnutrition. He has provided us with a broad outline of the Food Stamp Program required to meet needs in the near future. Mr. Freeman has pointed out that we need a Food Stamp Program which:

- Is operating in every county and independent city in the country;
- Has eligibility standards that encompass all financially needy families;
- Is readily accessible to all eligible families, with the States and localities providing prudent but prompt certification services and accessible locations at which to purchase coupons;
- Makes available to each participating family sufficient total food stamps to enable the family to purchase an adequate diet, with the family's monetary investment related to its basic ability to buy food;
- Includes homemaker training and educational services on what makes for a good diet and how to buy and prepare food to meet the family's nutritional requirements.

The Secretary has suggested that such a program, which meets the fundamental needs, would cost at least 1.5 billion dollars. We cannot afford to spend less to solve the problem of hunger in our nation.

Mr. Chairman, my own State of New Jersey offers substantial evidence in support of the need for continued operation and expansion of the Food Stamp Program. In April of this year, the Department of Agriculture reported over 100,000 households with poor diets in Hudson and Union Counties alone in New Jersey. I am sure that we can take care of these households with sufficient appropriations to the Food Stamp Program; we simply must take care of them.

During fiscal 1967, over 3,000 persons in Union County purchased food stamps; more must be helped. Hudson County does not yet have a program but is scheduled to get one in the near future; if the dollar limitations on appropriations are not lifted, there is grave danger that the thousands of households in Hudson County which require food stamps will never get them.

Obviously, Hudson and Union Counties are just two of the many areas throughout New Jersey and the entire nation which would be seriously damaged by a failure of Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to the Food Stamp Program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is significant that leaders of the Poor People have labeled "feeding the poor" as the number one item on their agenda. I know of no item, outside national defense, which should be ranked higher in our national agenda. In all good conscience, can we allow both Dives and Lazarus to exist within our one nation? Can we countenance a growing separation between rich and poor, fed and hungry in America? Can this, the most abundant nation on the face of the earth refuse to share its abundance with our deprived citizens? The answer to all these questions is, no.

The vital effort to feed the poor must not be allowed to falter or come to an end for lack of adequate funds. The Food Stamp Program has made great advances in the national program to guarantee a full share of life to all Americans. These advances must continue for, as the late President Kennedy said, "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

As a first step, we should move immediately to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the \$300 million which he needs for the fiscal year beginning in July. We can then proceed toward the ultimate goal of a truly adequate Food Stamp Program. A full national commitment on the part of Congress, the Executive Branch, and the States is necessary to meet the proposition that no man, woman, or child in this country shall go hungry while others are fed.

I urge this Committee to take favorable action on the bill before it, H.R. 17725. To do otherwise would be to court disaster. Thank you again for this opportunity to present my position.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify on the two bills amending the Food Stamp Act which I have sponsored. Last June, I introduced H.R. 10832 to permit localities to participate in both the food stamp and the surplus commodities programs, which are now mutually exclusive. This year, I joined the spirited and conscientious Congresswoman from St. Louis, Leonor Sullivan, in introducing H.R. 17725, to provide a four-year authorization of the food stamp program.

I concur with Agriculture Secretary Freeman that: "food stamps provide the most practical and efficient way to meet the food problems of poor families. Stamps provide the low-income family with the means for a wider, more varied diet. . . . It utilizes—rather than competes with—the best food distribution system in the world, our commercial marketing complex."

A country's investment in the nutrition and well-being of its citizens and their families yields results which are not easily measured economically, but which are of incalculable benefit to the bodies and spirits of its people.

For these reasons, I see no justification for not putting the food stamp program on a continuing basis through the four-year authorization provided by the bill I have sponsored, H. R. 17725 and the other bills initiated by Congresswoman Sullivan. This legislation provides that the yearly level of funding would be reached upon Congressional review of the Secretary of Agriculture's report of the operations and projected needs under the program.

Since the Food Stamp Act was passed in 1964, I have actively encouraged the participation of San Antonio and Bexar County in the program. I have written many letters, spoken about it often, and carried the debate to many forums. It was gratifying to me that Bexar County's application for food stamps (to be administered under contract to the City Welfare Department) was approved for inception in May. However, the lack of funds pushed the starting date back to July 1. There are over two-hundred approved projects which are also waiting to begin operations; I hope and trust that we will all be able to start next month.

At first, the food stamp program was simply made available to localities. Whether to start food stamps, whether to switch from surplus commodity distribution and whom to certify were strictly matters of local and state initiative. But soon the Department of Agriculture, responding more quickly to demonstrated needs, began actively to encourage food stamps. I wish to commend their actions in reducing the minimum purchase required from \$2 per person per month to 50 cents, and in widening the eligibility requirements. Today one-third of our counties participate in the food stamp program, and all but 40 of the remainder administer surplus commodities.

But the need for expanded federal food programs is still acute. For example, applications to O.E.O. for emergency food and medical assistance are reported to be double the money available.

Hunger and malnutrition can and must be eliminated in the United States. A hungry family is a family without hope, a family without the will to better its conditions or surroundings. Children who go to school after a breakfast of only beans or gravy, and without money for lunch, are children who cannot learn—children who are doomed to repeat the cycle of poverty of their parents.

The food stamp program must be improved. The total stamps available to participating families must be sufficient for an adequate diet, with the family paying a fair portion of its income for the stamps. Barriers to complete participation must be eliminated. Homemaking and consumer education should be available to assist stamp recipients in the planning and preparation of balanced diets.

And there is another deficiency of the food stamp concept which to my mind is most serious and must be eliminated. Food stamps should not force the elimination of surplus commodities, or preclude the existence of both federal food programs in one locality as now prevented by law. The two programs can complement each other in important respects. For families which are able on the given day of the month to purchase enough stamps to feed them for the month, the food stamp program offers an effective self-help mechanism utilizing local grocery stores and the private food distribution system. On the other hand, for families with no effective income, or without sufficient funds on the given day of the month, or without the means to get to the stamp distribution point on

the given day, the surplus commodities program can be the last barrier against hunger.

My bill, H.R. 10832, would provide localities with the additional option of electing to administer food stamps in conjunction with surplus commodities, but with the stipulation that no family may benefit from both programs in the same month. Such administrative processes as eligibility certification would be identical for both programs.

A few counties which have elected to convert from the surplus commodities program have shown an increase in the number of participants in the new food stamp program, possibly due in part to a widening of participation requirements. But other counties show a drop in participation of one-third upon conversion. Both reason and experience demonstrate that the people who get lost in the conversion from surplus commodities to food stamps are the poorest, the most miserable, and those most likely to go hungry without federal assistance.

I feel that the food stamp program is our best federal food program, best attuned to the principle of self-help and to our private food industry. But the surplus commodity program is vitally needed for emergency cases, and to help those who cannot meet the minimum requirements for food stamps.

I saw the portion of the television special "Hunger in America" which was filmed in San Antonio. Although I feel the program tended to overdramatize and failed to take the time to fully document and truthfully evaluate the extent of the problem, it served a good purpose. It translated the statistics on malnutrition into fellow humans. It showed the pitiful waste of human potential which still exists in our country. It revealed the loss of hope and the quiet despair which perpetrates the cycle of poverty.

I know that this committee will consider my proposals to improve federal food programs in the spirit in which I introduced them: in the commitment and trust that no one in this great country needs to go hungry.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for the Food Stamp bills recently introduced by Congresswoman Sullivan and over 100 other Members of Congress, including myself. These bills would extend the program for four more years.

Recently, much attention has been focused on the problem of hunger and malnutrition in the Nation. Today this Nation has all of the physical resources needed to insure every American a full and nutritious diet. We have the food, but we still have hungry and malnourished citizens in this country.

Much has been done by the Department of Agriculture's child feeding, Commodity Distribution and Food Stamp Programs, but much more needs to be done. The Commodity Distribution Program distributes surplus food commodities directly and the Food Stamp Program enables low-income households to buy more food with the money normally spent for food.

Much progress has been made during the decade of the sixties to make more and better food available to more hungry people.

IN CHILD FEEDING

In 1960—12.8 million children were eating balanced lunches under the National School Lunch Program. About 1.2 million children were receiving their lunches free or at a special token price; But in the 1968 school year—19.5 million children ate the Type A school lunch and 2.5 million were poor children who got a free lunch or paid a token price.

In 1960, there was no way to help poor schools with a large number of poor children, or to help them with a breakfast program, or to help them to buy essential equipment, or to help with feeding operations in non-school situations.

But in the 1968 School year—\$5 million was available to help poor schools serve more poor children; \$4.2 million was used as a base for further food services; and Congress provided new authority to move into non-school feeding programs.

IN NEEDY FAMILY FEEDING

In 1960—The Commodity Distribution Program was the only family feeding program offered in about 1,200 counties and areas; only five low-value foods worth, at retail, \$2.20 per person per month were offered; the program was helping 3.5 million needy people. Commodities were distributed in 370 of the 1,000 poorest counties.

In contrast, in 1968—the Food Stamp Program has been added and the Commodity Distribution Program has been improved and strengthened; sixteen foods are now available under the Commodity Distribution Program and six more will be added shortly; the Commodity Distribution and Food Stamp Programs are reaching 6.1 million people in 2,400 counties; and all of the 1,000 poorest counties are being or soon will be included.

Experience with the Food Stamp Program since 1961 demonstrates that it is a practical and prudent approach to the food problems of the poor. While it will not, of itself, assure that the food problems of the poor will be solved, program availability is the essential first step—the step upon which we can work to refine program operations in an effort to reach, and improve the diets of, all eligible needy families.

The Department of Agriculture is making striking progress and is stepping up its efforts to reach all of the people who are hungry. During the past year, major changes were made in the Food Stamp Program, which include: (1) a reduction in the purchase price of food stamps in the lowest-income category from \$2 per person per month to 50 cents. This means that a family of six or more who paid \$12 a month for \$70 or more worth of food coupons will pay \$3 and receive the same amount of coupons; (2) cutting the purchase price in half for the first month that a family participates; (3) hiring people who live in low-income neighborhoods to serve as "program aides" to help families to join the program. The results have been dramatic.

In April 1968 almost 2.5 million persons were participating in the Food Stamp Program in 1,027 project areas in 43 States and the District of Columbia. The total value of bonus coupons amounted to \$16.6 million dollars.

There are 239 project areas—already approved—waiting to begin operations. Of these, 166 wanted to open this May or June. But the Department of Agriculture had to ask them to postpone their openings because of a shortage of 1968 funds. The Department also has some 145 other areas that have officially requested the program and are anxious to start the program in 1969. Also, more requests are being received every day.

In my own district (Second District) of California, in April 1968, about 2,738 persons were participating in the Food Stamp Program in three counties—Lassen, Modoc, and Shasta—and the value of bonus coupons amounted to \$37,644. These bonus coupons provide added food purchasing power which enables participants to buy more and better food for improved diets. Also, the extra dollars that move into a food stamp community act as a stimulus to the entire economy of the area.

In the State of California in April 1968, 192,364 persons participated in the Food Stamp Program in ten counties, and the value of bonus coupons amounted to over a million dollars. Last December the Secretary of Agriculture designated Alameda County to operate the Food Stamp Program, but lack of funds has deferred its opening until the next fiscal year beginning in July. Requests for the program have been received from two more counties in California, but their designation is contingent upon availability of funds during the next fiscal year.

It has become clear that the events of the past year have placed new demands upon the Food Stamp Program.

More poor people are coming in to be certified in counties that have the stamp program, as program provisions are being refined.

More counties want the program and they should have it.

And more assistance should be provided to those already being reached.

Food Stamps do provide the most practical and efficient way to meet the food problems of poor families. Stamps provide the low-income family with the means for a wider, more varying needs of the family.

The food stamp approach has strong support and appeal among the State and local officials to whom USDA looks to get the food assistance job done.

As one of the co-authors, I, therefore, strongly support the identical bills H.R. 17721 through 17725. These bills provide for a four-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations. But, to assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decisions, the bills require specific

rules for an in-depth Congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. It will thus permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. A four-year authorization will remove the uncertainties which the States now face about the future of the program, and will implement the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year program expansion. The national need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for such action.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I thank you for this opportunity of appearing before you and expressing my views with respect to H.R. 17721, a bill that I co-sponsored, which would eliminate the present dollar limitation on appropriations for the Food Stamp Program for fiscal year 1969, and to provide authorization for appropriations for the three subsequent fiscal years.

The Food Stamp Program was inaugurated in Hawaii in the City and County of Honolulu on April 12, 1966. Some 3,057 welfare families were initially certified as being eligible to participate in the program, and within 30 days approximately 300 low-income families had applied. The program was eventually expanded to include the three remaining counties in Hawaii. In April 1968, the most recent month for which Department of Agriculture statistics are available, 11,633 persons in the State of Hawaii were participating in the program and the total amount of the bonus coupons was \$74,303. Exclusive of the bonus coupons for the months of May and June, bonus coupons in the amount of \$565,476 have been distributed during the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am sure that the figures for my State are representative of the other counties in other States where the Food Stamp Program is in force. Its almost instant success goes to prove that this program is not only an effective instrument in the war on poverty, but it is also an expression of the beneficent spirit of America. In our land of plenty, there is no reason why our Nation's abundance of food should not be utilized to the maximum extent practicable to safeguard the health and well-being of our Nation's population and raise levels of nutrition among economically needy households.

The elimination of the dollar limitation which is proposed in H.R. 17721 would make possible the implementation of the Food Stamp Program at a level which would eliminate a certain amount of selectivity among the people who are in need of its assistance, and bring its benefits to all who are the intended beneficiaries of the program. I am fully cognizant of some of the dangers which surround an "open-ended" authorization such as this, but I am also confident that the very nature of the program and the purpose it is intended to serve would at least discourage, if not completely prevent abuse.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, for the reasons I have stated I strongly recommend that H.R. 17721 be given favorable consideration.

Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE P. MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to join with Mrs. Sullivan in co-sponsoring H.R. 17722, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and I am pleased and proud to speak on behalf of it now.

This program is of vital interest and concern not only to the Congress but the country as a whole.

The necessity of assuring an adequate diet for the needy is an urgent matter. We must not delay in funding this program and, as stated in the bill, we must appropriate "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972."

No sadder picture can be conjured up in the mind than that of a hungry child.

Let us proceed now to take the necessary steps to erase that picture.

Let us provide the funds so that the counties which were supposed to enter the Food Stamp Program this year and those as far back as last year may now be able to participate.

Let us begin now to alleviate the problem of malnutrition in this country.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to cosponsor H.R. 17722 and to testify before the Committee on its behalf.

The ceiling on appropriations for food stamps should be eliminated this year, and authority provided to extend the legislation, allowing leeway to appropriate sums as may be deemed necessary in 1970, 1971 and 1972.

As a matter of conscience we cannot do less.

In a country whose gross national product is well over \$800 billion, and median family income \$8,000, it is incredible that we also have 10 million Americans who are chronically malnourished.

The CBS documentary, "Hunger in America", if it did not tell the whole story, told enough to make action imminent.

Besides physical, cultural and emotional damage, evidence has also shown that malnutrition, in the first three years of life—particularly when the human brain grows rapidly to reach 80% of adult size—may impair intelligence rapidly.

While I applaud the efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has brought more counties into this self-help Food Stamp Program, initiated the school breakfast and lunch programs, reduced the purchase minimum for food stamps, and increased the variety of items of surplus food to be distributed, clearly everyone has not been reached. The Secretary himself has personally testified to this fact.

While it is also true that the success of the Food Stamp Program rests on a cooperative federal-state-local structure, it is also true that because of the present ceiling, many counties who have requested food stamp programs, and been certified for them, will not be able to participate.

In Allegheny County, where the city of Pittsburgh, which I represent, is located, the most recent monthly figures indicate that \$306,000 in bonus coupons were made available to serve 51,000 participants. I would like to see this opportunity made available to every county in the United States.

Studies have shown that there is want, there is also restlessness, hopelessness, frustration and violence.

That is why I have consistently supported the Food Stamp Program, and why I have introduced legislation to establish a Commission on Hunger, H.R. 17145, to establish better ways for coordinating programs among the agencies striving to fulfill the hunger needs of our people. This is why I would support measures to give the Secretary authority to use Section 32 funds—which he is now prohibited to do—for food stamp programs.

It is my hope that we can delete the ceiling on appropriations for this program now—or at the very least provide for the \$245 million which the Senate has already authorized, to ensure nutritious, balanced diets for all American families.

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear in support of legislation submitted by 121 other members and me from 30 States to expand the food stamp program.

H.R. 17725 and other identical bills would provide for a four-year authorization to fund the existing food stamp program at such a level as may be needed. I fully realize that the proposed legislation is somewhat of a departure from the long-standing principles of stating exact dollar limitations in authorizations for appropriation of Federal funds. However, I am fully convinced that the proposed safeguards of including specific reporting requirements for the Secretary of Agriculture will (1) provide adequate opportunity for the Congress to evaluate the adequacy of all supporting information prior to the time of appropriation; and (2) permit maximum flexibility in the proper management of the food stamp program.

This flexible approach seems to me to be highly desirable since we are dealing with a special program which warrants special treatment. In our rich Nation surely there is no need for Americans who cannot work suffering from hunger or malnutrition. The flexible approach envisioned by H.R. 17725 and other identical bills would be to authorize, for the next four fiscal years, such appropriations as may be justified in the light of the then current situation.

Mr. Chairman, in my State of Alaska there are many families residing in extreme and abject poverty. A recent study showed that the median family income of the natives in the Yukon-Kuskokwin Delta regions of southwestern Alaska is slightly more than \$1,400 annually. In Alaska, where there is a minimum cost differential of 25 percent, the actual effective purchasing power of this median family income is only \$1,050 for all the basic necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program appears to be a reasonable solution to stretching the purchasing power of the food dollar in a severely limited budget. Elimination of hunger and malnutrition in this great and rich Nation is an objective which cannot be postponed or set aside, but is one which must be met squarely if those who cannot work are to be given the chance to survive. Accordingly, I urge your favorable consideration of H.R. 17725 and other identical bills.

STATEMENT OF HON. MELVIN PRICE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the Chairman, Mr. Poage, for providing this opportunity to offer a statement for the Record of Hearings on extending the Federal Food Stamp Program.

Recent disclosures about the extent of malnutrition in this country indicate much more needs to be done in this area during this Congress. The Food Stamp Program is a humane, effective response to the plight of those who eat less in quantity and quality than you or I do every evening here in this city. It is also a self-help program because its participants help meet the cost of it. It has been determined that it cost "the Government \$6.20 per month, per person to provide a low-income family with a adequate diet. At the same time, the participant's family contributes to their own well-being by meeting the remaining two-thirds of the costs.

The Federal Food Stamp Program has grown from an eight county pilot program in 1964 to where nearly 1,000 counties participate now. More than 300 additional counties will become eligible to participate this year. In recent weeks the Secretary of Agriculture has announced a stepped up effort to add more counties to this list.

Certainly then, there can be little question among those of us who have had some experience with the program that it has been an overwhelming success. However, there is room for disagreement over the extent of this program, its financing, and its authorized duration.

Personally I find that I am compelled by the logic of fact to support the views of my respected colleague, Rep. Leonor Sullivan of St. Louis, Missouri. In pursuance of this oneness of view, I happily cosponsored H.R. 17721 with Mrs. Sullivan. This is one of the bills the Committee considers today.

As you all know, H.R. 17721 would remove the present authorization ceiling of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and inserts in its place permission to spend such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the 1964 Food Stamp Act. It would also provide for a three-year authorization beyond fiscal 1969.

This bill, of course, differs from Chairman's Poage's H.R. 15896, which would increase the authorization for 1969 from its present level of \$225,000,000 to \$245,000,000 in order to provide sufficient funds for the 100 counties in the country that qualified for a Food Stamp Program at the beginning of this fiscal year. Some of these counties would not be included in the program at this authorization level and would be included at the level provided in Chairman Poage's Bill.

But there is no assurance that at the level of authorization provided by the Chairman's Bill we would be able to meet additional unexpected needs caused by increased participation by the poor in the projects that are underway. Apparently, more and more poor families in areas which now have the program have begun to recognize the great value of the Food Stamp Program and have considerably increased their participation. It is unlikely that this trend will abate, and most likely as we increase the number of counties participating in the program it will accelerate.

The logic of these facts dictate in my mind that we provide for an open ended authorization with appropriate safeguards to protect our Constitutional Authority to control financing and this Committee's authority evidenced by its expertise in this area. Under an open ended authorization we would be able to appropriate the funds necessary to meet the needs of the participant under this program.

With the built in safeguard of the required report by the Secretary of Agriculture under this program and your right to check on the details of its effectiveness would be protected.

Therefore I urge the Committee to accept as a minimum an open authorization in this area as urged by your many colleagues from urban and rural areas who joined Mrs. Sullivan in this effort. I would also commend to the Committee if it sees merit in the proposal the extension of the authorization for an additional three years beyond fiscal 1969 so that more effective planning of implementation of its programs can be brought about under the stable legal background provided for under a longer term authorization.

Again let me express my appreciation to the Committee for considering my views. I hope that you will act favorably on them.

STATEMENT OF HON. OGDEN REID, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to indicate my support for H.R. 17722, of which I was one of the cosponsors, and related bills, to remove the authorization ceiling for the food stamp program.

I think that all of us have seen and heard enough in the last several months to leave no doubt in our minds that hunger and malnutrition exist in the United States. These conditions have been documented to be especially severe in 256 counties in widely scattered areas of the nation.

Existing food programs—surplus food and food stamps—have been shown to be inadequate in meeting the nutritional needs of these Americans. Whatever the ultimate answer to the problem, we cannot be content with a long-range solution when Americans go hungry, when children suffer permanent brain damage because they have not received the necessary protein for normal growth by the age of four. Action is demanded now if we have among us Americans who cannot afford to buy even the basic foods that the Department of Agriculture recommends as essential to a balanced diet, and if the assistance programs offered by that Department do not even contain those foods although they could easily be made available.

One step that we can take is to provide an open-ended authorization for the food stamp program, thus enabling additional counties to participate in the program and, hopefully, making it more feasible for needy families to obtain food stamps. It is useful for a family to make a contribution toward acquiring stamps when they can afford to do so, but if they cannot, consideration should be given to supplying surplus foods or free food stamps until the family can earn a few dollars.

All Americans will not have a balanced diet under this proposal, but perhaps several million more will not suffer the pain, indignity and incapacitation of constant hunger.

I hope that the Committee will recognize that lack of food does not stem from a personal failing but that it results in a physical and psychological limitation—and is therefore a national responsibility.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES A. VANIK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

I appreciate this opportunity to testify before the Agriculture Committee on legislation to amend the operation of the Food Stamp program.

The Food Stamp program as it is presently funded in my county, is considered one of the most important and most successful endeavors of the Federal Government. In Cleveland, we believe that it has done more to fight poverty than any other Federal program. It has been calculated that in my county the poor have been able to increase their food purchases by over 25 percent through the use of Food Stamps.

In March of this year alone, 74,117 residents of Cuyahoga County in low income families or on welfare have received the benefits of the Food Stamp program. These benefits has amounted to nearly half a million dollars worth of food over each of the first nine months of fiscal 1968. Between July, 1967 and March, 1968, \$4,262,178 has been distributed in the form of Food Stamps to those residents of

Cuyahoga County who would not otherwise have been able to receive adequate food.

And this money, in the form of food stamps and bonus coupons, has been carefully directed to the people who are in need. The program satisfies basic human needs. It has not been a give-away program, because the people involved have had to purchase stamps with their own money, or out of their small public assistance grants.

It is my belief that a program which is as successful as the Food Stamp program has been should be extended to all those countries which desire to participate in it. Under the present authorization ceiling of \$195 million, there are many countries which desire to participate in the program which have been unable to utilize the benefits of Food Stamps. Many countries have been authorized to participate but are prohibited by the limit on expenditures. Even if the authorization is increased to \$245 million, as provided for in legislation which passed the Senate, all the countries which want to participate still could not.

For this reason, I have sponsored legislation to expand the Food Stamp program by providing "such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years" 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972.

An examination of the counties in the State of Ohio which cannot yet participate in the Food Stamp Program clearly shows that the program should be extended to these counties. At the present time, 49 Ohio counties participate and fourteen Ohio counties have requested to enroll in the program. When Ohio's counties are ranked by the size of their median income, seven of the fourteen counties interested in enrolling fall among the poorest half of Ohio's 88 counties.

There are 25 other Ohio counties which do not participate but which may soon become interested. An examination of these counties dramatically shows that the door to the Food Stamp program should be left open to them, for there is a heavy concentration of the poorest counties in this group. Of the twenty-five, seventeen rank in the lowest half of the State's 88 counties. Included in this group are the fifth, ninth, and very lowest counties in terms of median income.

I believe that, if the authorization level is increased to allow all these counties, including many of the very poorest counties, to participate, it will slow the tremendous in-migration to urban centers of residents of rural areas who have none of the skills needed for employment in the Nation's cities.

For fourteen years, I have voted in the House of Representatives in favor of farm legislation. One of the only reasons that I can see to justify my support of agricultural programs is the food stamp program. It is incumbent upon the agricultural sector of the county to extend this fine program to the poor in all counties of the Nation.

STATEMENT OF HON. LESTER L. WOLFF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be heard by the Committee on Agriculture in support of H.R. 17724. I co-sponsored this bill with a strong commitment, as it provides that very necessary steps be taken to bring to fulfillment a program I consider essential to the well-being of the Nation.

The Food Stamp Act of 1964 is designed to satisfy basic nutritional requirements of vast numbers of our people who suffer from needless malnutrition and hunger. It is a measure that could go a long way to closing the gap between the standard nutritional level of the poor in our society and the significantly higher level of nutrition enjoyed by the rest of the American people.

But, Mr. Chairman, however admirable the intent of this act may be, it will never be able to accomplish its aims without the full financial backing it requires. We should spare no effort in our attempt to relieve the urgent needs of the undernourished and underfed of our population. To hesitate now would be to neglect inexcusably our responsibilities to these people. Inadequate diets cause severe suffering; we need not countenance this most basic hardship while it is in our power to remedy it.

This Government expends approximately four billion dollars annually to plow crops underground. We should be filling people's stomachs before filling holes in the ground. This is a land of wealth; we cannot afford to waste its gigantic resources while people are not being properly fed. No one should have to be a victim of malnutrition in this Nation.

Moreover, malnutrition is a source of indolence. Poorly fed people can make no real contribution to the labor force, for malnutrition is debilitating and is self-perpetuating. Undernourishment saps a person of the energy necessary to pursue an education. Thus, besides our responsibilities to provide for the basic human need for a nutritious diet, we face here a matter of practical investment in regard to this country's future.

As the distinguished Congresswoman from Missouri pointed out in her speech before the House on May 1, new food stamp legislation is necessary not only to provide essential opportunities for future expansion of the program, but to provide immediate action to make possible the expansion in the program which was announced last December. Without our action now, numerous areas of the country designated for inclusion in the Food Stamp Program will be unable to participate. We cannot allow inaction now to impede the growth of this most vital and worthwhile program.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of specific features of the Food Stamp Act that I regard as especially noteworthy, and which, as I see it, make it imperative for us to preserve the effectiveness of that Act by amending it in accordance with the provisions of H.R. 17724.

The Food Stamp Program now encompasses nearly one-third of all the counties in the United States. It undertakes the urgent battle against malnutrition, not by means characteristic of welfare states, but by utilizing the channels of trade which operate within our free enterprise system. The program encourages self-assertion on the part of the participants by making them party to, rather than passive recipients of, a program which serves their needs. Furthermore, it avoids the debilitating effects of a free food program, one which would cost the Government three times as much without increasing the number of participants.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite another fact which strikes me as immensely significant: For the indigent, it can require as little as 50 cents per person per month to obtain sufficient food stamps for an entire month. Obviously, this amount of money, without the aid of the Food Stamp Program, could not possibly keep a family from starvation. Yet this same expenditure, with food stamps, assures a family an adequate diet for a month. What this means in terms of the health and well-being of the very, very poor is self-evident.

The Food Stamp Program must be continued. We must look to the future, and we must try to provide for the needs of the future as thoroughly as we are able. In providing for a four-year authorization of funds for this Program, H.R. 17724 answers this requirement. It gives us assurance that the Program will be able to grow if demand for it increases.

We should remember that our long-range aim in this matter is to eliminate the need for the Food Stamp Program entirely. But unless we give this Program maximum effort now, we are not entitled to hope for the eventual disappearance of the problem. Until that time, Congress must proceed surely and steadily towards this goal by means of programs such as that we are now considering.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think that the provisions of H.R. 17724, to remove the unduly restrictive ceiling on appropriations for this Program, while at the same time allowing for a continuing reexamination of the Program in the form of an annual report by the Secretary of Agriculture, will lead to needed changes and improvements in the Program. These are provisions which must be faithfully enacted on behalf of the needy of America for the Nation's well-being.

DETROIT, MICH., June 24, 1968.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN POAGE: The Food Industry Council of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce has long supported the Food Stamp Act as an effective tool to assist the Nation's economically poor and disadvantaged.

It is our belief, however, that the Food Stamp Program has been abused to the disadvantage of the program and the Nation's poor. This abuse of the program exists because of an interpretation of eligibility requirements established by the state agency and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture as provided for in Section 5 (b) of the Food Stamp Act. Here is a specific example.

Ford Motor Company hourly employees struck the company on September 6. They were not eligible to receive Food Stamp Program benefits until September 20. During the month of October 1967, 3,809 families consisting of 16,970 persons participated in the Food Stamp Program under category C (strikers). We under-

stand that category C was initiated and approved after the start of the Ford strike.

These families purchased \$157,420 in stamps and received \$115,751 in bonus stamps for a grand total of \$273,171 of food purchasing power. The Ford strikers were sent to two offices: 640 Temple (East) and Wayne County General Hospital (West). There was one extra office set up in Wayne County General Hospital, with personnel being changed from job to job to keep up with the increased traffic.

In our judgment, the Food Stamp Program was not intended to be made available to any individual who is voluntarily and temporarily unemployed because of the self-determined strike. We urge Congress to enact the necessary legislation to correct this abuse and exclude strikers from the Food Stamp Program benefits.

G. MERRIT MARTIN, *General Manager,*
Business-Government Relations Division,
Greater Detroit Board of Commerce.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1968.

Hon. W. R. (BOB) POAGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: I would appreciate it very much if you would make this letter a part of the record of the hearings on the Food Stamp Program held by the full House Committee on Agriculture, June 11 and 12, 1968.

Delegates to our 1968 convention made a brief but very positive statement in regard to programs to take care of the needy. The delegates said:

"Adequate Consumption.

"Needy families and individuals should have the opportunity to participate in a market-basket food and clothing stamp program, to include cotton mattresses. The Food Stamp Program should be expanded and liberalized. We support extension of expanded school lunch and milk programs."

Let the record be clear that we are in support of the Agriculture Department's efforts beginning seven years ago to make the Food Stamp Program the effective means that it is to cope with the problem of malnutrition and hunger.

Farmers Union is a pioneer supporter of this program. Our history of support pre-dates the beginning of the program by at least a decade. Moreover, we were supporters of the program in the forties when it was in effect from a brief period until World War II ended it.

The success of the program in meeting the objectives for which it was designed has been demonstrated.

The report of Secretary Freeman to the Committee as to the accomplishments of the program is further evidence as to its worth. But even though the program has been increased many fold since it began there remains unmet need. As long as there is hunger and malnutrition among us, we take the position that our Nation cannot turn aside but must act with dispatch to erase both the hunger and the basic ills that it signifies.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we want the record to show clearly that Farmers Union strongly supports the efforts of those in the Congress who would provide the opportunity to assess the need for the program without monetary restrictions being placed upon such deliberations. We agree in this connection with Secretary Freeman that to assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decisions, bills to provide a 4-year authorization with no specific monetary limits warrants support of the members of the House Agriculture Committee. We hope that the Committee will take action to approve such legislation.

Sincerely,

REUBEN L. JOHNSON,
Director of Legislative Services.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nothing further to come before the committee and there are no further witnesses to be heard—

Mr. FOLEY. I do not want to be heard but, if permitted, I would like to introduce some constituents of mine from my State, Mr. and Mrs. Stan Burt, of Wenatchee, Wash.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman is not going to say that he recognizes them, but we are glad to have them here. Let me go off the record.

(Discussion was had outside the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)



in our judgment, the Food Stamp Program is a very important part of the Nation's food program. It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.

It is a program that has helped millions of people to get the food they need to live. We are proud to have it as a part of our Nation's food program.