

1032

9074
Ag 8/2
F73/21

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

GOVERNMENT

Storage

HEARING BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY UNITED STATES SENATE NINETIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 953

A BILL TO AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS SUBSEQUENT TO THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967

APRIL 25, 1967

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1967

78-504

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

4
4
Ag 8/2
F73/21

KSU LIBRARIES
A 11500 694609

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Aiken, Hon. George D., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont	43
Byrd, Hon. Robert C., a U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia	3
Conway, Jack T., executive director, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO	55
Davis, Howard P., Deputy Administrator, Consumer Food Programs, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture	29
Dechant, Tony T., president, National Farmers Union	35
Durrett, Milton R., manager, Alabama Food Council, Alabama Merchants Association, Birmingham, Ala.	53
Freeman, Hon. Orville L., Secretary of Agriculture	14
Graham, Harry L., legislative representative, National Grange	30
Hamer, Mrs. Fannie Lou, Commission on the Delta Ministry, National Council of the Churches of Christ, Ruleville, Miss.	44
Horn, Mrs. Etta, vice chairman, National Coordinating Committee of Welfare Rights Groups	47
Johnson, Reuben L., director, legislative services, National Farmers Union	34
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., a U.S. Senator from the State of New York	6
King, Ruben K., commissioner of the Department of Pensions and Security, State of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala.	52
Lynn, John C., legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation	55
McCall, Hon. Tom, Governor of the State of Oregon, Salem, Oreg.	54
Mitchiner, Mrs. Myra J., American Public Welfare Association, Raleigh, N.C.	37
Pinson, Clarence M., Western Grain Co., Birmingham, Ala.	53
Sampson, Tim, staff associate, Poverty Rights Action Center	48
Sickels, Harvey, secretary, National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa	55
Sparkman, Hon. John, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alabama	52
Thompson, Winifred G., Director, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia	50
Wallace, Hon. Lurleen B., Governor of the State of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala.	52
Miscellaneous documents—	
S. 953, 90th Congress	1
Letter from the Department of Agriculture requesting enactment of draft bill	2
Staff explanation of S. 953	2
Food stamp program statistics for selected months	14
Participation and coupon value by project area	15

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1967

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
AND GENERAL LEGISLATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m., in room 324, Old Senate Office Building, Senator B. Everett Jordan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jordan, Byrd of Virginia, Young of North Dakota, and Boggs.

Also present: Senator Aiken.

Senator JORDAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

I would like to read an opening statement on S. 953.

The subcommittee is holding hearings today on S. 953, which would extend the authority for the appropriation of funds to carry out the food stamp program indefinitely. At present the Food Stamp Act of 1964 authorizes appropriations to carry out the program only through June 30 of this year.

The House Committee on Agriculture has reported a similar bill, H.R. 1318, with amendments authorizing appropriations only for fiscal 1968; limiting such appropriation to not more than \$195 million; and requiring States, beginning in fiscal 1970, to contribute 20 percent of that part of the coupon cost not borne by participating families.

There is inserted in the record at this point a copy of S. 953, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture dated March 2, 1967, requesting enactment of this legislation, and a staff explanation of this bill.

Good morning, Senator Kennedy. We are glad to have you here. We just started off.

The bill will be inserted at this time, with a letter from the Secretary to Vice President Humphrey, and following that the staff explanation, and then the statement by Senator Robert Byrd, the author of this bill.

(The documents referred to follow:)

[S. 953, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967

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 is amended by striking out "and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year" and substituting therefor "and for each subsequent fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1967.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, P.L. 88-525.

This bill would amend Section 16 of the Food Stamp Act. It would provide appropriation authority for fiscal years beyond 1967. No other change in the substantive legislative authorities for the Food Stamp Program is deemed necessary at this time.

P.L. 88-525, approved by the President on August 31, 1964, contemplated the progressive expansion of the program—over the period of the next several years—to those States and political subdivisions that desired to participate. That Act, however, provided appropriation authorities only through the fiscal year 1967. It is necessary, therefore, that Section 16 of the Act be amended to provide appropriation authorities to implement that policy of orderly and progressive program expansion.

When the Food Stamp Act was approved, the program was then operating in 43 areas—in 22 States—in which the food stamp approach had been carefully tested during a 3-year "pilot" period. Since then, the pace of the authorized expansion has, in fact, not kept pace with requests from States for the program. Nonetheless, by the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the program will be operating in about 800 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In requesting appropriation authority beyond 1967, it is contemplated that the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion would be continued. Such a policy would continue to permit State welfare agencies and this Department to provide the administrative organization and program supervision that is needed to insure the effective and efficient use of Federal funds in support of program objectives.

Action to assure States that the program will be continued beyond June 30, 1967, should be taken at the earliest possible date. If the future of the program for the next fiscal year remains in doubt, States will hesitate to complete 1967 fiscal year expansion plans—much less undertake the longer range plans to build the administrative organization needed to adequately supervise already operating programs.

The actual level of the annual appropriation for each fiscal year beyond 1967 would be determined by the Congress under the annual appropriation process. Additionally, because the proposed bill is concerned only with the continuation of appropriation authorities, it would not affect program cost or employment requirements for the program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Staff Explanation of S. 953

(SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4)

Short explanation

Extends Food Stamp Program. Section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 now authorizes appropriations to carry out the program only through June 30, 1967. The bill would authorize appropriations of such amounts as may be needed for all subsequent years.

Facts about the program

The program is designed to provide needy households with a means of obtaining a nutritionally adequate diet. Pursuant to approved State plans, participating households exchange the amount of money they normally expend for food for food coupons of higher monetary value. The coupons are used to purchase food in approved retail stores, which then exchange the coupons for funds appropriated to carry out the program. Certification of eligible households and issuance of coupons is the responsibility of the State agency administering federally aided public assistance programs. The poorest families pay about \$2.00 per person for about \$10 worth of coupons per person. The average family in the program pays about 64 percent of the value of the coupons it receives.

History

A food stamp plan was operated by the Department of Agriculture between 1939 and 1943 under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. In September 1959, a food stamp program was explicitly authorized by P.L. 86-341 for the period ending January 31, 1962. This authority was not exercised, but in 1961 a pilot food stamp program was undertaken pursuant to section 32 of Public Law 320.

When the Food Stamp Act of 1964 was passed in August 1964, about 351,000 persons were participating in 43 pilot areas in 22 States. In January 1967, about 1.4 million persons were participating in 589 areas in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

The 1964 Act authorized appropriations not exceeding \$75 million for fiscal 1965, \$100 million for fiscal 1966, and \$200 million for fiscal 1967. S. 953 authorizes appropriation of such sums as may be necessary in the future.

House committee action

On March 20, the House Committee on Agriculture ordered H.R. 1318 (companion to S. 953) reported with amendments authorizing appropriations only for fiscal 1968, limiting such appropriation to not more than \$195 million, and requiring States beginning in fiscal 1970, to contribute 20 percent of that part of the coupon cost not borne by participating families.

Departmental views

The Department of Agriculture requested enactment.

Objections in file

None. The National Cotton Council and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference have asked to be notified if hearings are held.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

I am the sponsor of S. 953, providing for the indefinite continuation of the Federal Food Stamp Program, so that this vital assistance to needy families may be provided on a stabilized basis. Otherwise, many deserving persons may not be able to purchase all the food they so greatly need.

For those of us who have watched the operations of this program since its inception, it is not comprehensible that a weapon of this tremendous value in the battle for improved standards of living can be permitted to lapse, or that the constant threat of lapsing will be permitted to impair its usefulness.

The people who have received the food stamps have benefited from it directly by receiving the "bonus" buying power, which they provide, and the communities in which they have been used have been economically benefited. I have had a steady flow of letters telling me of the visual evidence of the good which has been gained from the additional food for needy families in West Virginia, who have been eligible for participation in the food stamp program. School officials and teachers have pressed for its continuance in West Virginia and its expansion within the State to cover all of its counties, because of their personal observations that the children receiving extra food at home, through the program, are visually more alert and capable of progressively advancing the level of their school work.

West Virginia inaugurated this program as a pilot study in December 1961 and since its beginning in one West Virginia county it has spread to 589 counties in 41 States. I am told that it is estimated that approximately 1.4 million people share in the benefits of the food stamps in these 41 States and the District of Columbia.

In West Virginia, the program is operating in 40 counties, with an additional 8 expected to begin food stamp operations in early May. The total appropriation for the operation of the program for FY 1967 was \$140,000,000. If the present appropriations request for operation of the program during 1968 is approved—\$195,000,000—it will allow a reasonable amount of expansion during 1968, and it is hoped that the remaining seven of West Virginia's 55 counties can be blanketed in.

The following table will provide statistics on the operation of the Food Stamp Program in West Virginia:

West Virginia food stamp program

SELECTED STATISTICS

A. Program expansion

The following table shows the expansion of the program since June 1965:

	<i>Participants</i>
June 1965 (4 counties) -----	29, 060
June 1966 (19 counties) -----	72, 086
February 1967 (40 counties) -----	93, 640

Eight additional counties are scheduled to enter the program in May 1967.

The State welfare agency has requested the program for the remaining seven counties in the State.

B. Coupon issuance

The following table shows for each fiscal year since the beginning of the pilot program in West Virginia, the total value of coupons issued, the amount of federally financed bonus coupons issued and the total cash payments by participants:

Fiscal year	Total coupons issued	Bonus coupons	Cash paid by participants
1962 ¹ -----	\$2, 817, 352	\$1, 335, 079	\$1, 482, 273
1963 -----	4, 773, 248	2, 011, 542	2, 761, 706
1964 -----	5, 992, 093	2, 396, 728	3, 595, 365
1965 -----	5, 766, 852	2, 258, 477	3, 508, 375
1966 -----	10, 672, 277	4, 348, 925	6, 323, 352
July 1966 through February 1967 -----	10, 877, 629	4, 432, 732	6, 444, 897
Total -----	40, 899, 451	16, 783, 483	24, 115, 968

¹ Includes June 1961 issuance.

C. Impact of the amendment requiring States to pay 20% of the cost of bonus coupons commencing in fiscal year 1970

Under a fully expanded Statewide program, it is possible, that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969 the issuance of bonus coupons in West Virginia could amount to \$12,000,000. In this event, the proposed amendment to the Food Stamp Act would require the State to pay 20% of the cost of these bonus coupons—\$2,500,000—in addition to the intra-State costs of the program.

On the National level, I am advised that the cost of the Food Stamp Program from December 1, 1961, through December 31, 1966, amounted to \$202,808,734. Added to this amount, families receiving the stamps spent another \$342,574,529, for a total food expenditure of \$545,383,263.

I note that comments have been made in the House of Representatives, in considering similar legislation to my bill, that the value of the Food Stamp Program does not match that of the Federal school lunch and commodity distribution programs. To that, I can answer that the nutritional problems of the State of West Virginia and similar regions throughout the United States persist despite the hard work of State and Federal officials in the administration and distribution of foodstuffs under these two other programs.

The commodity distribution program is heavily restricted in the variety of food distributed, so that there is always a built-in danger of poor nutrition from lack of certain essential nutrients. The school lunch program does indeed benefit the children in attendance at schools, but what about the other members of families—the elderly at home—the expectant mothers—to mention two classifications of family members certainly in need of balanced nutritional values. What about the needs of the pre-school children?

There is an additional benefit to be derived from the administration of the Food Stamp Program—it has an accelerating effect on businesses in the communities participating in it, generating new economic activity in an estimated ratio of \$7 for each \$1 in new money spent for food.

I would be pleased to answer questions as to the operations of the Food Stamp Program in West Virginia—operations which, from personal observation, convince me of the great merit of continuation of the program without crippling amendment or severely limiting the time factor.

Question:

I know West Virginia was the first State to start a pilot food stamp program back in 1961. And, as I recall, at that time the State was distributing the surplus foods in all countries. Since you have personally taken an interest in these programs, could you tell us why your State prefers the food stamp approach?

Answer:

1. West Virginia definitely prefers the food stamp approach. After seeing the actual results of the pilot test in four West Virginia counties—the State moved quickly to include other counties.

2. In fact, all but 7 of the 55 counties in the State will have food stamp programs by May of this year. And, our State Welfare Commissioner Lon Vincent has told me he wants to bring in the 7 other counties as soon as possible. I am very hopeful that those 7 counties can be brought in early in the next fiscal year.

3. I have followed these programs very closely, and I feel these are the reasons why West Virginia prefers the food stamp approach.

(a) It does provide low-income families with a more dignified way to obtain the extra food they want. And, it provides them with a greater variety of food and a better chance for a nutritious diet. And, of course, they are making a financial investment in the program.

(b) In addition to helping people, it gives an economic boost to the local economy. The additional dollars moving into the community in the form of extra coupons means more retail sales. The retailer buys more food from the wholesaler, and some have told me that they have had to put on more help.

This, of course, was not true of the surplus foods. But, that program was of tremendous help, before food stamp started.

(c) I also believe the Food Stamp Program is subject to better management and control. The State welfare agency can plan it better and provide the kind of staff to see that it is well supervised.

Frankly, it's very well accepted and supported throughout the State.

Question:

It has been said that States would not be able to operate the program if they had to finance part of the cost of the bonus coupons. Do you think that would be true in West Virginia?

Answer:

1. Very definitely. The State just would not be in a position to do that.

2. And, of course, the counties could not pick up the cost.

3. I believe the State would have to return to the surplus commodity program because it is not required to finance any part of the cost of the surplus foods themselves.

4. I do want to point out that West Virginia is now financing the cost of administering the Food Stamp Program within the State. The 1964 Act requires the State to use trained merit-system personnel in certifying families. The State also pays the cost of issuing the coupons.

It may well be that it is costing West Virginia somewhat more to run the Food Stamp Program than it did the surplus food program. But, they obviously believe the stamp program is worth it.

5. West Virginia is now under real pressure to raise the tax funds they need for their basic welfare programs.

Food stamps are a very valuable supplement to those welfare programs. But the State would just not be able to pay for part of free coupons.

6. If, in fact, West Virginia could afford the kind of welfare program that is needed, the State would not necessarily need to have food stamps in addition.

Question:

I've heard considerable talk that eligible people should receive the food stamps free of charge. Do you think they should?

Answer:

1. First, the idea that people should help themselves—in accordance with their ability—has always seemed to me to be a sound approach.

2. The families invest in the program, the amounts they have been spending for food. So, in this sense, the purchase requirement is not a cost. It's an exchange of the money they would have had to spend for food, for the food coupons that are worth more.

3. I am not in a position to say whether these purchase requirements—the exact amount families pay—need to be modified. But, I certainly concur in the principle behind the purchase requirement. This is what guarantees that the Federal subsidy will be used for more and better food.

4. If there is some question about the exact amount the families pay, I am sure this can be worked out with the people in the Department of Agriculture.

Question:

What do you think about running both the Food Stamp Program and the Commodity Distribution Program in the same county? Do you know if West Virginia would want that authority?

Answer:

1. Well, the State people have never talked to me about it.

2. I would want to point out that surplus foods can be made available if a disaster disrupts the normal commercial marketing of food.

3. We recently had some floods in West Virginia and the surplus foods were used to help out families during that emergency.

4. Frankly I don't believe the operation of two different programs to give food assistance to needy families would be very practical.

I do not believe West Virginia could afford to pay the increased administrative costs involved—they would have to store and distribute the surplus food and they would have to also pay the cost of issuing the stamps.

5. It seems to me that the stamp program is a flexible program that can be adjusted to meet the needs.

6. And, of course, any State or county can continue in the commodity program—they do not have to go into food stamps.

Question:

From the State's point of view, do you feel appropriations for the program should be authorized for more than a year at a time?

Answer:

1. Yes—as far as the authority is concerned. Of course, the Congress must look at the amount to be appropriated on a year-to-year basis.

2. The State does need some assurance that the program will continue and will be expanded in line with State and local requests.

3. In this way, they can plan in advance for the funds and the staff they need to operate and supervise the program.

4. The program has been carefully planned and supervised and I believe that a year-to-year extension would make it difficult for the States to continue the good job they have been doing.

Question:

It's been said that the program isn't flexible enough—that some poor families can't participate. Would you care to comment on that?

Answer:

1. That is a very broad question and I can only comment with respect to my own knowledge of the West Virginia experience.

2. I know our State welfare agency did have some problems, for example, in staffing up to meet certification standards for local personnel. But, these problems were worked out between the State people and the Department of Agriculture.

3. I believe I would reflect the feeling of our State Commissioner in saying that I have found the Agriculture people to be reasonable, practical people. If some modifications are needed, I believe these could be worked out.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Kennedy, we are glad to have you with us this morning, and we will be glad to hear from you at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you want me to read this statement or put it in the record?

Senator JORDAN. You can put it in the record in its entirety, or do as you please, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. Perhaps I will read a little bit of it.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express my support for S. 953 to continue and expand the food stamp program.

The program has received support from 41 States and the District of Columbia, and more communities and States want to initiate the program.

In my State, one project has been operating in Erie County since February 1966. Participation in this program averaged about 20,000 persons a month during the first year. These people received over \$1 million in additional food purchasing power.

An additional 14 areas—13 counties and one city—were designated for the program last November. Two of those 14 started the program on April 1 and the others are expected to begin shortly. The State welfare agency has indicated to the Department that it eventually plans to operate the program statewide if all counties are interested in participating.

Last October New York State requested the program also for New York City, hoping to begin in fiscal 1968. As many as 200,000 persons of low income in New York City may be eligible for the food stamps if this application is approved. This would bring some \$10 to \$15 million in added purchasing power to the city.

Of the 15 largest cities in the country, only two—New York and Boston—are not included in the program. The need for the program is evident when you realize that 70 percent of the people on welfare in the State of New York live in New York City.

To put this food stamp program in really means an improved diet for people there who are presently living on inadequate diets.

I should like to mention at this point my concern, which I think is shared by many, with the action taken by the House committee in adding an amendment to increase the State participation in the cost of the program to 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons. The Department estimates that States now provide about 7 percent of administrative costs through their work in certifying families and distributing coupons. At the project level of the program next year, the 20-percent requirement would mean \$40 million a year which the States would have to pay. It is estimated that New York would face \$4.4 million in additional costs. Coupled with the administrative costs of running the program, the State would have to provide a total of \$6 million. We are a wealthy State, Mr. Chairman, but, like every other State, have tax problems and financial problems. The State has just turned to a lottery because of those financial problems, and I know that other States also face the same kind of difficulties and will have a difficult time affording even this relatively small cost. So, I would hope that the committee would seriously consider the difficulty and problems that the House amendment might cause if it is added here in the Senate.

The House committee amendment would, in my opinion, cripple, and probably kill, the program. Costs to the States would rise to such a level that many States would have to drop out of the program. And it means that those who would obviously suffer from such an action are the recipients of the stamps: people on public assistance whose incomes do not permit them to spend enough for adequate amounts and kinds of food.

I was in Mississippi 2 weeks ago with the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. I saw conditions of extreme hunger and saw people who eat only one meal a day or one meal each day for a period of a couple days. I saw widespread and extreme malnutrition and seriously inadequate diets. Farmworkers who in the past have had only a few months of work are now losing even that meager income as mechanization removes their jobs.

These problems are not all in Mississippi. Only 11 percent of the poor have access to a food distribution system in Alabama—the food stamp or the commodity distribution program. In South Carolina, the figure is 1.6 percent and in Virginia, 1.9 percent. But there are also many who are hungry in my State and throughout the country.

That is why I believe the food stamp program is so important, why it should be continued without the 20-percent State requirement imposed by the House committee and why consideration should be given soon to ways in which the program can be improved so that more of the poor, including those with no income at all, can maintain an adequate diet. The food stamp program increases the amount of food welfare families receive by about 50 percent.

This program is not a system of handouts. It requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food and provides them with the opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money.

I cannot too strongly urge this committee to report out S. 953 in its present form. With this assurance that the program has a future, millions of low-income families in this country can continue to improve their diets and we can address ourselves to needed improvements in our food distribution plans so that more may benefit.

I might just add on our trip to Mississippi, Mr. Chairman, we did see children with distended stomachs and with sores on their lips because of malnutrition, and who are really kept alive because of the food stamp program and the assistance that they receive. They have been driven off the farms now because of mechanization, and I think to some extent, also, the minimum wage, as Senator McClellan said in the Senate last week, and they do not have any place to go. The only thing that they and their children live on is the food they get from the Federal Government. I think if we would have difficulty in New York, certainly Mississippi would have great difficulty in paying the extra 20 percent which would be required by the House action, and I know that those people in the delta, particularly, desperately need the program.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Boggs, do you have any questions?

Senator BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment Senator Kennedy for his appearance here and his presentation. We are glad to have your views and firsthand observations. Thank you very much.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Young.

Senator YOUNG. I thought it was a very fine statement, Senator.

I have been a cosponsor of this kind of legislation with Senator Aiken ever since I came to the Senate. I feel this is a fine program. The House requirement that the States provide 20 percent of the cost of the stamps may cause us some trouble. I know in the past I was always opposed to a requirement for local participation in the disaster

relief program but it was finally put into the legislation. However, it does appear there is some advantage if local interests have to put up a little money. There is a question whether it be 20 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent, but I think there is an advantage if local interests have to put up a little of the cost of these programs.

Secretary FREEMAN. Could I make a point here, that they do put up quite a little now because the cost of certification of the recipients is a very heavy burden and represents quite an investment of time and concern and participation. The normal good effect of requiring some local understanding and some local investment is more than met, I think, under this current requirement.

Senator YOUNG. This money is put by the individual counties?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, the State has to—you see, the State has to certify that the person is entitled to food stamps, which means they have got to interview them. It means that they have got to make a judgment as to their income, as to what they are spending for food, as to what they should be spending for food to have an optimum food income. And on that basis, why, then the food stamps are made available and a determination made as to how much they will be required to invest in order to get the number of stamps. So this does involve a rather considerable investment of personnel and money on the part of the States. This is not something that they just get without any effort on their own part.

Senator YOUNG. The State and the local political subdivisions do have to put up some money?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir, whether it is a local subdivision or the State, will depend on the local circumstances. But the financing of this whole machinery of certification is done by the county or the State in combination with the local people.

Senator BOGGS. The State or county has to run it.

Secretary FREEMAN. The State or county has to run the certification process.

Senator BOGGS. Will the Senator yield?

Senator YOUNG. Go ahead.

Senator BOGGS. From the State's standpoint, is it not cheaper to do this with the food stamp approach rather than distribute the surplus food?

Secretary FREEMAN. I suspect this is a close question but—you just have to match off. In the direct food, the detailed certification does not take place. That cost would not be nearly as great. On the other hand, then you get into the very physical problem of warehousing, of handling, of distributing.

Senator BOGGS. And this covers much more.

Secretary FREEMAN. This covers much more, and it gives people access to different kinds of food.

In effect, what we are doing is using our commercial distribution system, rather than duplicate it with other nonconventional distribution systems.

Senator BOGGS. Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Secretary, I just noticed here on this list, right now New York State, the cost of their program is \$1.5 million a

year. If you put up 20 percent of the bonus value, you would have \$4.4 million additional to pay.

Senator KENNEDY. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. Which would make \$5.9 million for New York State, and that same thing would be true all through the States, depending on the amount that they are now receiving.

Senator YOUNG. Would you yield there?

Senator JORDAN. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. Would the House provision of 20 percent be in addition to what they are paying now?

Senator JORDAN. It would be in addition to what is already there; that is correct. In other words, it would wind up at \$5.9 million—this is in New York—instead of \$1.5 million.

Senator Byrd, we are glad you got here.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being late.

Senator JORDAN. That is all right, that is customary. You are a little ahead of time, according to the usual procedure around here. But we have heard the testimony of Senator Byrd—I mean Senator Kennedy.

Senator KENNEDY. I do not mind getting mixed up.

Senator JORDAN. This is Senator Byrd's bill of—West Virginia—we have here. Do you have any questions on this food stamp bill?

Senator BYRD. Not at the present time.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

Are there any other questions?

Senator KENNEDY. Could I just take 30 seconds more of your time?

Senator JORDAN. Yes.

Senator KENNEDY. I would hope that the committee, maybe not right at the moment, but that it would consider some of the problems that are created by those who have no income at all. Many of these people whom we saw during our poverty hearings have been thrown out of work and do not have access to any income, so that therefore they cannot buy the stamps. The result is that they are living virtually on nothing and the children are living virtually on nothing. And as I say, there is a tremendous amount of hunger, not just among older people but among hundreds and hundreds of children whom we saw. And as I say also, here in the United States in 1967 we saw a lot of children with swollen stomachs just as you see them in India or Africa.

Senator JORDAN. That might be overeating. You cannot tell.

Senator KENNEDY. No, no, it wasn't; because I asked them what they ate, but in any case it creates a problem for them. And for those who cannot afford to buy the stamps, it is a serious problem as to how they are going to get any food.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator KENNEDY. I just bring it to the committee's attention.

Senator JORDAN. Well, thank you very much.

Senator BOGGS. Let me ask the Senator right there, in those cases where they are not able to buy the stamps, what is being done for them?

Senator KENNEDY. Nothing, really.

Senator BOGGS. Are they not on county or State general welfare of some kind?

Senator KENNEDY. A lot of them cannot come under welfare, and many of them are trying at least to leave that area, and they will end up, of course—in the group that we saw, they end up in the ghettos of the North and then try to go on relief there.

Senator BOGGS. But there is nothing to reach them.

Senator KENNEDY. Not really. The fact is they do not have anything to eat, and they cannot get what some of the other families live on.

Senator BOGGS. Can the surplus food—there is not much surplus, but can that reach them, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary FREEMAN. We do not duplicate in a county both the food stamp and the direct distribution. The problem to which Senator Kennedy refers is the fact that in some States, in some areas, the relief is not available. Where relief is available the amount of money, or whatever it is that is made available for food is then used as the investment for these stamps. But if there is not any relief, we just face the cold hard fact that there is nothing by which to make the investment required by law to get the stamps.

Now, the current level within the Department that we have felt should be a minimum is \$2 a month per person. And we have had under advisement for some time the question of what that amount should be in instances where there might not be any local relief program and thereby people literally having no source of income.

The other side of the coin in some instances is the basic philosophy and premise that the people in this program should put in what they have been spending for food so that they will not divert it to another use and end up in their diet no better than they were when they started.

That was a basic premise to this and the reason the food stamp broke down in the early period was because people would take the money they had been spending for food, put it for something else, and they ended up no better than when they started.

And as I say, that sum is under careful review now, and we felt that virtually everyone would be spending at least \$2 a month for food, and therefore that was the basis on which that was set, but some of the subsequent developments and the results of some of our investigations, the results of the committee investigation which Senator Kennedy referred to in Mississippi, have resulted in some more review and investigation of this. We have it under review—under active consideration to this very moment possibly lowering that amount.

Senator BOGGS. I must say, Senator, it is a very, very pitiful sight.

Secretary FREEMAN. Because they are the ones we are trying to get at, too.

Senator KENNEDY. It is very disheartening when you see a child 7, 8, 9 years old, an American child, and you ask him what he had for breakfast—molasses, and you ask him what he had for lunch, and he did not have anything, and you ask his mother what she expects to feed him for dinner—and you find out it is going to be beans. That is what he is living on all the time, and they do not go to school. They cannot go to school, because, of course, they do not have any clothes.

Senator BOGGS. I do hope before this committee finishes that you have a recommendation along that line because it appears we are missing the very ones we must cover, somehow or other.

Senator KENNEDY. There is a great and most acute need.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Secretary a question?

Senator JORDAN. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. You are buying beef now, are you not?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. For what purposes is this beef used?

Secretary FREEMAN. It goes in the school lunch program.

Senator YOUNG. None of this beef is being used for relief or the food stamp program?

Secretary FREEMAN. No; well, it would not go to the food stamp program, you see, because the food stamp recipient would get this by buying it at the store. That is the function of the food stamp program. They buy it in the normal commercial outlets. But we have never, with a few exceptions, distributed on direct distribution perishables, because, generally speaking, there are not the physical conditions for adequate storage to get this kind of thing, such as fresh meats, to people who are the recipients of direct distribution of foods. They get canned meat. They will get canned meat but not fresh meat.

Senator YOUNG. When cattle prices were down, I believe it was in 1955, the Department of Agriculture purchased around 860,000 head of cattle.

Secretary FREEMAN. About \$240 million worth of beef we bought in 1964.

Senator YOUNG. In some cases this was distributed for relief around the world.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, no; it was distributed in the United States, but it was canned meat, primarily, and we are still doing that.

Senator YOUNG. There was some given to foreign countries, too, for relief.

Secretary FREEMAN. I would have to check.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Secretary, there was a program to assist the Greek Army, but this was not a grant, I do not believe.

Secretary FREEMAN. Anyway, if it was—you may be right—it was a very small volume, but we are now, the question is we are now purchasing at about \$1 million level, and that would go in terms of fresh meat into schools, and some of it that we would purchase as canned or mixed pork and beef does go out through direct distribution. And we can find some, I think, in Mississippi and other places.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Any further questions?

Thank you very much, Senator Kennedy. We appreciate your statement very much. It will be carried in its entirety in the record.

Senator Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The complete statement of Senator Kennedy follows:)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express my support for S. 953 to continue and expand the food stamp program.

As you know, Public Law 88-525, the Food Stamp Act of 1964 authorized appropriations for three years until June 30, 1967. To insure the continuity of the program, authorizing legislation must be enacted by the Congress before that date.

The program has received support from 41 states and the District of Columbia. Six hundred and fifty projects are in operation involving more than two million low-income families. And many more communities and states wish to initiate the program.

In my state, one project has been operating in Erie County since February, 1966. Participation in this program averaged about 20,000 persons a month during the first year. These people received over \$1 million in additional food purchasing power.

An additional fourteen areas—thirteen counties and once city—were designated for the program last November. Two of those 14 started the program on April 1 and the others are expected to begin shortly. The State Welfare agency has indicated to the Department that it eventually plans to operate the program statewide if all counties are interested in participating.

Last October, New York State requested the program also for New York City, hoping to begin in fiscal 1968. This application is now being reviewed at the Department with all indications that it will be approved if the money is available to the Department. As many as 200,000 persons of low income in New York can expect to be eligible for the food stamps. If the food stamp bonus averaged about \$66 a year for each of these applicants, an additional \$10 to \$15 million in purchasing power could be expected in the city.

Of the 15 largest cities in the country, only two—New York and Boston—are not included in the program. The need for the program is evident when you realize that 70 percent of the people on welfare in the State of New York live in New York City.

What is so very important for these people in New York City and those in the other 15 areas in the state is the opportunity for an improved diet, the means to obtain more and better food.

I should like to mention at this point my concern with the action taken by the House Committee in adding an amendment to increase the state participation in the cost of the program to 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons. The Department estimates that states now provide about 7 percent of administrative costs through their work in certifying families and distributing coupons. At the projected level of the program next year, the 20 percent requirement would mean \$40 million a year which the states would have to pay. It is estimated that New York State would face \$4.4 million in additional costs. Coupled with administrative costs of running the program, the State would have to provide about a total of \$6 million.

The House committee amendment would, in my opinion, cripple and probably kill the program. Costs to the states would rise to such a level that many states would drop out of the program. Those who would obviously suffer from such an action are the recipients of the stamps—people on public assistance whose incomes do not permit them to spend enough for adequate amounts and kinds of food.

When I was in Mississippi two weeks ago with the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, I saw conditions of extreme hunger. I saw people who eat only one meal a day or one meal every two days. I saw widespread and extreme malnutrition and seriously inadequate diets. Farm workers who in the past have had only a few months of work are now losing even that meager income as mechanization removes their jobs.

These problems are not all in Mississippi. Only 11 percent of the poor have access to a food distribution system in Alabama—the food stamp or the commodity distribution program. In South Carolina, the figure is 1.6 percent and in Virginia, 1.9 percent. But there are also many who are hungry in my state and throughout the country.

This is why the food stamp program is so important, why it should be continued without the 20 percent state requirement imposed by the House committee and why consideration should be given soon to ways in which the program can be improved so that more of the poor, including those with no income at all, can maintain an adequate diet. The food stamp programs increases the amount of food welfare families receive by about 50 percent.

This program is not a system of handouts. It requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food and provides them with the opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money.

I cannot too strongly urge this Committee to report out S. 953 in its present form. With this assurance that the program has a future, millions of low-income families in this country can continue to improve their diets and we can address ourselves to needed improvements in all our food distribution plans so that more may benefit.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Secretary, we would be glad to hear from you at this time, and your statement will go in the record in its entirety. You may handle it any way you see fit.

STATEMENT OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Secretary FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will quickly review my statement. It is not very long, and I will, of course, welcome your questions.

I am happy to appear here this morning to discuss the food stamp program with you.

The food stamp program is a success.

It has more than lived up to our very high expectations of 3 years ago.

It has, in fact, been an exciting, imaginative, and effective venture.

It has charted a new course in the wise and prudent use of this country's abundance of food.

It has improved the diets and health of our low-income families.

It has expanded food markets for our farmers.

It has stimulated the local economies of the areas in which it operates.

And again I want to pay tribute to the vision of members of this committee, who, in 1964, helped enact the Food Stamp Act. And I want—as I did then—to acknowledge the special contribution of Senator Aiken of the committee—who, for more than 20 years worked to enact such legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there is attached to my statement a table which shows the progress we have made since the act was signed in August 1964. I am also submitting for the record detailed data for each of the 645 areas that operated food stamp programs in February of this year, in which 1.5 million people in 41 States and the District of Columbia were participating.

(The table referred to follows:)

Food stamp program—Selected program statistics for specified months

Item	For the month of—				
	August 1964	June 1965	June 1966	February 1967	June 1967 (projection)
Number of States.....	22	29	1 41	1 42	1 43
Number of areas.....	43	110	324	645	875
Number of participants.....	350, 550	632, 687	1, 218, 399	1, 557, 063	2, 000, 000
Number of retail foodstores.....	13, 300	18, 000	42, 200	60, 900	88, 000
Number of wholesale foodstores.....	700	1, 000	1, 500	1, 600	2, 000
Monthly value of coupons issued:					
Total coupons.....	\$5, 865, 057	\$10, 639, 497	\$20, 577, 786	\$26, 409, 959	\$34, 000, 000
Bonus coupons.....	\$2, 235, 405	\$3, 988, 717	\$7, 398, 372	\$9, 559, 675	\$12, 280, 000
Percent of bonus coupons.....	38%	37%	36%	36%	36%
Bonus coupons per person.....	\$6. 38	\$6. 30	\$6. 07	\$6. 14	\$6. 14

¹ Includes the District of Columbia.

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Alabama (3):							
Greene	82	3,410	3,492	\$42,160	\$6,696	63	\$7.64
Jefferson	3,209	6,661	9,870	131,710	69,615	53	7.05
Walker	2,087	2,564	4,651	67,882	33,618	50	7.23
Total	5,378	12,635	18,013	241,752	129,919	54	7.21
Alaska (1):							
Nome	9	88	97	2,040	724	35	7.46
Arkansas (21):							
Arkansas	246	505	751	11,026	4,771	43	6.35
Bradley	215	364	579	8,876	3,415	38	5.90
Conway	718	407	1,125	17,846	6,668	37	5.93
Craighead	387	924	1,311	19,454	9,439	49	7.20
Crittenden	546	7,256	7,802	89,683	54,826	61	7.03
Cross (New)	186	1,617	1,803	21,088	11,791	56	6.54
Faulkner	321	126	447	8,552	2,574	30	5.76
Independence	692	632	1,324	21,382	9,075	42	6.85
Izard	165	158	323	5,642	2,140	38	6.63
Jefferson	764	4,081	4,845	59,677	33,231	56	6.86
Lee	675	3,655	4,330	50,451	28,979	57	6.69
Lincoln	560	635	1,195	16,902	8,470	50	7.09
Lonoke	540	1,513	2,053	26,229	13,894	53	6.76
Mississippi	1,755	6,161	7,916	103,769	55,599	54	7.02
Monroe	495	2,175	2,670	33,362	19,312	58	7.23
Perry	382	93	475	8,594	2,682	31	5.64
Phillips	1,768	6,642	8,410	105,842	58,773	56	6.99
Poinsett (New)	755	1,864	2,619	37,073	17,921	48	6.84
Prairie	374	186	560	9,210	3,322	36	5.95
Pulaski	2,256	1,437	3,693	55,497	21,714	39	5.88
St. Francis	1,179	4,454	5,633	67,156	40,564	60	7.20
Total	14,979	44,885	59,864	777,311	409,170	53	6.83
California (4):							
Contra Costa	7,853	1,746	9,599	184,061	49,461	27	5.15
Humboldt	1,575	661	2,236	46,111	13,153	29	5.88
Los Angeles	66,201	14,526	80,727	1,492,529	406,254	27	5.03
San Francisco	8,515	2,279	10,794	219,997	58,603	27	5.43
Total	84,144	19,212	103,356	1,942,698	527,471	27	5.10
Colorado (26):							
Adams	1,050	1,669	1,719	31,725	10,211	32	15.94
Alamosa	1,143	1,223	1,366	5,686	2,300	40	16.28
Arapahoe	1,900	1,221	1,121	22,500	6,682	30	15.96
Bent (New)	1,148	2,000	1,348	6,666	2,190	33	16.29
Boulder	1,275	1,191	1,466	9,116	2,784	31	15.97
Clear Creek	1,116	13	119	402	125	31	16.58
Conejos	1,175	1,585	1,760	11,266	4,943	44	16.50
Costilla	1,60	1,297	1,357	6,001	2,493	42	16.98
Crowley	1,60	164	124	2,397	838	35	16.76
Custer	1,27	14	131	671	210	31	16.76
Denver	19,200	12,170	11,370	240,305	73,107	30	16.43
Elbert	118	11	119	478	126	26	16.63
Gilpin	117	112	129	1,645	200	31	16.90
Huerfano	1,326	1,280	1,606	11,298	3,642	68	16.01
Jefferson	1,654	1,373	11,027	20,108	6,108	30	15.95
Larimer	1,337	1,195	1,532	9,014	2,972	33	15.59
Las Animas	1,574	1,602	11,176	22,314	7,350	33	16.25
Logan (New)	1,100	181	1,181	3,409	1,137	33	16.28
Mesa	1,308	1,198	1,506	8,696	2,926	34	15.78
Otero	1,379	1,377	1,756	11,823	4,508	38	15.96
Phillips (New)	116	110	126	544	164	30	16.31
Prowers (New)	1,100	186	1,186	3,415	1,168	34	16.28
Pueblo	12,318	1,459	13,777	69,664	23,075	33	16.11
Rio Grande-Mineral	1,197	1,321	1,518	8,262	3,372	41	16.51
Washington (New)	160	124	184	1,734	528	30	16.29
Weld	1,850	1,332	1,182	21,206	7,376	35	16.24
Total	118,308	18,978	127,286	529,345	170,535	32	16.25

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Connecticut (1): Waterbury District.....	2,093	1,517	3,610	\$67,837	\$19,022	28	\$5.27
District of Columbia (1): Washington.....	11,637	7,269	18,906	319,106	116,027	36	6.14
Georgia (18):							
Bibb.....	1,249	1,951	3,200	48,820	20,135	41	6.29
Burke.....	204	1,014	1,218	14,970	6,924	46	5.68
Charlton.....	176	270	446	6,035	2,755	46	6.18
Clinch.....	109	115	224	3,454	1,406	41	6.28
Echols.....	75	98	173	2,674	1,972	36	5.62
Hall.....	254	361	615	10,271	3,851	37	6.26
Hancock.....	101	581	682	8,747	4,185	48	6.14
Houston.....	117	447	564	8,014	3,634	45	6.44
Lowndes.....	430	407	837	12,225	4,886	40	5.84
Lumpkin.....	210	94	304	4,908	1,870	38	6.15
Mitchell.....	338	802	1,140	15,986	6,996	44	6.14
Pulaski.....	151	348	499	6,949	2,768	40	5.55
Rabun.....	215	351	566	9,185	3,763	41	6.65
Richmond.....	565	643	1,208	17,160	6,045	35	5.00
Stephens.....	137	212	349	5,761	2,315	40	6.63
Taliaferro.....	49	85	134	1,789	796	44	5.94
Thomas.....	530	637	1,167	16,880	7,357	44	6.30
Washington.....	79	651	730	8,995	4,587	51	6.28
Total.....	4,989	9,067	14,056	202,823	85,245	42	6.06
Hawaii (3):							
Honolulu.....	4,157	792	4,949	100,610	128,076	28	5.67
Kauai.....	238	125	363	7,350	12,059	28	5.67
Mauai.....	447	193	640	12,450	13,631	29	5.67
Total.....	4,842	1,110	5,952	120,410	33,766	28	5.67
Illinois (53):							
Alexander.....	872	435	1,307	24,253	6,854	28	5.24
Bond.....	107	46	153	2,912	818	28	5.35
Calhoun.....	91	45	136	2,810	792	28	5.82
Champaign (New).....	577	26	603	10,022	2,651	26	4.40
Clark (New).....	81	29	110	2,288	622	27	5.65
Clay.....	166	134	300	5,194	1,530	29	5.10
Clinton.....	32	50	82	1,529	488	32	5.95
Coles (New).....	144	21	165	3,358	883	26	5.35
Cook.....	77,503	6,703	84,206	1,630,170	440,373	27	5.23
Crawford.....	134	68	202	3,878	1,110	29	5.50
Cumberland (New).....	10	48	58	1,128	387	34	6.67
De Witt (New).....	35	42	77	1,461	422	29	5.48
Douglas (New).....	65	75	140	2,596	771	30	5.51
Edgar (New).....	123	38	161	2,888	796	28	4.94
Edwards.....	8	55	63	1,228	400	33	6.35
Effingham (New).....	176	53	229	3,905	1,096	28	4.79
Fayette.....	124	55	179	3,658	1,016	28	5.68
Franklin.....	1,457	640	2,097	45,509	12,319	27	5.87
Gallatin.....	162	115	277	5,908	1,643	28	5.93
Greene.....	164	90	254	4,351	1,230	28	4.84
Hamilton.....	112	77	189	3,929	1,204	31	6.37
Hardin.....	181	68	249	5,604	1,480	26	5.94
Iroquois (New).....	50	0	50	1,007	261	26	5.22
Jackson.....	612	258	870	16,187	4,603	28	5.29
Jasper.....	56	81	137	2,535	770	30	5.62
Jefferson.....	851	308	1,159	23,285	6,379	27	5.50
Jersey.....	69	66	135	2,663	740	28	5.48
Johnson.....	82	98	180	3,552	1,055	30	5.86
Lawrence.....	359	147	506	9,368	2,567	27	5.07
Macon (New).....	1,258	54	1,312	22,482	5,875	26	4.48
Macoupin.....	166	153	319	6,579	1,886	29	5.91
Madison.....	2,251	900	3,151	37,706	10,551	28	3.35
Marion.....	531	388	919	16,785	5,011	30	5.45
Massac.....	353	115	468	9,325	2,561	27	5.47
Monroe.....	85	36	121	1,762	539	31	4.45
Montgomery.....	141	72	213	3,861	1,094	28	5.14
Moultrie (New).....	79	13	92	1,609	463	29	5.03
Perry.....	144	74	218	4,694	1,242	27	5.70

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assist- ance	Non- public assist- ance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per- cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Illinois—Continued							
Piatt (New).....	70	7	77	\$1,293	\$332	26	\$4.31
Pope.....	178	70	248	4,713	1,298	28	5.23
Pulaski.....	868	271	1,139	20,804	5,792	28	5.09
Randolph.....	80	104	184	3,515	1,066	30	5.79
Richland.....	51	32	83	1,703	505	30	6.08
St. Clair.....	9,033	1,086	10,119	216,776	58,374	27	5.77
Saline.....	711	394	1,105	24,175	6,657	28	6.02
Shelby (New).....	50	36	86	1,265	360	28	4.19
Union.....	181	138	319	6,463	1,897	29	5.95
Vermillion (New).....	282	2	284	3,767	1,032	27	3.63
Wabash.....	67	35	102	2,264	618	27	6.06
Washington.....	26	0	26	651	146	25	5.62
Wayne.....	127	40	167	2,088	723	27	4.33
White.....	118	121	239	4,921	1,412	29	5.91
Williamson.....	666	305	971	22,180	6,052	27	6.23
Total.....	101,919	14,317	116,236	2,248,957	610,746	27	5.25
Indiana (17):							
Bartholomew.....	247	167	414	6,497	2,600	40	6.28
Floyd.....	428	439	867	13,883	5,160	39	5.95
Gibson.....	380	258	638	9,302	3,882	42	6.08
Harrison.....	150	284	434	7,588	2,823	37	6.50
Knox.....	341	327	668	12,523	4,345	35	6.50
Lake.....	7,134	1,415	8,549	140,244	47,574	34	5.56
Madison.....	954	165	1,119	10,875	4,116	38	3.68
Marion.....	4,327	2,046	6,373	101,677	35,975	35	5.64
Perry.....	385	301	686	12,860	4,246	33	6.19
Pike.....	283	139	422	6,100	2,602	43	6.17
Posey.....	184	384	568	8,087	3,329	41	5.86
Putnam.....	63	40	103	1,616	615	38	5.97
Spencer.....	310	237	547	8,873	3,385	38	6.19
Switzerland.....	53	89	142	2,300	912	40	6.42
Tipton.....	101	41	142	2,518	792	31	5.58
Vanderburgh.....	2,408	1,893	4,301	67,195	24,255	36	5.64
Warrick.....	256	262	518	8,467	3,142	37	6.07
Total.....	18,004	8,487	26,491	420,105	149,753	136	15.65
Iowa (42):							
Adams.....	28	23	51	1,067	315	30	6.18
Appanoose.....	324	165	489	10,688	3,027	28	6.19
Benton.....	96	47	143	3,011	775	26	5.42
Butler.....	74	82	156	2,858	806	28	5.17
Calhoun.....	64	74	138	2,634	756	29	5.48
Cerro Gordo.....	309	65	374	7,323	1,967	27	5.26
Clark.....	11	5	16	410	110	27	6.88
Dallas.....	165	67	232	4,871	1,394	29	6.01
Davis.....	39	30	69	1,390	428	31	6.20
Decatur.....	89	61	150	2,980	1,012	34	6.75
Des Moines.....	197	246	443	6,856	1,997	29	4.51
Dubuque.....	722	373	1,095	18,640	5,674	30	5.18
Franklin.....	46	46	92	1,796	515	29	5.60
Greene.....	88	70	158	2,954	792	27	5.01
Grundy.....	23	4	27	618	178	29	6.59
Guthrie.....	88	77	165	2,907	837	29	5.07
Hamilton.....	126	15	141	3,009	779	26	5.82
Hardin (New).....	93	36	129	2,775	728	26	5.64
Harrison.....	56	64	120	2,444	743	30	6.19
Henry.....	54	13	67	1,504	424	28	6.33
Ida.....	18	32	50	1,024	288	28	5.76
Jasper.....	156	71	227	4,871	1,373	28	6.05
Johnson.....	303	123	426	4,417	1,288	29	3.02
Lee.....	305	196	501	10,147	2,731	27	5.45
Lucas.....	205	62	267	5,896	1,693	29	6.34
Madison.....	57	69	126	2,642	826	31	6.56
Marshall.....	98	27	125	2,728	777	28	6.12
Monona.....	109	135	244	4,540	1,443	32	5.91
O'Brien.....	120	45	165	3,499	966	28	5.85
Plymouth.....	62	24	86	1,968	490	25	5.70
Pottawattomie (New).....	938	89	1,027	22,163	5,848	26	5.69

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Iowa—Continued							
Scott.....	797	483	1,280	\$24,458	\$7,033	29	\$5.49
Sioux.....	121	33	154	3,398	918	27	5.96
Tama.....	63	62	125	2,391	666	28	5.33
Taylor.....	28	58	86	1,755	548	31	6.37
Union.....	128	79	207	4,308	1,151	27	5.56
Van Buren.....	89	36	125	2,786	750	27	6.00
Wapello.....	507	388	895	18,634	5,683	30	6.35
Warren.....	135	67	202	4,138	1,107	27	5.48
Washington.....	77	57	134	2,642	760	29	5.67
Wayne.....	114	38	152	3,286	922	28	6.07
Woodbury.....	2,041	536	2,577	50,965	14,208	28	5.51
Total.....	9,163	4,273	13,436	263,391	74,726	28	5.56
Kansas (5):							
Bourbon.....	169	44	213	4,442	1,288	29	6.05
Cherokee.....	614	71	685	14,245	4,020	28	5.87
Crawford.....	836	94	930	20,464	5,490	27	5.90
Labette.....	541	109	650	12,804	3,564	28	5.48
Wilson.....	154	12	166	2,907	882	30	5.31
Total.....	2,314	330	2,644	54,862	15,244	28	5.77
Kentucky (44):							
Adair.....	107	376	483	6,630	3,194	48	6.61
Bath.....	134	394	528	7,250	3,520	49	6.67
Bell.....	2,215	2,134	4,349	67,056	26,568	40	6.11
Breathitt.....	2,203	1,762	3,965	62,564	22,762	36	5.74
Campbell.....	233	400	633	9,352	4,123	44	6.51
Carter.....	225	883	1,108	15,566	7,880	51	7.11
Casey.....	185	650	835	11,312	6,046	53	7.24
Clark.....	90	128	218	3,391	1,401	41	6.43
Clay.....	1,270	2,749	4,019	57,898	25,846	45	6.43
Clinton.....	86	602	688	9,340	5,132	55	7.46
Cumberland.....	320	433	753	11,154	4,965	45	6.59
Elliott.....	241	308	549	8,074	3,332	41	6.07
Estill.....	346	622	968	14,580	6,458	44	6.67
Floyd.....	2,601	2,975	5,576	85,464	32,480	38	5.82
Harlan.....	2,452	3,435	5,887	87,570	35,712	41	6.07
Jackson.....	603	671	1,274	19,704	7,432	38	5.83
Jefferson.....	2,528	1,852	4,380	73,256	24,734	34	5.65
Johnson.....	772	1,849	2,621	37,852	18,216	48	6.95
Knott.....	2,881	2,509	5,390	82,464	30,264	37	5.61
Knox.....	1,887	2,527	4,414	66,640	26,908	40	6.10
Laurel.....	418	1,682	2,100	29,174	15,232	52	7.25
Lee.....	356	1,198	1,554	22,546	10,726	48	6.90
Leslie.....	1,700	1,702	3,402	51,406	20,628	40	6.06
Letcher.....	1,624	2,068	3,692	55,386	22,733	41	6.16
Lincoln.....	163	569	732	9,972	5,442	55	7.43
Logan.....	176	348	524	7,754	3,335	43	6.36
McCreary.....	603	1,442	2,045	28,776	13,574	47	6.64
Magoffin.....	1,122	1,941	3,063	44,322	19,616	44	6.40
Martin.....	1,439	1,140	2,579	39,072	14,936	38	5.79
Menifee.....	294	197	491	7,304	2,762	38	5.63
Montgomery.....	224	264	488	7,396	2,968	40	6.08
Morgan.....	665	776	1,441	21,236	8,808	41	6.11
Muhlenburg.....	177	374	551	8,668	3,894	45	7.07
Owsley.....	497	868	1,365	20,994	8,494	40	6.22
Perry.....	3,782	3,075	6,857	102,306	39,324	38	5.73
Pike.....	2,247	2,509	4,756	72,672	28,180	39	5.93
Pulaski.....	445	1,251	1,696	24,428	11,892	49	7.01
Rockcastle.....	246	923	1,169	16,350	8,592	53	7.35
Russell.....	81	637	718	9,370	5,606	60	7.81
Simpson.....	72	190	262	3,875	1,585	41	6.05
Todd.....	36	127	163	2,508	1,057	42	6.48
Wayne.....	206	1,357	1,563	20,344	11,986	59	7.67
Whitley.....	852	1,631	2,483	36,368	16,446	45	6.62
Wolfe.....	709	492	1,201	18,900	7,038	37	5.86
Total.....	39,513	54,020	93,533	1,398,244	581,827	42	6.22

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Louisiana (22):							
Acadia.....	1,500	2,600	4,100	\$59,584	\$27,718	47	\$6.76
Assumption.....	302	1,512	1,814	21,482	11,299	53	6.23
Avoyelles.....	2,392	5,774	8,166	117,156	54,218	46	6.64
Calcasieu.....	1,559	1,403	2,962	43,155	18,100	42	6.11
Caldwell.....	218	444	662	9,530	4,200	44	6.34
East Baton Rouge.....	507	1,028	1,535	17,254	8,618	50	5.61
Evangeline.....	3,814	5,249	9,063	136,480	59,086	43	6.52
Franklin.....	745	3,525	4,270	53,558	28,191	53	6.60
Iberia.....	734	797	1,531	21,810	9,188	42	6.00
Iberville.....	470	1,798	2,268	27,030	12,900	46	5.69
Jefferson Davis.....	688	500	1,188	17,373	6,781	39	5.71
Lafayette.....	1,062	2,767	3,829	48,998	25,093	51	6.55
Natchitoches.....	1,167	2,672	3,829	51,138	26,279	51	6.84
Pointe Coupee.....	856	1,901	2,757	37,312	16,678	44	6.05
Red River.....	413	1,641	2,054	25,400	13,145	52	6.40
Richland.....	484	3,148	3,632	42,484	24,214	57	6.67
St. James.....	163	418	581	7,482	3,327	44	5.73
St. John.....	97	409	506	6,925	2,789	40	5.51
St. Landry.....	2,101	10,052	12,153	156,424	82,122	52	6.77
St. Martin.....	1,321	2,258	3,579	48,603	23,809	49	6.65
Vermilion.....	335	1,152	1,487	19,517	9,991	51	6.72
Winn.....	448	155	603	9,913	3,530	36	5.85
Total.....	21,376	51,203	72,579	978,608	471,276	48	6.49
Maine (1):							
Androscoggin.....	736	877	1,613	30,110	9,642	32	5.98
Maryland (10):							
Allegheny.....	937	417	1,354	27,517	8,999	33	6.65
Anne Arundel.....	711	703	1,414	24,152	9,070	38	6.41
Baltimore.....	696	135	831	16,456	6,012	37	7.23
Caroline.....	209	30	239	4,682	1,647	35	6.89
Charles.....	154	31	185	2,664	996	37	5.38
Dorchester.....	313	92	405	6,907	2,382	34	5.88
Garrett.....	356	330	686	13,530	4,734	35	6.90
Prince Georges (New).....	223	26	249	4,154	1,621	39	6.51
Queen Annes.....	98	103	201	3,124	1,157	37	5.76
Talbot.....	121	65	186	3,096	1,124	36	6.04
Total.....	3,818	1,932	5,750	106,342	37,742	35	6.56
Michigan (6):							
Gogebic.....	686	371	1,057	20,896	5,729	27	5.42
Houghton.....	800	790	1,590	31,685	9,067	29	5.70
Macomb.....	2,316	563	2,879	59,674	17,007	28	5.91
Oakland.....	5,024	738	5,762	111,161	29,267	26	5.08
St. Clair.....	1,653	283	1,936	34,005	9,196	27	4.74
Wayne.....	41,036	7,490	48,526	929,742	246,766	27	5.09
Total.....	51,515	10,235	61,750	1,187,163	317,032	27	5.13
Minnesota (29):							
Aitkin.....	107	309	416	8,479	2,800	33	6.73
Anoka.....	492	310	802	15,391	4,164	27	5.19
Becker.....	259	741	1,000	17,366	5,897	34	5.90
Beltrami.....	530	893	1,423	25,192	8,041	32	5.65
Benton.....	62	280	342	5,466	1,737	32	5.08
Big Stone.....	147	145	292	5,690	1,734	30	5.94
Carlton.....	291	632	923	17,407	5,384	31	5.83
Chippewa.....	49	79	128	2,324	722	31	5.64
Crow Wing.....	185	723	908	17,570	5,482	31	6.04
Dakota.....	497	224	721	14,267	3,770	26	5.23
Hennepin.....	5,567	2,333	7,900	165,580	44,045	27	5.58
Hubbard.....	81	499	580	10,216	3,791	37	6.54
Itasca.....	274	674	948	17,898	5,621	31	5.93
Kandiyohi.....	337	326	663	12,810	3,895	30	5.87
Koochiching.....	260	310	570	11,235	3,086	27	5.41
Lac qui Parle.....	78	242	320	5,699	1,810	32	5.66
Lake.....	35	134	169	2,914	954	33	5.64
Otter Tail.....	146	143	289	5,792	1,674	29	5.79
Pine.....	186	245	431	8,892	2,522	28	5.85
Pipestone.....	45	96	141	2,741	832	30	5.90

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Minnesota—Continued							
Polk	249	351	600	\$11,118	\$3,464	31	\$5.77
Ramsey	6,238	2,305	8,543	176,539	46,892	26	5.49
Renville	174	133	307	5,327	1,682	32	5.48
Roseau	97	112	209	3,492	1,194	34	5.71
Stearns	260	940	1,200	20,196	6,585	33	5.49
St. Louis	4,294	3,461	7,755	151,505	41,907	28	5.40
Swift	29	280	309	5,977	1,756	29	5.68
Washington	327	98	425	8,081	2,152	27	5.06
Wright	103	159	262	4,652	1,549	33	5.91
Total	21,399	17,177	38,576	759,816	215,142	28	5.58
Mississippi (20):							
Attala	612	2,132	2,744	36,450	19,674	54	7.17
Chickasaw	672	1,859	2,531	34,866	17,292	50	6.83
Clay	554	2,810	3,364	41,255	24,548	60	7.30
Coahoma	1,249	9,426	10,675	134,730	72,502	54	6.79
De Soto (New)	430	2,462	2,892	37,031	20,969	57	7.25
Forrest	787	2,086	2,873	38,420	20,129	52	7.01
Harrison	652	1,591	2,243	30,992	15,866	51	7.07
Jones	1,333	4,117	5,450	74,032	39,955	54	7.33
Leflore (New)	926	7,405	8,331	104,732	58,428	56	7.01
Lee	879	1,687	2,566	37,537	18,062	48	7.04
Lowndes	826	2,063	2,889	38,862	19,960	51	6.91
Madison	924	4,735	5,659	69,729	40,026	57	7.07
Marion	472	637	1,109	16,855	7,693	46	6.94
Panola	392	3,397	3,789	48,067	25,467	53	6.72
Pike	696	1,403	2,099	29,342	15,340	52	7.31
Quitman (New)	431	4,415	4,846	61,550	32,528	53	6.71
Tallahatchie (New)	1,138	4,987	6,125	78,958	42,955	54	7.01
Warren (New)	633	690	1,323	20,198	9,528	47	7.20
Yalobusha (New)	527	572	1,099	16,426	7,638	46	6.95
Yazoo	928	3,760	4,688	60,084	33,072	55	7.05
Total	15,061	62,234	77,295	1,010,106	541,632	54	7.01
Missouri (1):							
St. Louis (City)	14,175	8,888	23,063	371,649	156,659	42	6.79
Montana (3):							
Cascade	1,433	1,033	2,466	145,573	115,191	133	16.16
Deer Lodge	78	229	307	5,787	1,701	29	5.54
Silver Bow	952	337	1,289	26,470	7,731	29	6.00
Total	2,463	1,599	4,062	177,830	124,623	132	16.06
Nebraska (22):							
Boone	49	26	75	1,632	498	31	6.64
Boyd (New)	14	28	42	676	284	42	6.76
Buffalo	225	103	328	6,070	1,843	30	5.62
Clay	44	0	44	854	248	29	5.64
Cumming (New)	21	13	34	625	172	28	5.06
Custer	173	45	218	4,293	1,212	28	5.56
Dakota (New)	73	55	128	2,585	782	30	6.11
Douglas	4,765	2,189	6,954	134,350	46,906	35	6.75
Franklin	18	43	61	1,120	1,397	133	16.51
Gage	111	50	161	3,666	958	26	5.95
Hall	175	154	329	5,543	1,681	30	5.11
Holt	135	120	155	1,118	334	30	16.07
Keith	27	27	54	781	264	34	4.89
Lancaster	991	592	1,583	30,202	9,610	32	6.07
Morrill	51	36	87	1,815	549	30	6.31
Nemaha	66	56	122	2,475	719	29	5.89
Rock (New)	16	1	17	291	74	25	4.35
Sarpy	106	218	324	4,964	1,691	34	5.22
Saunders	98	161	259	4,358	1,603	37	6.19
Scotts Bluff-Banner	286	221	507	8,700	2,760	32	5.44
Sheridan	27	56	83	1,571	528	34	6.36
York	18	51	69	1,137	380	33	5.51
Total	17,389	14,145	111,534	1,218,906	173,493	134	16.37

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

21

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (percent)	Average dollar bonus per person
New Jersey (4):							
Bergen (New).....	975	151	1,126	\$24,862	\$8,001	24	\$5.33
Camden (New).....	3,026	1,005	4,031	86,760	23,478	27	5.82
Mercer.....	1,768	2,600	4,368	84,327	23,820	28	5.45
Salem.....	239	512	751	14,137	4,405	31	5.87
Total.....	6,008	4,268	10,276	210,086	57,704	27	5.62
New Mexico (17):							
Chaves.....	671	324	995	17,470	5,824	33	5.85
Colfax.....	277	185	462	7,898	2,953	37	6.39
Curry.....	662	400	1,062	18,153	6,808	38	6.41
Eddy.....	779	1,104	1,883	28,344	12,093	43	6.42
Guadalupe (New).....	299	400	699	11,089	4,724	43	6.76
Harding.....	31	94	125	1,978	822	42	6.58
Lea.....	399	300	699	11,513	4,535	39	6.49
Mora.....	493	535	938	14,957	6,734	45	7.18
Quay.....	391	289	680	9,110	3,902	43	6.73
Rio Arriba.....	1,154	2,890	4,044	61,570	29,981	49	7.41
Roosevelt.....	283	673	956	13,952	6,470	46	6.77
Sandoval.....	350	1,633	1,983	27,631	16,213	59	8.18
San Miguel.....	1,754	2,138	3,892	63,596	26,879	42	6.90
San Fe.....	1,574	2,449	4,023	64,124	27,978	44	6.85
Taos.....	1,047	1,165	2,212	36,043	16,155	45	7.30
Torrance (New).....	300	151	451	7,854	2,788	35	6.18
Union.....	110	35	145	2,786	944	34	6.51
Total.....	10,384	14,765	25,149	398,068	175,803	44	6.99
New York (1):							
Erie Welfare District.....	15,950	5,092	21,042	406,698	114,919	28	5.46
North Carolina (22):							
Bertie.....	573	4,032	4,604	59,736	32,360	54	7.03
Cabarrus.....	149	144	293	4,718	2,112	45	7.21
Chatham.....	159	428	587	8,744	4,252	49	7.24
Chowan.....	107	583	690	9,054	5,164	57	7.48
Cleveland.....	470	184	654	10,444	3,846	37	5.88
Dare.....	76	75	151	2,706	992	37	6.57
Durham.....	1,186	661	1,847	28,857	12,014	42	6.50
Forsyth.....	1,889	541	2,430	39,864	14,444	36	5.94
Franklin.....	474	1,560	2,034	26,544	13,678	52	6.72
Granville.....	110	895	915	11,322	6,200	55	6.78
Halifax.....	901	3,808	4,709	62,278	30,822	49	6.69
Harnett.....	281	320	601	11,115	4,771	43	7.94
Lee.....	522	368	890	13,275	5,440	41	6.11
Martin.....	441	2,534	2,975	38,558	20,396	53	6.86
Moore.....	538	302	840	13,034	5,290	41	6.30
Nash.....	1,631	5,974	7,605	99,618	52,816	53	6.94
New Hanover.....	607	270	877	15,119	5,603	37	6.39
Northampton.....	474	1,615	2,089	26,666	13,934	52	6.67
Orange.....	349	444	793	10,940	5,155	47	6.50
Person.....	367	593	960	12,894	6,222	48	6.48
Scotland.....	469	994	1,463	19,626	8,640	44	5.91
Surry.....	380	694	1,074	15,992	7,402	46	6.89
Total.....	12,153	26,929	39,082	541,104	261,553	48	6.69
North Dakota (1):							
Morton.....	164	280	444	7,750	2,731	35	6.15
Ohio (33):							
Allen.....	923	230	1,153	21,545	7,166	33	6.22
Ashland.....	127	42	169	3,212	1,026	32	6.07
Athens.....	967	332	1,299	24,614	8,659	35	6.67
Belmont (New).....	908	208	1,116	22,602	7,692	34	6.89
Carroll (New).....	99	61	160	2,949	1,043	35	6.52
Clark.....	866	571	1,437	27,330	8,904	33	6.20
Clermont.....	1,882	1,066	2,948	55,764	18,303	33	6.21
Columbiana.....	940	686	1,226	23,762	8,055	34	6.57
Coshocton (New).....	57	16	113	2,313	711	31	6.29
Cuyahoga.....	58,621	4,647	63,268	1,188,182	414,238	35	6.55

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per-cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Ohio—Continued							
Franklin.....	15,263	1,700	16,963	\$299,325	\$106,309	36	\$6.27
Guernsey (New).....	507	187	694	13,492	4,658	35	6.71
Hamilton.....	21,115	6,345	27,460	511,847	171,417	33	6.24
Harrison.....	156	82	238	4,488	1,574	35	6.61
Holmes.....	97	17	114	2,434	772	32	6.77
Jefferson.....	1,226	489	1,715	34,468	12,060	35	7.03
Knox.....	107	75	182	3,834	1,188	31	6.53
Lake.....	363	67	430	8,802	2,684	30	6.24
Lawrence.....	2,211	1,166	3,377	64,246	23,838	37	7.06
Lorain.....	2,186	814	3,000	56,960	20,163	35	6.72
Lucas.....	14,681	1,994	16,675	313,970	108,167	34	6.49
Mahoning.....	4,222	2,590	6,812	109,835	36,809	34	5.40
Monroe (New).....	543	158	701	13,148	4,674	36	6.67
Morgan.....	146	154	300	5,159	1,739	34	5.80
Montgomery.....	7,304	1,238	8,542	159,280	56,872	36	6.66
Richland.....	1,238	679	1,917	26,198	9,626	37	5.02
Scioto.....	3,572	996	4,568	84,904	29,988	35	6.56
Stark.....	2,424	1,042	3,466	67,961	23,093	34	6.66
Summit.....	8,921	1,298	10,210	188,449	64,501	34	6.31
Trumbull.....	2,219	711	2,930	56,508	19,463	34	6.64
Tuscarawas.....	747	177	924	18,070	6,246	35	6.76
Washington.....	357	238	595	11,383	3,834	34	6.44
Wayne.....	252	69	321	6,775	2,196	32	6.84
Total.....	154,887	30,145	185,032	3,433,809	1,187,668	32	6.42
Oregon (1):							
Multnomah.....	9,100	2,288	11,388	203,994	58,358	29	5.12
Pennsylvania (29):							
Allegheny.....	42,940	8,328	51,268	967,379	296,725	31	5.79
Armstrong (New).....	1,014	366	1,380	22,064	6,991	32	5.07
Blair (New).....	1,976	795	2,771	47,500	14,650	31	5.29
Bradford.....	1,555	1,712	2,267	38,988	12,889	33	5.69
Cambria.....	4,404	1,440	5,844	118,008	37,387	32	6.40
Clarion (New).....	676	248	924	18,562	5,708	31	6.18
Clearfield.....	2,187	979	3,166	55,368	17,964	32	5.67
Clinton.....	534	247	781	13,437	4,196	31	5.37
Crawford (New).....	961	324	1,285	23,308	7,325	31	5.70
Dauphin.....	3,131	431	3,562	60,330	17,517	29	4.92
Fayette.....	12,192	2,064	14,256	263,161	81,649	31	5.73
Greene.....	1,870	708	2,578	41,771	13,813	33	5.36
Huntingdon.....	1,075	419	1,494	27,896	9,018	32	6.04
Indiana.....	1,814	659	2,473	34,531	11,555	33	4.67
Jefferson (New).....	1,088	456	1,544	29,079	9,533	33	6.17
Lackawanna.....	4,469	2,392	6,861	126,815	40,970	32	5.97
Luzerne.....	6,039	3,066	9,105	167,127	54,637	33	6.00
McKean.....	1,025	430	1,455	25,742	8,079	31	5.55
Mifflin.....	696	197	893	14,545	4,629	32	5.18
Northumberland.....	1,379	746	2,125	37,659	11,776	31	5.54
Philadelphia.....	36,710	12,816	49,526	823,855	275,020	33	5.55
Potter.....	410	213	623	10,270	3,324	32	-----
Somerset.....	2,143	1,063	3,206	57,362	18,440	32	5.75
Sullivan.....	107	63	170	3,072	970	32	5.71
Susquehanna.....	771	303	874	12,406	4,028	32	4.61
Tioga.....	771	552	1,323	22,269	7,467	34	5.64
Verango (New).....	1,061	411	1,472	25,460	7,717	30	5.24
Washington.....	4,447	1,596	6,043	106,167	34,605	33	5.73
Wyoming.....	202	105	307	6,136	1,935	32	6.30
Total.....	137,447	42,129	179,576	3,200,267	1,020,517	32	5.68
Rhode Island (4):							
Central Falls (City).....	3,626	451	4,077	91,060	25,877	28	6.35
Pawtucket (City).....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	-----	-----
Providence (City).....	8,741	687	9,428	194,820	57,322	29	6.08
Woonsocket (City).....	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	-----	-----
Total.....	12,367	1,138	13,505	285,880	83,199	29	6.16

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION

23

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
South Carolina (8):							
Beaufort (New).....	322	116	438	\$4, 872	\$2, 736	56	\$6.25
Cherokee.....	126	295	421	6, 238	3, 144	50	7.47
Dillon.....	229	4, 816	5, 045	60, 296	37, 540	62	7.44
Edgefield.....	96	577	673	9, 172	4, 792	52	7.12
Lee.....	201	3, 504	3, 705	43, 284	27, 791	64	7.50
McCormick.....	106	692	798	10, 540	5, 756	55	7.21
Williamsburg.....	456	6, 446	6, 902	86, 310	50, 530	59	7.32
York.....	204	930	1, 134	15, 466	8, 364	54	7.38
Total.....	1, 740	17, 376	19, 116	236, 178	140, 653	60	7.36
Tennessee (38):							
Anderson.....	621	1, 949	2, 570	37, 278	17, 980	48	7.00
Bledsoe.....	189	351	540	8, 282	3, 666	45	6.79
Campbell.....	628	3, 276	3, 904	56, 136	29, 780	53	7.62
Cannon.....	46	237	283	3, 858	1, 901	49	6.72
Chester.....	164	230	394	6, 275	2, 365	38	6.00
Claiborne.....	601	1, 909	2, 510	34, 917	17, 869	51	7.17
Cocke.....	196	904	1, 100	15, 138	7, 884	52	7.17
Dyer.....	446	2, 417	2, 863	40, 161	20, 311	51	7.09
Fayette.....	118	6, 128	6, 246	76, 424	46, 424	61	7.43
Fentress.....	144	919	1, 063	14, 829	7, 478	50	7.03
Grundy.....	217	542	759	11, 232	5, 536	49	7.29
Hamilton.....	2, 496	3, 284	5, 780	88, 076	35, 548	40	6.15
Hancock.....	264	897	1, 161	16, 196	8, 506	53	7.33
Hardeman.....	260	2, 818	3, 078	38, 890	21, 014	54	6.82
Hardin.....	301	890	1, 191	18, 922	8, 108	43	6.81
Haywood.....	263	6, 953	7, 216	88, 583	50, 679	57	7.02
Henry.....	139	223	362	6, 474	2, 208	34	6.10
Knox.....	1, 043	2, 648	3, 691	57, 444	25, 270	44	6.85
Lake.....	234	1, 576	1, 810	21, 670	13, 078	60	7.23
Lauderdale.....	323	3, 902	4, 225	55, 642	30, 682	55	7.26
Lawrence.....	173	467	640	10, 297	4, 257	41	6.65
Macon.....	76	186	262	4, 404	1, 832	42	6.99
Marion.....	406	1, 229	1, 635	24, 001	11, 174	47	6.83
McNairy.....	395	980	1, 375	22, 112	9, 854	45	7.17
Meigs.....	43	186	229	3, 124	1, 551	50	6.77
Morgan.....	284	1, 107	1, 391	19, 344	10, 224	53	7.35
Pickett.....	50	253	303	4, 044	2, 222	55	7.33
Rutherford.....	302	471	773	10, 025	4, 553	45	5.89
Scott.....	729	2, 388	3, 067	45, 596	21, 122	46	6.89
Sequatchie.....	124	195	319	4, 154	1, 706	41	5.35
Sevier.....	109	309	418	6, 232	3, 044	49	7.28
Shelby.....	4, 064	5, 983	10, 047	144, 430	56, 797	39	5.65
Smith.....	79	286	365	5, 627	2, 529	45	6.93
Sumner.....	134	474	608	8, 461	4, 249	50	6.99
Tipton.....	168	5, 192	5, 360	63, 518	39, 012	61	7.28
Trousdale.....	22	165	187	2, 598	1, 248	48	6.67
Weakley.....	138	242	380	6, 252	2, 508	40	6.60
Wilson.....	82	222	304	4, 306	1, 975	46	6.50
Total.....	16, 071	62, 338	78, 409	1, 084, 902	536, 144	49	6.84
Texas (2):							
El Paso.....	¹ 1, 011	¹ 2, 200	¹ 3, 211	44, 397	21, 802	49	¹ 6.79
Tarrant.....	¹ 2, 504	¹ 3, 242	¹ 5, 746	93, 941	39, 362	42	¹ 6.85
Total.....	¹ 3, 515	¹ 5, 442	¹ 8, 957	138, 338	61, 164	44	¹ 6.83
Utah (20):							
Beaver (New).....	30	0	30	762	216	28	7.20
Box Elder.....	113	17	130	2, 636	840	32	6.46
Cache.....	179	120	299	6, 209	2, 213	36	7.40
Carbon.....	240	46	286	5, 697	1, 704	30	5.96
Davis.....	394	49	443	8, 108	2, 900	36	6.55
Emery.....	110	6	116	2, 538	720	28	6.21
Garfield.....	84	15	99	2, 057	612	30	6.18
Iron (New).....	52	0	52	1, 226	332	27	6.38
Juab.....	53	6	59	1, 384	394	28	6.68
Kane.....	21	9	30	620	184	30	6.13
Millard.....	69	6	75	1, 654	468	28	6.24
Morgan.....	18	0	18	384	120	31	6.67
Plute.....	53	2	55	1, 224	352	29	6.40

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assist- ance	Non- public assist- ance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per- cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
Utah—Continued							
Rich	7	2	9	\$216	\$60	28	\$6.67
Sanpete	270	23	293	6,374	1,885	30	6.43
Sevier	143	15	158	3,310	968	29	6.13
Utah	1,364	108	1,472	28,938	9,649	33	6.56
Washington (New)	119	13	132	2,947	851	29	6.45
Wayne	14	0	14	323	88	27	6.29
Weber	1,855	170	2,025	39,970	13,027	33	6.43
Total	5,188	607	5,795	116,582	37,583	32	6.49
Vermont (1): St. Albans Welfare District	474	1,425	1,899	33,302	10,663	32	5.62
Virginia (7):							
Bristol (City)	358	507	865	13,326	5,732	43	6.63
Chesapeake (City)	637	512	1,149	18,646	7,785	42	6.78
Danville (City)	259	148	407	6,038	2,176	36	5.35
Dickenson	595	1,748	2,343	33,294	16,768	50	7.16
Lee	894	1,233	2,127	31,458	14,678	47	6.90
Norfolk	3,088	1,194	4,282	67,530	22,323	33	5.21
Wise	471	1,537	2,008	28,618	14,826	52	7.38
Total	6,302	6,879	13,181	198,910	84,288	42	6.39
Washington (23):							
Adams	118	54	172	1,364	1,139	136	16.62
Asotin	305	37	342	1,640	1,052	130	16.00
Benton	975	294	1,269	121,879	16,345	129	15.00
Clallam	447	247	694	113,650	14,095	130	15.90
Clark	1,478	310	1,788	138,407	110,370	127	15.80
Columbia	59	20	79	1,432	1,444	131	15.62
Cowlitz	872	406	1,278	126,078	18,345	132	16.53
Franklin	514	87	601	13,343	14,003	130	16.66
Garfield	17	16	33	1,707	1,198	128	16.00
Gray's Harbor	1,255	455	1,710	132,727	19,491	129	15.55
Jefferson	185	22	207	14,270	11,153	127	15.57
Kitsap	1,022	209	1,231	125,585	17,164	128	15.82
Klickitat	176	72	248	15,075	11,505	128	16.07
Lewis	875	333	1,208	127,178	17,610	128	16.30
Lincoln	57	19	76	11,657	1,464	128	16.10
Mason	230	66	296	15,327	11,545	129	15.22
Pacific	332	79	411	18,903	22,404	127	15.85
Skamania	125	151	276	14,140	11,325	132	14.80
Thruston	1,332	158	1,490	127,564	17,718	128	15.18
Wahkiakum	27	13	40	1,873	1,262	130	16.55
Walla Walla	882	216	1,098	122,039	16,171	128	15.62
Whitman	102	126	228	14,520	11,311	129	15.75
Yakima	5,080	963	6,043	118,781	133,264	128	15.50
Total	16,465	4,353	20,818	1,414,439	118,378	29	5.69
West Virginia (40):							
Barbour	806	326	1,132	19,746	8,476	43	7.49
Boone	2,798	375	3,173	56,882	22,376	39	7.05
Braxton	1,379	259	1,638	28,444	11,900	42	7.26
Cabell	1,893	263	2,156	40,738	15,162	37	7.03
Calhoun	756	110	866	14,782	6,164	42	7.12
Clay	1,481	491	1,972	34,010	14,548	43	7.38
Doddridge	255	70	325	5,438	2,430	45	7.48
Fayette	4,859	1,500	6,359	109,970	45,750	42	7.19
Gilmer	593	183	776	13,426	5,636	42	7.26
Greenbrier	1,299	515	1,814	30,886	13,426	43	7.40
Harrison	688	516	1,204	20,328	9,020	44	7.49
Jackson	788	198	986	17,246	7,056	41	7.16
Kanawha	7,699	1,572	9,271	163,972	66,732	41	7.20
Lewis	664	162	826	14,050	6,082	43	7.36
Lincoln	3,496	434	3,930	69,712	28,030	40	7.13
Logan	5,755	620	6,375	112,320	44,282	39	6.95
Marion	934	329	1,263	22,062	9,056	40	7.17
Mason	535	298	833	14,086	6,298	45	7.56
McDowell	7,067	1,335	8,402	147,214	58,216	40	6.93
Mercer	3,201	623	3,824	69,752	27,760	40	7.26
Mingo	6,472	922	7,394	130,614	51,414	39	6.95

See footnotes at end of table, p. 25.

Food stamp program—Participation and coupon value, by project area, February 1967—Continued

Project area	Number of persons participating			Coupons issued			
	Public assistance	Non-public assistance	Total	Total dollar value	Bonus dollar value	Bonus of total (per cent)	Average dollar bonus per person
West Virginia—Continued							
Monongalia	504	224	728	\$12,960	\$5,458	42	\$7.50
Monroe	746	133	879	15,438	6,248	40	7.11
Nicholas	1,115	637	1,752	30,176	13,176	44	7.52
Pendleton	261	84	345	5,846	2,592	44	7.51
Pocahontas	450	64	514	9,214	3,708	40	7.21
Preston	602	196	798	13,938	5,896	42	7.39
Putnam	650	186	836	14,604	6,274	43	7.50
Raleigh	3,889	1,163	5,052	90,300	36,740	41	7.27
Randolph	1,213	217	1,430	25,076	10,002	40	6.99
Roane	1,025	183	1,208	20,678	8,630	42	7.14
Summers	1,583	536	2,119	36,532	15,692	43	7.41
Taylor	345	150	495	8,630	3,590	42	7.25
Tucker	221	34	255	4,698	1,924	41	7.55
Upshur	692	238	930	16,434	6,676	41	7.18
Wayne	4,773	615	5,388	94,516	38,260	40	7.10
Webster	1,562	274	1,836	32,668	13,210	40	7.19
Wirt	118	58	176	3,040	1,366	45	7.76
Wood	745	367	1,112	19,954	8,586	43	7.72
Wyoming	2,644	624	3,268	57,742	23,628	41	7.23
Total	76,556	17,084	93,640	1,648,722	671,520	41	7.17
Wisconsin (18):							
Burnett	154	104	258	4,575	1,398	31	5.42
Crawford	175	288	463	8,202	2,821	34	6.09
Door (New)	107	99	206	3,557	1,101	31	5.34
Douglas	836	871	1,707	31,129	10,493	34	6.15
Dunn	195	376	571	8,083	2,705	33	4.74
Grant	306	180	486	9,269	2,738	30	5.63
Iron	49	130	179	3,549	1,038	29	5.80
Kewaunee (New)	28	15	43	842	244	29	5.67
Lafayette	99	118	217	3,657	1,239	34	5.71
Langlade	187	659	846	14,532	4,722	33	5.58
Milwaukee	12,059	2,900	14,959	253,728	75,751	30	5.06
Pepin	138	60	198	3,608	1,034	29	5.22
Pierce	1,138	112	1,250	4,305	1,308	30	5.23
Price	137	487	624	11,509	3,860	34	6.19
Rusk	222	275	497	10,367	3,250	31	6.54
St. Croix	72	89	161	2,803	844	30	5.24
Vernon	176	183	359	6,411	2,090	33	5.82
Waukesha	599	406	1,005	16,318	5,758	35	5.73
Total	15,677	7,352	23,029	396,244	122,394	31	5.31
Wyoming (23):							
Albany	117	155	272	4,664	1,603	34	5.89
Big Horn	214	293	507	8,741	3,109	36	6.13
Campbell	80	26	106	1,808	680	38	6.42
Carbon	398	312	710	11,793	4,412	37	21.6
Converse	91	40	131	2,054	748	36	5.71
Crook	6	5	11	248	80	32	7.27
Fremont	150	142	292	5,075	1,885	33	6.46
Goshon	234	79	313	6,141	1,846	30	5.90
Hot Springs	70	43	113	2,024	640	32	5.66
Johnson	59	28	87	1,557	467	30	5.39
Laramie	775	334	1,109	19,719	6,303	32	5.68
Lincoln	30	11	41	890	240	27	5.85
Natrona	787	526	1,313	23,196	8,596	37	6.55
Niobrara	27	39	66	1,362	424	31	6.42
Park	181	92	273	4,564	1,470	32	5.38
Platte	95	76	171	3,152	980	31	5.73
Sheridan	412	107	519	10,407	3,131	30	6.03
Sublette	22	42	64	1,160	516	44	8.06
Sweetwater	307	147	454	7,937	2,963	37	6.53
Teton	14	0	14	322	80	25	5.71
Uinta	25	6	31	757	197	26	6.35
Washakie	180	99	279	4,582	1,568	34	5.62
Weston	44	103	147	2,522	1,082	43	7.36
Total	4,318	2,705	7,023	125,275	43,020	34	6.13
Grand total (645)	1959,990	1,597,073	1,1,557,063	126,409,959	19,559,675	136	16.14

¹ Estimates.

² Combined with Central Falls, R.I.

Secretary FREEMAN. But today, I do not want to dwell on the details of program operations or statistics. Rather, I want to review the broad place and purpose of the program in the whole range of activities for which the Department of Agriculture is responsible.

This program is in the Department of Agriculture because it is a farm and food program.

It provides increased outlets for our food surpluses and helps raise farm income. Here, I do not refer to food surpluses in the narrow sense of the commodities we have under loan or in inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Rather, I refer to the excess capacity our farmers have to produce food—the food they could produce to their economic benefit, if the markets were available. And a larger market is available—it is the need for better diets among our low-income families. In effect—through the food stamp program—this committee and the whole Congress are building a bridge between those of our farmers who need larger markets and our poor families who need more and better food.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that we undertook a careful 3-year test of this program before we asked the Congress to provide continuing authority for it. During that test, we carefully studied its results to determine if, as a farm program, we would get the results we expected.

Those studies dramatically demonstrated the effectiveness of the food stamp approach.

Farm markets were expanded. A study in Detroit showed that food stamp families bought: 37 percent more meat, 32 percent more poultry, 67 percent more fresh fruit, 60 percent more fresh vegetables, 80 percent more fluid milk.

I could go on—these food stamp families used more grains—even though we had been donating cereal products to them before the food stamp program started.

If we want to enlarge domestic markets for grains, the best way to do it is to make it possible for low-income families to buy more livestock products. And the food stamp program does that.

That Detroit study showed that—with the same amount of Federal subsidiary—the food stamp program has a greater impact on farm income than does the direct donation of surplus foods.

The level of food consumption obtained among low-income families in Detroit—when we were providing surplus foods—provided a return of \$1.75 per person per week to the farmer. Under the stamp program, the farmer's share increased to \$2.01—a 15-percent increase.

Its successes as a farm program have been paralleled by its success as a food program.

It is a very valuable supplement to the restricted food budgets of our low-income families. It means more meat, more milk, more poultry, more fruits and vegetables for the food stamp family. And these are the protective foods that make for better diets and improved health.

Our files are full of unsolicited reports from families concerning what the food stamp program has meant to them. Let me quote from an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 30, 1966:

"But I can't raise a family of young-uns on three days work and \$35 a week."
So Mr. Collins, who has spent his whole life here in the Cumberland Mountains, counts heavily on help from Federal food stamps that can be used like cash at

the grocery store. Gesturing at his neatly-dressed eight-year-old boy, he says: "This one would still be eating bread and gravy for breakfast instead of eggs, milk and cereal if it weren't for those food stamps."

The food stamp program has been well administered. There have been no scandals. There has been no evidence of poor administration.

And again I would acknowledge the contribution of this committee in developing the basic framework of the program—as set forth in the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Among other things, this committee developed amendments to our original bill that more clearly and precisely defined program eligibility and that more precisely established the responsibility of States for proper program administration. Those amendments have stood the "test of time" and actual operating experience.

Finally, the program has acted as a stimulus to the entire economy of the community. The extra dollars that move into food stamp communities increase retail food sales by an average of 8 percent, according to studies. The retailer buys more food from the local wholesaler—many retailers report that they hire extra help, et cetera. So, these extra dollars turn around many times in the local community.

Again, let me quote from the Wall Street Journal article:

"My grocery business is like the old days when the coal mines were booming," says Merlin D. Smith who has run a country store in the county for 20 years.

As always, there are some misunderstandings about a new program.

First, there is some misunderstanding about the role of State and local governments and the control they exercise.

It is a cooperative Federal-State-local program. The Department of Agriculture cannot put a single program into operation anywhere. The States and localities must request it. In fact, it's a 100 percent voluntary program—for the States, for the localities, for the retail stores, and for the family it is designed to help.

The States set the eligibility standards and each family is certified by the local office of the State welfare agencies. The States and localities determine how and where the coupons are to be sold to participating families. And they must finance almost all of those certification and issuance costs.

Second, there is a misunderstanding that the food stamp program permits States to evade their responsibilities for the basic public assistance or general relief of the poor.

Families must continue to spend their own money for food—even though the families were getting their income from a public assistance or local relief grant. That is why we have a minimum purchase requirement—even for the family with very low and irregular income. It has been traditional for community resources—either public or private—to help families who find themselves in a short-term emergency. Thus, when we put a food stamp program into an area, we expect those community resources to finance the minimum purchase requirements for the family in an emergency.

So, the States and localities must continue to carry out their basic responsibilities for the relief of the poor. They cannot use the food stamp program as a back-door method of shifting that responsibility to the Department of Agriculture.

Third, some have felt that the States should finance 20 percent of the cost of the free coupons so that they may exercise proper control of the program.

If this change is made in the program, then most of the States will likely end their participation in the program, and go back to the distribution of surplus foods.

1. States continue to have serious difficulty providing sufficient funds to support their own public welfare programs. Some States—particularly the lower income States—are not now taking full advantage of available Federal public assistance funds because they have not been able to raise the tax funds required.

2. Major efforts are being made both by the Federal Government and the States to upgrade the level of welfare assistance to provide more adequately for the needs of the Nation's needy families. These efforts will further tax available financial resources within the States between now and the time States would be asked to assume cost-sharing responsibility for the food stamp program.

3. Welfare programs must provide for many pressing needs of poor families in addition to better nutrition through increased food consumption. The States' welfare programs must provide for all the needs of their needy families and State resources must be effectively allocated to that end. In fact, if States were now able to finance a public assistance program of adequate scope, we would not need a food stamp program.

4. The States have available to them a Federal food program which does not require cost sharing. By choosing to participate in the commodity distribution program they can continue to provide food assistance to needy families without assuming the financial burden that would be imposed on them by a cost sharing requirement in the food stamp program.

Finally, it is important that the appropriation authorities for the program be authorized for an additional 3 years. We believe our experience under the act demonstrates the wisdom of this committee and the Congress in establishing the principle of gradual progressive program expansion—with appropriation authorities specified for a 3-year period. This has meant that both the Department and cooperating State welfare agencies have had the time to gain experience and modify and adjust the program—based upon that experience. And it has permitted both the Department and the States to build the kind of administrative organization that is essential to effective and prudent program management and control.

The program has worked well because the States have been able to plan ahead, rather than on a year-to-year basis. And it was in recognition of this need that the Congress acted to provide the Department and the States a basis for forward planning—for 3 years—when the act was passed in 1964.

To now place the program on a year-to-year basis would mean less orderly program expansion and less effective administration. It would endanger the goals and objectives set forth by the Congress and the effective administration that we and the States have been able to achieve.

I urge the subcommittee to recommend a food stamp bill that will permit the program to continue and to expand—on the sound and workable basis embodied in the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, for a very fine report.

Senator YOUNG.

Senator YOUNG. How much is the amount of authorization?

Secretary FREEMAN. The amount of authorization that we currently have before the Congress is \$195 million.

**STATEMENT OF HOWARD P. DAVIS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR,
CONSUMER FOOD PROGRAMS, CONSUMER AND MARKETING
SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Mr. DAVIS. That is our budget request for 1968.

Secretary FREEMAN. A total of \$140 million for the current fiscal year; right?

Mr. DAVIS. Right.

Senator YOUNG. What is the authorization limit?

Secretary FREEMAN. There was no authorization limit in the basic legislation. That was left open to the Appropriation Committee establish the amount.

Senator YOUNG. I see.

Mr. DAVIS. In the bill before the committee.

Senator BOGGS. Should there be—is that your point, Senator—should not there be an authorization limit to cover the 3-year period if we go to the 3-year period, rather than an open—

Senator YOUNG. Well, there usually is; but I did not remember this case, whether there was any limitation.

Secretary FREEMAN. Am I wrong? Is there limitation in the basic legislation we have now?

Mr. DAVIS. In the bill as passed in 1964 there was a limitation for each of the 3 years for which appropriations were authorized.

Secretary FREEMAN. I stand corrected. I was wrong.

Mr. DAVIS. That, of course, runs out in June.

Senator YOUNG. You are now proposing that it be open end, with no authorization limitation?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct, sir. The bill before the committee has no limitation on time or money.

Senator YOUNG. What did the House do in that respect?

Mr. DAVIS. They limited the appropriation authorization to 1 year and \$195 million.

Senator YOUNG. Just 1 year?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Secretary FREEMAN. The amount was satisfactory, but the year limitation, I think, would not be constructive.

Senator YOUNG. I think it should be for a longer period, too.

Senator BOGGS. Yes, but my observation is that if you left it open end, you always run into a lot of trouble on the floor about it. It makes it easier if you put some figure in there.

Senator JORDAN. Any further questions?

Senator BOGGS. Well, getting back to the point, Mr. Secretary, that Senator Kennedy raised about your not being able to reach some of these people who have no means of coming up with the \$2, for example—in the overall program when a State or one of its subdivisions requests to get into the program, are there certain criteria that they must comply with?

Secretary FREEMAN. The general rule on this is that the participant in the program will spend the amount to get the stamps that he has been spending for food before, and then the additional stamps that he gets will depend upon the difference between what he has been spending and what in that vicinity is determined as the amount of food that he should have to have an adequate nutritious diet.

So, if a person was, for example, on relief in the State of Minnesota, and he received \$100 a month for relief and would be spending under that \$20 a month but that if he was going to have a real adequate diet he should be spending \$30 a month, he would then take the \$20, and he would exchange that for \$30 worth of stamps which he could use like money at the grocery store.

Senator BOGGS. I understand that. But now, how are you going to get to these people who must come up with the money to purchase any stamps? Is there not really an obligation of the county or State to try to provide them with some funds?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that we would expect that every State or town in this Nation should see to it that nobody would starve to death.

Senator BOGGS. That is my point.

Secretary FREEMAN. And that would mean that everyone would get at least \$2 a month for food.

Senator BOGGS. Right.

Secretary FREEMAN. And, therefore, we would take that \$2 a month in Mississippi and it would be changed to \$12 a month, increased four or five times in regard to food. However, we then face the practical problem that if they do not actually in some areas have a program, State or local, that gets \$2 to people for food, what do you do then? And, in this instance, what we are considering is lowering that \$2 level so that perhaps it would be 50 cents instead of \$2, so then you would get, need to put in only that amount because somewhere or other this we are required to do because the law requires that the person should make a token, at least, contribution toward getting these stamps.

Senator BOGGS. I see.

Senator JORDAN. Anything further?

Senator BOGGS. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Young?

Senator YOUNG. No questions.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. We appreciate you being with us.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Graham, Mr. Harry Graham.

Mr. Harry Graham is the legislative representative of the National Grange.

Harry, we are always glad to have you. I always enjoy seeing you and hearing you.

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to come before this committee. This is the first time this year, and this is a very important bill, and I have a very short statement on it.

Senator JORDAN. Do you not have some other information you would like to put in the record at this point?

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to add something to this statement.

Senator JORDAN. All right, you proceed as you wish.

Mr. GRAHAM. Since the statement will only take about 3 minutes, I think I will just read it.

Senator JORDAN. All right, that will be fine.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was originally passed as somewhat of a pilot program and it, of course, had a termination date which is in 1967. It was anticipated that a number of States would want to use the program, but the requests for sharing in the program have exceeded original estimates, indicating the general approval of the operation of this program.

S. 953 by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Robert C. Byrd, properly puts the program on the basis that it is not to be terminated until specifically done by the Congress, allowing for the orderly programing and budgeting not only by the Federal Government, but by the State and local governments involved.

At the same time, it provides for an expansion of the program on an orderly basis to cover the needs of those who are in the income brackets which properly and legally qualify them for receiving this assistance.

The Grange supported the original pilot project, we supported the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and we are happy to support S. 953 to put this on an expanded and more permanent basis.

One of the concerns of the Grange as it has surveyed this and previous programs was that the Nation was dependent upon the distribution of surplus food commodities. These were purchased by the Government at support levels, far below a fair price to the producers.

The Food Stamp Program has brought the procurement of food into the regular market channels where the recipients have access to the same food available to others in our society. The dual results of upgrading the diets by making essential food available, and the normalizing of the market system for food distribution were and are commendable and worthwhile objectives.

As Under Secretary Schnittker said last month in a speech before the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association:

The steady expansion of the food stamp program is an important force in expanding markets. By the end of the current fiscal year, nearly 2 million persons will be involved. Much of the increase in spending for food will be for meat and other livestock products.

We are of the firm conviction that nobody in this United States should be permitted to go hungry as long as there is an abundance of food available and as long as we have great wealth this Nation so obviously possesses.

The passage of S. 953 would provide a practical means of making this food available to the needy people of our Nation. The Grange earnestly urges the approval of this legislation by the committee and the passage of the legislation by the Senate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of comments.

We did not add anything in our testimony concerning the matching funds by the State because that bill was not before the committee, although we anticipated that this question would arise. And, also,

we would point out the difference between the surplus food disposal program and this present program.

In the surplus food disposal—during the house hearing the question was asked about what foods were available at the present time for surplus disposal. I went back and dug out the answers to this. I do not have the list with me, but I would say with the exception of a little cheese and a little butter that very recently became available, that all the rest of it is cereals. It is either wheat or wheat products, rice or beans.

Senator JORDAN. Beets?

Mr. GRAHAM. Beans.

Senator JORDAN. Beans.

Mr. GRAHAM. So, basically it is a cereal diet at that point.

Now, this obviously is not an adequate diet, especially for children and especially for older people, the two groups that would most properly be the concern of the committee.

We point out that for children—that we have learned, and we have made some emphasis about this in terms of the foreign relief programs, that children with inadequate protein diets during the first 4 years of their life, suffer permanent damage to their learning capacity.

That is one of the great tragedies of the world, that not only is a child hungry, but that he is limited for all future time. It is true in India, it is also true in Mississippi or Harlem, or wherever the hungry child may be. And a balanced diet obviously is not only desirable, but I think it is a social necessity for us; otherwise we burden ourselves with people that are incapacitated in terms of their ability to learn skills through all the rest of their lives.

So, we simply perpetuate a problem by not getting the kind of food where it belong.

Now, we are beginning to solve this in school lunch programs, but this is too late. The damage has already been done for the children by the time they get to the school lunch.

Now, I think that in general, and the Grange has supported this principle, in terms of State sharing, where the project are socially desirable, the States should share and that the Federal Government has properly used the carrot-stick approach in order to get some of these projects accepted by the States. Roads, for instance. This is basically the responsibility of the State, and so we have used the enticement: If you will do such and such a thing in terms of roads, if you will contribute a certain amount, then we will give you a much larger amount. But this has been an enticement to do something that is desirable and may be necessary. But in some areas they could get along on the bumpy roads. I do not like to, and neither does anybody else, but we could get by.

Now, when you get into food, especially food for people that have no resources, this is not a desirable situation. This is a necessity of life. And I think we need to remember this, that the carrot-stick approach really is not quite so valid in terms of feeding people, as it is in building roads.

The question always arises about these people who cannot afford even the original cost of the food stamps. The States, I think, at this point, who do have the responsibility for keeping people from starving to death would be well-advised to spend some of this welfare money for food stamps because they just multiply their welfare money.

Senator BOGGS. I agree.

Mr. GRAHAM. They multiply at that point.

Senator BOGGS. I think it is their responsibility. There should not be a single person without food under a system like this.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course there should not, and the cheapest way that the States feed the needy is to do it with this kind of system. We could save them more money that way than any other way we could do it. And I am concerned, and I think the Congress is concerned, I think the Nation is concerned about the loads that some of these States carry. This is where the big increase in expenditure comes. People talk about the increase in expenditures to the Federal Government. With the exception of something like the Vietnam project, there is no correlation between the increase of Federal expenditures and increase in population. We have held these expenditures almost constant—or relatively so, but we have had this tremendous increase in the cost of State government.

If you were a Governor, you would well know this problem.

This program, it seems to me, helps the two groups of States that are in most difficulty. One is the States with a high percentage of urban population. New York is the best example. It is just in fiscal problems all the time. It is just a cat and dog race to see who comes out ahead, and how in the world they can get the money to run the various services that are required for the State and especially a city like New York City. This becomes particularly acute when you get large numbers of indigent people that all of a sudden are plunked down into this society who had no origin there, but they are there and somebody has to take care of them.

On the other side of the coin, if you flip it over, other States from which these people came—basically rural, basically low-income, basically no resources, and where—according to some of the testimony that was given in the poverty program hearings, it was indicated that there are counties in some of the Southern States, and especially in the cutover land where if they spent every cent they could raise for tax money, they would not have enough for schools. If they would commit all their taxes, they would not have enough just for the schools.

Now, to try to impose this welfare load and all the rest of the loads on them, we are just imposing a load they are simply not able to carry. And this is where, as Dr. Rositer of Harvard says, we need some “social overhead capital” that is plowed into these areas, and the food stamp program is one of the ways of doing it and accomplishing another desirable objective, and that is just getting people well fed.

May I comment on this authorization because this is a program that extends further than the previous one. I think it should. I think the same reason for doing this is the one we used for passing the 4-year farm bill. It gives the States and local communities and everybody else a chance to plan just a little further ahead. You cannot set up this program overnight and you cannot terminate it overnight without a great deal of hardship. When it comes to authorization limitations, I think we ought to consider the rate of growth of the acceptance of these programs. The authorization of \$195 million this year probably is not the proper authorization for next year. So it would seem to me that somebody could, on the basis of the figures and trends that we already have, project the authorization. Maybe it is 195 this year, and it seems to be acceptable, but maybe it ought to

be 225 next year and 275 the next year and 310 the next year. But we ought to recognize that this program is only so far in its relatively pilot stage, that it is going to grow, and to be fair to the people involved, it ought to grow. We should make it possible for this growth, so that we do not hamstring it by an authorization which says that this is fine but you cannot go any further, and a whole host of people that need these services would be left out.

These are the only extra comments I had left out.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Graham.

Senator Young?

Senator YOUNG. No questions.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Boggs.

Senator BOGGS. Thank you, Mr. Graham, for your testimony.

Senator JORDAN. Harry, that was a very fine presentation. I thoroughly agree. I think the Federal Government not only has an obligation and a duty, but it is nothing but right that somehow or other we should see that ample food is gotten to every person in the United States. And we have been very magnanimous in our treatment of foreign countries, a great deal, and properly so. I have supported every one of those programs—

Mr. GRAHAM. So have we.

Senator JORDAN (continuing). And you have, too, and your organization has, but there is an old proverb saying that charity begins at home. And it certainly is applicable in this case. And if we have anybody that is really hungry, why, we should see that he is fed—I mean amply fed, not just—

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that is correct.

Senator JORDAN (continuing). The basic commodities. They are good, but you need more than that.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is unbelievable that we should have hungry people in a land with the productive capacity of these United States. It is incredible and indefensible any way you put it, because we have the food, and even if we have not, we can doggone well produce it.

Senator JORDAN. That is right. Thank you very much. We appreciate your being with us today.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Reuben Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON, we will be glad to hear you. Mr. Johnson is the director of the legislative services, National Farmers Union.

Mr. Johnson, we are glad to have you, sir, and you may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF REUBEN L. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Boggs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask permission to submit my statement for the record.

Senator JORDAN. You may do so.

Mr. JOHNSON. Rather than burden you here with a lot of additional testimony, which will be repetitious of many of the comments made by Mr. Harry Graham, I would just like to subscribe to the comments that he made to the committee and to say that this is just one more example where we farm organizations can point to an area of agreement.

Contrary to the view of farm organizations that is sometimes presented there are a number of areas of agreement between some of us in organized agriculture, and this certainly is one of them.

I would like to especially say that we subscribe wholeheartedly to the comments made by the Grange concerning the authorization for the program.

I would like to suggest to the committee that the outlook is for a continuation of this program over a really long time, and I believe that the provisions of Senator Byrd's bill, which would make this program a permanent program, unless ended by the Congress, has a great deal of merit.

I would just like to also inject one other comment.

We have recently had a fly-in program involving about 100 cotton farmers from Texas. These men, who were also represented at our convention at Oklahoma City, have decided that we ought to be using some of our huge surplus of cotton to alleviate the need that exists for cotton bedding. We have been talking about food here, and there was one brief mention made as to the lack of clothing in Mississippi. Certainly we feel that some type of direct distribution program of cotton bedding, including mattresses, would be worthwhile. Maybe we could use the Job Corps program to help process some of this surplus cotton into mattresses and comforts and bedding. I was told by a representative of the Department of Agriculture that went to Mississippi recently that some of the people he visited were literally sleeping in a bed of rags, just crawling down in a bed of rags like an animal would burrow in. And in many instances, people are sleeping on the floor. And children are not in school because of the lack of clothing.

Now, while the direct distribution program would lend itself admirably to a cotton mattress or comfort, in such a program there would be, in my opinion, justification for a cotton stamp program for children's clothing to be administered very similarly to the way that we administer the food stamp program. In other words, the various sizes of clothing would make it impractical to proceed to distribute clothing through a direct distribution program, but would be extremely practical and realistic if stamps were provided needy families with children that were out of school because they did not have adequate clothing.

I do not think there was a need for a great amount of money here, but I know there are families that need this type of program.

You need not worry about support from farm people for both the food stamp and the cotton stamp for cotton mattress program, because the support is out there, and I believe also that this is one area where farmers and their city counterparts look with unanimity on the worthwhileness of this kind of effort.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Mr. Dechant's statement submitted for the record is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when the pilot Food Stamp Program was initiated by this Administration in eight selected areas of the country in 1961 an important objective of the legislative program of the Farmers Union was achieved. The success of this initial program resulted in public demand for its extension on a pilot basis to other areas. By June 30, 1967, the Food Stamp Program will be serving over 800 areas in 41 states. This compares with some 209

areas in 37 States and the District of Columbia which were taking part in the program a year ago. The public acceptance of this program has resulted in consideration of additional areas to be added as funds become available.

Career employees of the Department of Agriculture who are administering the Food Stamp Program as well as other programs with the objective of increasing the utilization of agricultural commodities and upgrading the diets of the needy, are to be commended for the outstanding success of the Food Stamp Program. They have been successful in developing the techniques of making the program practical and workable from a standpoint of administration. In addition, a series of studies have been made under their direction which dramatically illustrate the benefits that have accrued under this program to farmers and to low-income families and individuals.

The fact that current expenditures of needy families for food is augmented through the Food Stamp Plan makes it possible for a family participating in the program to substantially upgrade their diet. For example, animal products such as meat, poultry, fresh milk and eggs and fruits and vegetables accounted for more than 80% of the gains in food consumption in the areas surveyed several years ago. These are the foods most needed for proper nutrition and which are difficult to distribute in the conventional manner.

Taking a sample of retail food stores in the original eight pilot food programs, the Department of Agriculture has demonstrated that the dollar value of food sales increased by 8% under the Food Stamp Program. The retail outlets included in this survey represented an estimated 50-85% of the total retail food sales in all of the original eight pilot areas except Detroit.

It was found in the Detroit area that meat consumption among the recipients of food stamps increased by one pound per person per week from 2¼ pounds to 3¼ pounds. One pound of meat is equal to approximately six pounds of feed grains. In the Detroit area, also, poultry consumption among recipients of food stamps increased by ½ pound per person per week. This is equivalent to approximately one pound of feed grains.

It is clearly demonstrated, from this early survey as well as later surveys, that the Food Stamp Plan is upgrading diets of the needy at the same time it has made possible increased utilization of feed grains.

While these increases in meat consumption were taking place, surveys show that consumption of cereal products remained at approximately the same level as under the direct distribution program.

It is also clear, Mr. Chairman, that farmers have a stake in the rapid expansion of this program because of the strengthening of markets for a broad range of food items, a number of which remain in surplus supply.

S. 953, introduced by Senator Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.), would make possible the expansion of the Food Stamp Program and give the program permanent status. We believe the demonstrated worth of the program warrants the full and unanimous support of all the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The farmers of this nation have supported on many occasions important legislation under consideration by this distinguished Committee to expand the utilization of food, both in the United States and to needy people abroad.

Based on my discussion with farm people throughout this country, I can think of no legislative area in which there is a stronger interest than in programs that have increased the use of food in schools, in institutions and to individual families both here in the United States and abroad. I, therefore, respectfully urge the Committee to give S. 953 its strong approval.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Committee and will be happy to respond to any questions that Members of the Committee may have.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

Senator BOGGS. Do you have any questions?

Senator BOGGS. No, I have no questions. I thank you, too, Mr. Johnson.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much for that fine statement.

Mrs. Mitchiner.

Mrs. Mitchiner is director of the division of public assistance, State board of public welfare, of Raleigh, N.C., and that is a great State you are representing there. We are mighty glad you came up, and Mrs. Mitchiner is representing the American Public Welfare Association this morning.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. And we would be glad to have you proceed any way you like, Mrs. Mitchiner.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I would like to read my statement. It is very brief.

Senator JORDAN. Fine. Incidentally, did you have anyone with you that you wanted to have recorded as being here?

Mrs. MITCHINER. Well, Mr. Harold Hagen, who is the Washington representative for the American Public Welfare Association, is here with me.

Senator JORDAN. Does he have a statement to make?

Mrs. MITCHINER. No; this is the statement.

Senator JORDAN. All right; fine.

Senator BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, before Mrs. Mitchiner proceeds, I want to ask permission to be excused because I do have a commitment I must keep at 11 o'clock. I will read your testimony very carefully, and I thank you, too, for being here today.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Senator Boggs. I appreciate your being here for the first part of this hearing.

Senator BOGGS. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Mrs. Mitchiner, that is one of our problems here. We all have many duties to be different places, and we just have to do it the very best we can, but it will all be in the record and available to every member of this committee.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I will proceed as quickly as I can.

Senator JORDAN. Fine.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MYRA J. MITCHINER, AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION, RALEIGH, N.C.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I would like to state that the American Public Welfare Association is the national membership organization representing the field of public welfare. Included in the membership of the association are State and local departments of public welfare which have the responsibility for the certification of eligibility and certain other administrative functions in connection with the food stamp program. For this reason, as well as the fact that the food stamp program and the public welfare program are closely interrelated, we have a direct interest in the legislation now before your committee.

Our general view of the food stamp program as now administered is a positive one. Through cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, low-income families, including not only those families receiving public assistance through the categorical assistance programs, but other needy persons have been able to improve their standard of living and safeguard the health of themselves and their children through better nutrition. The categorical public assistance programs are limited to helping only about 7½ million of the Nation's 32 to 34 million poverty-stricken people. The remaining millions of persons, though poor, do not have the added misfortune, which would qualify them for public assistance payments, of being blind, totally disabled, widowed, or deserted with dependent children, or over 65 years of age. And yet, their need, particularly for the basic item, food, is just as great, and quite often even greater. Those counties and cities

which have been fortunate enough to participate in the food stamp program are, through the provisions of the program, able to reach out and help many of these other needy persons and provide some assistance directly in one of the areas of greatest need, the need for an adequate diet. Not only does the food stamp program provide public welfare with a means of reaching many who were heretofore unreachable, but, through the requirement that these families convert their existing food dollars to food stamps, an assurance is provided that the food assistance is received in the form for which it was intended. This guard against substitution of food dollars for other necessities or nonessentials insures, without exception, the availability of a more adequate and nutritional diet for participating families. Research has shown that, while the consumption of grains and cereals of low-income families remains relatively stable, about 80 percent of their increased consumption when receiving benefits of the food stamp program is in meat and meat products, fruits and vegetables.

Many of these families have become so accustomed to a "beans and potatoes" diet that it is difficult for them to adjust their purchasing habits to a balanced, more nutritional diet. In many communities cooperative efforts are being made by representatives of Consumer and Marketing Service, Cooperative Extension Service, Health and Welfare, to establish nutrition education committees to assist these families in proper management of the additional food dollars provided by the program.

Although the program improves the conditions of low-income families, it should be remembered that it also stimulates and increases the flow of food products from the Nation's farms through normal commercial channels. Thus, thousands of persons who are non-indigent but who derive their livelihood from agricultural interests, also benefit from food stamp activities. Research conducted in one test area has shown that the returns to farmers alone from food purchased by low-income families rose from \$1.75 per person to \$2.01, or an increase of approximately 15 percent. Other groups which benefit are food merchants, food processors, banks, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the remainder of my remarks to one of the amendments to the Food Stamp Act proposed by the House Agriculture Committee: That of requiring, effective July 1, 1969, each participating State or political subdivision to pay 20 percent of the cost of the free stamps distributed to eligible households. It is the position of the American Public Welfare Association that this amendment will place the food stamp program in great jeopardy and will, in effect, reduce participation, and in some areas, complete withdrawal, from the program. This, in our opinion, would be retrogression on the part of a nation whose philosophy is firmly rooted in a belief in the worth of the individual and committed to all-out efforts to help deprived individuals and families improve their general conditions.

It is universally known that States find it difficult to support their basic public assistance programs because of the lack of sufficient State and local revenues. In fact, one of the advantages of the food stamp program is the elevation of the living standards of the recipients. Actually, as has been said earlier, one of the reasons that a Federal food assistance program is needed is related to States' inability to

raise sufficient revenue for the basic ongoing public assistance programs. In fact, individual and family public assistance budgets generally cover only minimum subsistence amounts for food, clothing, rent, utilities, and, in some few States, other recognized basic needs. When fixed-expense items, such as rent and utilities, exceed a State's maximum allowance in the public assistance budget, then the amount for food is the only flexible item from which to draw. Consequently, quantity and quality of food are reduced. Too, many States cannot even meet the full cost of minimum food allowances as set by their own standard for health. How, then, can they be expected to participate financially in the much-needed food stamp program when they cannot "cough up" sufficient funds to meet food costs in their basic public assistance programs?

The Commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare in Mississippi has said:

While Mississippi has supported public welfare to the extent of the State's financial ability to do so, we must recognize that welfare checks in our State are still too low in view of the present cost of living.

Mississippi has a large food stamp program. By June 1, 1967, there will be 38 counties in that State which will have the program in operation. Most of these counties are either the larger and wealthier counties or some of the smaller wealthier counties. The poorer counties where, no doubt, the need is greater, cannot afford the program. The 38 food stamp counties in Mississippi constitute over half of that State's population. If the amendment requiring States to pay 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons is enacted into law, it would cost Mississippi an estimated \$1,300,000 per year for the 38 counties in the program on June 1, 1967, without consideration of adding more counties desiring to enter the program. Mississippi's commissioner continues:

If our State has to pay 20 percent of the bonus coupons in addition to the present costs of administration being paid by the counties, we see no way that the food stamp program could be continued in Mississippi. Due to our limited general fund revenues, neither our State nor counties could separately or collectively financially afford a food stamp program that would cost this amount.

The commissioner of public welfare in Louisiana has stated:

According to information now available to use, we estimate that if this proposed legislation is enacted into law, it would cost Louisiana an additional one million, two hundred thousand dollars annually to operate the present program now in operation.

In addition, the Louisiana State Board of Public Welfare at its regular monthly meeting on April 12, 1967, passed a resolution including the following statement:

Therefore be it resolved, that due to the serious financial condition of Louisiana at the present time, and in the foreseeable future, if the present proposal is put into effect, the cost would be more than the State could bear and would therefore jeopardize the entire program in Louisiana.

The State Director of the Ohio Department of Public Welfare wired:

Ohio is very much concerned about proposed legislation relating to Food Stamp Program. The requirement for state to meet 20 percent of cost of bonus stamps would result in drastic curtailment of what has been a most successful program.

The State of Tennessee where 51 counties are approved for participation in the food stamp program, the State Commissioner of Public Welfare states:

The amendment which the House Committee on Agriculture made to H.R. 1318 . . . would in my opinion be disastrous for the program here in this State. At the present rate of participation this would mean that the State of Tennessee would be required to contribute approximately one and one-half million dollars annually.

In North Carolina where we have 22 counties participating in the program, the effect of the amendment would result in a need for additional funds in excess of \$900,000. The public welfare program in North Carolina is locally administered, Mr. Chairman, as you know, and State supervised. Consequently, at least a portion of this financial burden would have to be passed on to the counties with the probable result that many counties would have to terminate the program.

There seems to be an assumption on the part of some people that States and localities do not now participate in the cost of the food stamp program. This is erroneous. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 requires State and local financial participation for the purposes of administration. I would like to cite an example of one county in North Carolina currently participating in the program. This small, rural, county has a population of only 24,350 persons. The county's share of the administrative expenses currently amounts to approximately \$6,000 per year. This is county money. In addition, a similar amount is contributed from State funds. Enactment of the 20-percent amendment would increase the burden on this county by approximately \$40,000 per year. The point we are emphasizing here is the fact that States and localities are now participating in the cost of the food stamp program.

It is a fact of life that many of the poorer States cannot afford to pay the full cost of need established by their own standards in their ongoing public assistance programs. Other States like Illinois, where need is met in full and the States' average public assistance payments exceed the Federal matching formula, the difference is paid from State funds. An additional requirement to finance 20 percent of the cost of the bonus food stamps distributed in such States would penalize those States which are already carrying a disproportionate share of financing. It is completely unrealistic to assume that States can pick up this additional fiscal responsibility, and some States and localities would be forced to forgo the advantages of the food stamp program.

Since this statement was prepared, Mr. Chairman, we have heard from three other States. Pennsylvania has 29 counties with 12 additional counties planning to enter the program. And according to their State commissioner, the amendment for 20 percent of the cost of the free stamps would require in excess of \$1.5 million additional money in Pennsylvania.

In Kentucky, where there are 54 counties currently in the program, the amendment would require an additional \$1,470,000.

We also had a letter from the director in Wyoming opposing the amendment and saying that the Governor of Wyoming had gone on record as opposing the amendment.

In relation to the fact that some States have been unable to meet the full amount of need as determined on the basis of a reasonable assistance budget, we call your attention to H.R. 5710, the Social

Security Amendments of 1967, which include a Federal requirement for States to meet the full amount of need as determined by the State. Interestingly enough, the effective date of this amendment to the Social Security Act and the effective date of the proposed amendment to the Food Stamp Act is one and the same, July 1, 1969. The American Public Welfare Association has already gone on record as strongly supporting the establishment of a Federal requirement for the payment of the full amount of need as determined on the basis of a reasonable budget. In our opinion this step forward must be taken. The additional requirement for States to meet 20 percent of the cost of the bonus food coupons in the food stamp program would have a direct effect on their ability to meet the requirement as proposed in the amendments to the Social Security Act. Consequently, it is clear that some States would be forced to drop the food stamp program.

I would like to make a personal observation for your consideration. The public welfare program is an all-pervasive one, touching the lives of millions of people in our country. Much legislation is considered and in fact, is enacted which has a direct effect on the total public welfare program, without full consideration of the effect of implementation at the grassroots level. Several examples come to mind. For instance, the amendments to title V of the Economic Opportunity Act involving the Department of Labor; the Food Stamp Act of 1964 itself which, in effect, gave legal responsibility for certification of need to the public welfare agency; the 1966 Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. Now, we agree with the purposes and functions of all of these programs, and we believe it appropriate that efforts be coordinated in furthering any program which will improve and uplift the general conditions of millions of our poor people because no one agency of Government knows and understands needy, deprived, and uneducated families better than public welfare does. It is our firm belief that public welfare should be involved; however, we feel strongly that public welfare is too frequently handed responsibility without consultation with us and without financial provision to carry out our obligations.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the American Public Welfare Association, I wish to express appreciation to you and this committee for the opportunity of appearing before you. Again, I wish to state that it is our opinion that the food stamp program as presently administered has proven highly successful, has been well accepted, and has made a great contribution to the welfare of the Nation. In public welfare, it has given us a long-awaited opportunity to extend services to a portion of the millions of needy persons outside the public assistance categories and to provide some help in at least one of their many areas of deprivation.

Because of the positive response across the Nation to the food stamp program, we urge your consideration in continuing the program with an adequate appropriation for future expansion. We also ask particularly for your support in removing the amendment which would require States to pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus stamps.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Mitchiner. We are delighted to have you here, because I know that you are thoroughly familiar with this whole program and the—every other phase of welfare, because you have done a very effective and fine job in my home State.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. And I believe are at the front ranks of doing an excellent job in the welfare field.

I notice on this table here that North Carolina last year received \$9.5 million for the food stamps, but the State of North Carolina and the counties, as I pointed out, contributed \$665,000.

Now, if this 20 percent were added on there, it would be \$1.9 million instead of \$665,000.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. And I know, as you well know—and the same thing prevails in other States—that a lot of counties are still not able to raise very much. That would jump theirs up to \$2.5 million.

Mrs. MITCHINER. That is right.

Senator JORDAN. It was interesting to note Ohio is the largest recipient of this program. They got \$25 million, and their contribution was \$1,650,000 in the program. But Mississippi is next. We have been hearing an awful lot of Mississippi. Now, I know they have a lot of problems, but they had \$23 million last year in this program, so they are participating rather freely. They are the next largest—25 million in Ohio and 23 million in Mississippi, but at the same time Mississippi put \$1,600,000 in it herself.

Mrs. MITCHINER. This is right.

Senator JORDAN. On the other hand, if they jumped to 20 percent, they would take \$4,600,000, and that would be a tremendous burden on a State that is having as much problems as they are right now.

Mrs. MITCHINER. Mr. Chairman, may I comment on a question that came up in the earlier testimony relating to what happens when people do not have any income.

Senator JORDAN. Why, indeed, we would be glad to hear you.

Mrs. MITCHINER. I can talk only about North Carolina, because this is the program that I am most familiar with.

We do not have a State general assistance program. Now, the general assistance program is the program from which you can help people who do not meet the categorical assistance requirements for eligibility, that is, old-age assistance, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, in which there is Federal financial participation.

North Carolina does not have a State general assistance program. Many counties do have a county general assistance appropriation. This is money appropriated by the county commissioners. It is never enough to take care of emergency situations where there is illness or where there is some crisis. And in some counties it is necessary for the county director of public welfare to secure individual approval of the county commissioners before general assistance can be made available to a family in need.

And this is, as was said so graphically this morning, a real problem in the area of the food stamp program because these people do not have the money with which to buy the stamps.

Another point that was made earlier this morning seemed to indicate that the same type of certification procedures are not carried out in public welfare in the direct distribution program as in the food stamp program.

This may be true in other States, but in North Carolina we follow the same method of determining eligibility for the direct distribution of surplus commodities as we do for food stamps.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Aiken, I am delighted you got here before this hearing was over because you are one of the "daddies" of this program. You have been advocating it for many, many years, and you have done a great deal to bring it into being.

Earlier we had Senator Kennedy, that is, Robert Kennedy, who testified, and Secretary Freeman, and Reuben Johnson more or less just sanctioned what Harry Graham said, and now we have Mrs. Mitchiner here. And I will be glad to hear from you in any comments or questions you wish to make.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Senator AIKEN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared comments.

My first experience with the food stamp program was about 1939, I believe, when it was tried out in Vermont and apparently worked the best of any of the recovery programs of that day. That was the reason, when I came down here in 1941—it might have been 1943—I joined Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin in introducing a bill to reestablish the program. We kept it up as long as he lived, and then Senator Young and one or two others cosponsored it with me until 1964. That year Mrs. Sullivan in the House introduced it, and it seemed like a good idea to let the House pass it first, and that worked.

It has now been established in Vermont for about 3 years. It has worked exceptionally well and the cost has not been prohibitive.

Senator JORDAN. Vermont got \$750,000 last year, and their contribution was \$52,500 that the counties and State had to contribute. Now, if 20 percent were added to your State, Senator, that would jump it up \$150,000, and that would be quite a burden on your population.

Senator AIKEN. Yes. And we have to understand if it is discontinued the State would have to pay more for a certain percentage who now benefit from it. Furthermore, when you eliminate the contributions of food, usually surplus, lower cost food, it not only impairs the diet but does not reduce the cost of the Federal Government too much.

So it has worked better than anything else in this field.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Byrd of Virginia was here part of the time this morning, Senator Boggs, and Senator Young was here, and we had a good representation of the subcommittee.

Senator AIKEN. I am not on your subcommittee—

Senator JORDAN. I know you are not, but you are always a very valued and welcome member. You know, we do not go exactly by the rules. Anybody on the committee can come and offer any suggestions, and we take them, and we get a lot of good information that way.

Senator AIKEN. In fact, our public welfare commissioner in Vermont, Mr. Wackerman, who is one of the best in the country—

Mrs. MITCHINER. Yes; we know him.

Senator AIKEN (continuing). Told me last time I was home that he would like to see it extended to the whole State and not cover just part of it. They have much better diets through the food stamp program than they had under the surplus food distribution program.

We used to find cornmeal that was given them out on the dump somewhere.

Senator JORDAN. They were not very hungry then.

Senator AIKEN. They were not that hungry. And further than that, where they pay a substantial part of the cost themselves, it does make them stand straighter.

Mrs. MITCHINER. It has a psychological effect.

Senator AIKEN. They walk a little straighter.

Senator JORDAN. They do. Fine.

Thank you, Mrs. Mitchiner.

When, are you going back home?

Mrs. MITCHINER. I am going back this afternoon.

Senator JORDAN. Well, keep them straight until I can get home this weekend, will you?

Mrs. MITCHINER. All right, thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you so much for coming.

Mrs. Hamer.

You may have a seat anywhere you like along here, Mrs. Hamer. I believe you are representing the National Council of Churches.

Mrs. HAMER. Yes, and the people of Mississippi.

Senator JORDAN. All right; will you give your full name and your address, and whom you are representing, and also those who are with you this morning.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FANNIE LOU HAMER, COMMISSION ON THE DELTA MINISTRY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST, RULEVILLE, MISS.

Mrs. HAMER. My name is Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer. I am a native of Mississippi. I exist at 626 East Leaviat Street, Ruleville, Miss. I am a member of the Commission on the Delta Ministry of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. I am speaking only as a member of the commission, as no one can speak for all the member churches of the National Council of Churches.

Senator JORDAN. Do you have any statement to present for the record?

Mrs. HAMER. I had this statement I can submit. We have copies of it.

Senator JORDAN. Fine, fine. I know Mr. Moore was expecting to be here.

Mrs. HAMER. Mr. Moore is sick, and he asked me to come.

Senator JORDAN. Yes; I understand. I am sorry he is sick. I hope he will soon be better.

Mrs. HAMER. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. You may proceed, and the statement will go into the record.

Mrs. HAMER. Mr. Chairman, the National Council of Churches, as an agency for cooperative witness and service of 34 Protestant and Orthodox churches in the United States, appreciates this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. Senate its concern for the disadvantaged in the State of Mississippi.

The National Council of Churches operates an extensive mission and service program in Mississippi entitled "The Delta Ministry." Daily contact with scores of the most poor indicate to us that a crisis is impending. A particular problem has arisen because of the change-over from food commodity distribution to the food stamp plan. Although the food stamp plan has much to commend itself, under the present guidelines it would work an undue hardship upon those who have no cash to purchase the stamps.

One hundred thousand more people in Mississippi will be out of work in 1967, according to the noted USDA analyst, Dr. Calvin Beale of Washington, D.C. This loss of work is a result of further mechanization in cotton. Many of those out of work will be permitted to remain on the plantations, but will have no cash income. The changeover from the distribution of surplus commodity food to the purchase of food stamps will result in further suffering for the multitudes of the poor in Mississippi. Unless cash is provided or the payment waived, the people will go hungry. To protest inequity, a rally of 800 people occurred in January at Cleveland, Miss. During the week of March 13, Mr. Neil Carter of the USDA Consumer and Marketing Service heard testimony from more than 12 families in Tallahatchie County to the effect that they, and scores of their neighbors, had no cash to purchase food stamps. On April 14, another team from the USDA heard testimony and received over 100 affidavits from people who have no cash income.

The Reverend James F. McRee of 341 Cameron, Canton, Miss., president of the Madison County Movement, says:

People don't have money to purchase stamps. Not as many people buy food stamps as received surplus commodities. I would estimate two-thirds of the people who received commodities can't afford stamps. Some people can't even buy stamps on the two-week basis, because they don't have the money to buy the stamps on a regular basis. If you don't buy the stamps twice in a row you are told you have to reapply. A lot of people just quit the program completely because they would rather let it go than mess with the red tape.

Mrs. Mildred Cosey of Route 2, Box 110B, Vicksburg, Miss., says:

I accompanied my neighbor, Mrs. Willie Mae Thomas, to the Vicksburg food stamp office. When she didn't buy stamps they told her she wasn't going to get no more stamps. She said she owed bills and couldn't buy stamps. Later she received a letter stating she was not going to get stamps any more. She used to receive commodities for her children, who go to school. She is a widow and receives a social security check, but no welfare.

I carried another lady to the food stamp office in Vicksburg by the name of Mrs. Sophia Ransifer. She lived in the rurals and received disability and her husband received aid to the blind. She was getting commodities, but when she went to buy food stamps, she wasn't able to buy the stamps.

Mr. Eddie Thomas, 2217 Letitia St., Vicksburg, Miss., says:

I attended a meeting April 3 in Beechwood, Mississippi, outside of Vicksburg, and the people there said they didn't like the food stamp program because they couldn't afford them. One lady, Mrs. Carolina Saunders, has six children and gets ADC help. She said the welfare worker told her she would have her ADC cut if she went out and got work. Yet when she put cash in for those stamps, she didn't have enough money for other expenses. She was well pleased with the return she got with the stamps, but she said she had no money left after buying the stamps. She has to clothe those children and pay other bills but she can't afford to take care of those things now.

The Country Board of Supervisors brought in the stamps but they didn't tell nobody about it. Later I spoke with them and they told me that if there were 20 people who had complaints, the U.S. Agriculture Department would come

down. But they haven't come down yet. The food stamp program began here last February.

We also had a delegation of eight people who complained about the food stamps to the man in the Vicksburg Food Stamp Office. But so far, everything is the same.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has consistently expressed its concern for public assistance programs. In a policy statement adopted by the general board on June 4, 1958, it was stated:

The primary objective of public assistance programs is to furnish monetary assistance to persons in accordance with the determined degree of their economic need.

For the people dependent on all of these programs there is universal need for an improvement in the standards of assistance so that health and decency may be maintained. The churches have a vital role to play in raising these standards, and churches need to work for the elimination of all inequitable and punitive policies.

Many of the counties in Mississippi that are starting the food stamp program have not told the poor people about it. They are just signing people up when they come to get commodities. And they are not explaining to poor people how the program works. Six counties began the stamp program in January and eight more have begun in February and March.

In some counties poor people are being told they will lose their welfare checks if they do not sign up for food stamps. A very bad part of the program is that people must pay for a month's stamps all at one time. Many people do not have that much money together at one time.

Some people who will be buying the food stamps are not asked if they want the program. In many counties people do not even know that their county supervisors have voted to have a stamp program.

Some county supervisors want the food stamp program because it does not cost the county as much money to operate as the commodity program does.

Also, many businessmen and store owners want food stamps because they will make much more money if poor people have to buy food at stores rather than getting commodities.

People who have seen the food stamp program in action say that these things sometimes happen:

—Store owners sometimes accept stamps only for the most high-priced brands.

—Retail prices often are raised on the days when stamps are being traded.

—Public meetings to explain the program to poor people are not held as the Federal Government says they should be.

—County supervisors do not tell poor people that they have voted to have food stamps instead of commodities.

—People are told they will lose their welfare checks if they do not sign up for stamps.

Many poor people in Mississippi, and the delta in particular, cannot participate in this program because they do not have money. With commodities cut off they will not have any food. Alternatives include:

—Providing a given amount of free or bonus stamps to people under a certain income.

—A return to a program providing free commodities to people who need them.

—An integrated staff at all levels, whatever the program.

—In counties with food stamps, commodities issued to the very poor under the emergency provisions of the food stamp law; certainly an emergency exists.

—Strict adherence to the guidelines by management and store owners, with the burden of enforcement, not upon the recipients, but upon the Federal and State agencies.

—Desegregation of county welfare offices, which, as part of these programs, receive Federal money and are in violation of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches, on December 9, 1960, in a resolution entitled "Ethical Issue in the International Age of Agriculture," concluded:

Our Lord taught his disciples to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." Christians should continue to seek to achieve the goal implied in this prayer by breaking the barriers which persist between agricultural abundance and human need. Through their informed and sustained efforts toward this high goal Christians will thereby serve Him who provides and cares for His children everywhere.

May I make one other comment, Mr. Chairman?

Senator JORDAN. You certainly may.

Mrs. HAMER. Mr. Chairman, we would hope that something is done about the situation in the State of Mississippi where people not only have not been able to buy the stamps, but we have had people unable to pay 50 cents to go pick up the commodities with the free stamp programs.

Thank you very much.

Senator JORDAN. Well, thank you very much. We appreciate your being here and your statement. It will be included in its entirety in the record.

Do any of your friends wish to make a statement?

Mrs. HORN. Yes. I am Etta Horn from the District of Columbia.

Senator JORDAN. You are who?

Mrs. HORN. Etta Horn. I am from the District.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ETTA HORN, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF WELFARE RIGHTS GROUPS

What we see in the food stamp program is too high—I am on welfare, and the food stamps are too high. By the time we buy food stamps, we do not have enough money left to pay rent and buy children's clothes. For instance, I have a daughter in senior high. When I get finished paying for her, paying for something for her to wear to school and the other kids to wear to school, and then buy food stamps and pay rent, we just do not have anything left.

I was one of the coordinators who went down to the Agriculture Department and spoke about this, and I was told that they did not care about whether our children went to school or had clothes on, just as long as they had full stomachs. And I think this was kind of a bad attitude.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much. That is a good observation. Did you have something?

**STATEMENT OF TIM SAMPSON, STAFF ASSOCIATE, POVERTY/
RIGHTS ACTION CENTER**

Mr. SAMPSON. Yes. My name is Tim Sampson. I am a staff associate with the Poverty/Rights Action Center which serves as a national headquarters for the welfare rights movement, a federation of 200 welfare recipients organizations in more than 70 communities across the country. And we are hopeful that the food stamp program not only will continue, but will address itself to some of the serious problems in its functioning which have been identified by recipients.

This morning testimony was given from farm groups and from public welfare people indicating that the program is working very well, and I think that there is some serious mistake here and some serious problems, and that people have not been hearing the voice of the welfare recipients who are deeply concerned about this program.

New York was mentioned; just this week in New York 400 people representing welfare recipients, organized welfare recipients, in the city of New York demonstrated before the department of public welfare to demand that that department not institute the food stamp program because they were convinced that despite some of the benefits of the program its difficulties and its harassments to them as people, would not make it a good program for them. And I think that this is serious indictment of the way that the program has operated because New York recipients are speaking to one of the problems.

I would just, without taking too much of the committee's time, Mr. Chairman, would like to mention very briefly a couple of the key problems.

The major problem, as Mrs. Hamer has said, in Mississippi and elsewhere and has been recognized by other people speaking before the committee this morning, the major problem has been that there are people who can't afford to commit that portion of their income which the Department of Agriculture guidelines require in order to obtain food stamps. It is either too much money for them to commit or in the case of many, many poor people in the South and in urban America in the North they do not have any part of their income that they can—they do not have the income or any cash that they can commit to the purchase of food stamps. This is a serious problem. We believe some adjustment in the program must be made for it, either some provision for giving free stamps to such people or drastically lowering these guideline amounts.

The Department of Agriculture, as Mrs. Horn mentioned, when Members of the National Coordinating Committee of Welfare Rights Groups met with them recently, was not at all interested in hearing any of the complaints that we recipients had about the program nor in any negotiations or discussions about how some of the regulations might be shifted to provide a better program for recipients as they experience it.

For example, one way that this program could be much more responsive to recipients' needs would be to provide a range for the amount that the recipient has to spend. Now, that is a fixed amount. The Department of Agriculture determines in any area how much a person should spend for food. They must commit that portion of their income in order to receive this bonus. We would urge that that at least be a very flexible amount.

Second, recipients who are kept off of this program—because they have irregular purchases of stamps, are denied getting back on it—have no appeal as the regulations are now set up. We believe this is contrary to the spirit of our welfare programs as reflected in the Social Security Act requirements that recipients be allowed a right to a fair hearing, to appeal from any administrative ruling.

There are several pages of spelled out procedures for store owners to file when they have been denied participation in the program. They have a set procedure, a whole elaborate process whereby their rights to participate in a program to receive the stamps from recipients are safeguarded. Recipients have no such rights in the present program. And these are but a few of the ways in which there could be—in which recipients voices across the country, people who are receiving food stamps—I would like for Mrs. Horn to show you all what a food stamp coupon looks like. I'll bet most of the people here have not had the experience of seeing a food stamp coupon—and I think that this is my way, if you will, and our way, as representatives of recipients telling you—you might pass it around—

Senator JORDAN. I know what it looks like.

Mr. SAMPSON (continuing). Telling you that recipients on the receiving end of these programs have something valuable to contribute in terms of letting you know how these programs are functioning. And their voices must be heard and listened to, and some of the reforms they urge must be incorporated in this law; otherwise, it will be in fact, a law for the farmers. The Department of Agriculture on several occasions has told representatives of recipient organizations that this is not a welfare program. This is a food program. If you want a welfare program, go over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Now, the response that the recipients have made to that is that it is a welfare program. The Department of Agriculture has made it very clear whose welfare it is for. This is a welfare program for the farmers. It is not for poor people because their voices, their concerns, their needs have not been incorporated. And as people like Mrs. Horn, Mrs. Hamer, many others who represent welfare recipients, are here and available to speak, we would hope that some of their concerns are entered into this record, and, in fact, entered into the process of changing this law so that the basic principle that other people have spoken to, that no one go hungry in America, can be followed.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SAMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. We appreciate those comments that you added, and I can assure you that the full committee will take into consideration all the comments that have been made this morning.

If anybody has a statement to make that was not here this morning, we will give them 1 week to present that, and it will be incorporated in the record—that is, a written statement. There will not be any futher hearings on this, though, open hearings.

Mrs. Winifred G. Thompson, Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, did send a statement up. That will be put in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows):

STATEMENT OF WINIFRED G. THOMPSON, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The D.C. Food Stamp Program is a program administered by the D.C. Department of Public Welfare. We act as a State agency under an agreement between the District Commissioners and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. S. 953, of course, is a proposal for funding a *Federal* program, and we are only a remote beneficiary of it. However, we think it proper to offer testimony on it. Local program operation is, ultimately, the test of the virtue of the proposed legislation.

We also feel that we have a responsibility to this Committee. Our program is nearest geographically. Low-income families within sight of the Capitol participate in the Food Stamp Program and they, and the community, profit from the relationship.

Over thirty per cent of our families who buy and use Food Stamps do *not* receive Public Assistance payments. This number is steadily growing and this is good for the basic premise of this legislation is radically different from the commonly held philosophies of public welfare.

Participating families make their own decisions to join or not to join the program, then use their own funds to finance purchase of Food Coupons. In the District of Columbia, Food Stamps are not sold by the Department of Public Welfare, but are sold across the counter by tellers of participating commercial banks under contract with us.

Users of Food Stamps select the retail stores where they spend Food Coupons from among 442 approved retail food stores, who are not only willing to cooperate, but who have found it profitable indeed in terms of the increased purchasing power made available to otherwise severely limited food buyers. We feel now that merchandising practices have been affected to the extent that grocers who, in the past, found it commercially unfeasible to offer variety foods in poverty areas now do so in anticipation of reasonable inventory turnover. The result is that needy families are able to provide their children with that necessary variety in diet which is essential to adequate nutritional levels.

The Food Stamp Program does not "give" something in the sense that cash grants for Public Assistance "give". Rather, the Food Stamp Program provides opportunity for needy families to obtain minimum food requirements for their families *with what they have*, no matter how small their income may be. The benefits provided are not excessive and at the very low income levels they may seem quite small, but this particular feature reinforces the essentially American notion that families prefer to make do with what they have rather than seek the charity of their neighbors.

Every Food Stamp family must contribute *to the extent of its ability* before receiving any benefit whatever! We affirm this as good business for the country over and above the benefit to the economy so graphically expressed by Senator Robert C. Byrd at the time when he introduced the bill which is now being considered.

The Food Stamp Program is not "welfare" in the sense that the term is usually used. However, the use of Food Stamps does have an effect on households which do receive Public Assistance payments through our agency. It is a truism that many families who receive Public Assistance have household management problems, and this despite the best efforts of caseworkers who are in contact with them.

Food Stamp workers tell us that management in these households is improving, that purchase of Food Stamps, which represent the month's food budget, induces these households to make reasonable allocations of stamps for periodic food purchasing, with reservations for "special" shopping and bulk staple purchases. Since we are not now deeply involved in aggressive consumer education projects, we can make no hard assessment of the extent of this improvement in household management practice, but we do feel that there has been such improvement and that the Food Stamp Program has made its contribution to it.

Prior to our participation in the Food Stamp Program, the D.C. Department of Public Welfare distributed commodities under the Donated Foods Program. Our participants feel that Food Stamps are far superior. They appreciate the opportunity for variety buying and the relative independence and dignity offered by the Food Stamp Program. We have the aggressive support of public health agencies who help us to inform needy families and also to assist those families in wisest use of stamps in improving diet. Adequate diet is necessary to full life and vigor, to effective performance by wage-earners, and to response to education by

the children of needy families. Cooperating agencies include private health and community service organizations as well as the D.C. Department of Public Health. We are united in an effort to inform the needy of this new approach to helping people help themselves.

A particular area of concern has been meeting the need of Social Security pensioners whose retirement payments are grossly inadequate to provide the diet necessary to health and well-being, but who enjoy the feeling of independence derived from use of Food Stamps rather than direct welfare-type supplementation. Despite inherent difficulties in reaching this group with information, their participation is growing.

To demonstrate the need for continued effort in the specific problem area of participation by senior citizens, we surveyed a segment of people known to our agency through another program. The group we consider here are persons approved during the months of February and March of this year for aid as aged medical indigents under the Kerr-Mills program. We emphasize that these people are not in receipt of Public Assistance payments. They *have* income, but such low income, as verified by our agency, that they require some assistance with medical necessities. In short, they are old, ailing, and poor, and may be expected to require even better diet than some of the rest of us.

After excluding all persons other than those residing in households—that is, institutional cases and the like—we found that of the remainder fewer than seven per cent now participate in the Food Stamp Program.

Our program is small—something in excess of 6,000 participating households involving a few less than 25,000 persons. We attribute this to two basic reasons. The first is the difficulty in providing information about the program and its benefits to people who are somewhat removed from the mainstream of society by their poverty. The second is that the Food Stamp Program extends benefits to only those who are willing to contribute their own best effort to help themselves. Only after expending their own cash to the limit of their ability to do so, do they receive “bonus” stamps. This may restrict participation to a degree, but it assures maximum beneficial use of program funds. These families *want* to do better than they *can* and are willing to *try!*

The D.C. Department of Public Welfare is committed to promoting maximum use of this program within the limits of the eligibility requirements imposed by the Food Stamp Act as implemented by our regulations and those of the Department of Agriculture. The law wisely provided effective controls for prevention of abuses. We have found them enforceable with no undue hardship to our participants and with no excessive expense to the agency.

We strongly urge favorable action by the Committee and make no recommendations for essential changes.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you. That will conclude this hearing.

I want to thank every one of you for being here, those who participated, and those who came to learn what goes on in a hearing. And I hope you profited by the hearing.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(Additional statements filed for the record are as follows:)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
April 28, 1967.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received a number of messages from Alabama concerning H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill of 1967, all of them strongly opposing that section of the bill which would assess 20 percent of the cost of the Food Stamp program to the various States.

As these correspondents point out, the inclusion of this section will make it impossible for most States to participate in the program, since they would be unable to take on this additional burden.

I invite your attention to the comments of Governor Wallace and those of Ruben K. King, Commissioner of Pensions and Security for the State of Alabama. I also enclose letters which have come to me from food distributors and processors.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Montgomery, Ala., April 24, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: Both as Governor of Alabama and Chairman of the State Board of Pensions and Security, I am writing to express my concern about H. R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill of 1967. Mr. King has shared with me his communications to you and all other members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation regarding this bill. I am writing to say that I wholeheartedly concur in his analysis of the situation.

Both the Surplus Food Program and the Food Stamp Program are of great benefit to needy Alabamians in the counties in which they operate. We have been concerned that all counties have not taken advantage of one or the other of these programs. This is partially because of the fact that the Department of Pensions and Security does not have enough State funds to defray the entire cost of the Commodity Distribution and Food Stamp Programs. Instead, it has to be sold to the counties with a request that they participate in the cost. We have been pleased that additional counties are participating, and others are considering entering the program. If H. R. 1318 were enacted, it is my considered judgment that the Food Stamp Program could no longer operate in any counties in Alabama.

For this reason I respectfully urge you to use your influence in seeing that H. R. 1318 is not enacted because it would be a real disservice to the needy people in Alabama. I am sending a similar letter to all members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation.

Sincerely yours,

LURLEEN B. WALLACE,
Governor.

MARCH 29, 1967.

Hon. BILL NICHOLS
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NICHOLS: Thank you very much for your letter of March 23, 1967, informing me about the action of the Committee on Agriculture which proposed to have the States bear 20% of the cost of the free food stamps issued to recipients.

Last year in Jefferson and Walker Counties we distributed \$1,463,690.00 in free food stamps to recipients. You can readily see that 20% of this figure would be \$292,738.00 if we had to bear that portion of the cost. We opened the Greene County Food Stamp Program in January, and have just this month opened in Lamar and Dallas Counties. We do not have figures on these counties but it would be reasonable to assume that by including these the current amount could very easily be in the neighborhood of \$400,000.00. We have opened the program and will begin selling stamps in Bullock County probably the first of June which will add to this figure.

Dealing with the overall situation we believe that we should take into account just what such a policy would do if we opened the program in all sixty-seven counties, and we believe that we should be prepared to treat all counties alike. Our experience to date leads us to believe that Walker County is a fair estimate of what we might expect to find in counties throughout the State. It would, of course, vary from county to county but we believe Walker County would give us a fair estimate. Last year we issued food stamps to 4,878 people. This was 9% of the population of Walker County. The 1960 census shows that Alabama had a population of 3,266,740 people. Nine percent of that figure would lead us to believe that if we were operating statewide we would serve 294,000 persons per month. The average value of free food stamps given per month is approximately \$7.50, which means we would issue free stamps in one month valued at \$2,205,000.00 or a total of \$26,460,000.00 in one year. Again, applying the 20%

figure as a proposed participation for States, the cost to the State of Alabama in one year would amount to \$5,292,000.00.

It is my considered opinion that such a move on the part of the Congress in this respect would defeat all of the good work that has been done since the program was first instituted. We feel that the program has been beneficial to eligible recipients in Alabama and has been a material boost to the economy where it has been operating as all of the free or bonus stamps represent that much additional food purchasing power.

Departing from the above I should like to add that we have already experienced great difficulty in selling the program to county governments. This office directs and supervises the program, but the basic funds for operating the program are supplied by the county governments with the U.S. Department of Agriculture participating in the cost of administration to the tune of about one-third of the cost of personnel. In addition to that cost, the county has to supply office space and other local facilities. We have had several of the county governments approach us on getting state relief through the legislature in the cost of administration. We have not yet worked up anything on this subject, but we know that we will be pressed for some sort of action.

Again, looking at the Food Stamp Program in an overall manner I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the whole idea of States participating would cause mass withdrawal of participation in the program by the States and particularly Alabama.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Cordially yours,

RUBEN K. KING,

Commissioner, Department of Pensions and Security, State of Alabama.

Birmingham, Ala., April 11, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
3213 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are informed that there is a bill before Congress that proposes to revamp the Federal Food Stamp Program, by requiring the states to participate up to 20% of the cost of the coupons issued to the needy. We are not too familiar with the status of this bill at the present time, but believe that it would have the effect of killing the Food Program so far as Alabama is concerned.

The Stamp Program is the most practical way to issue food to the needy, in giving them a balanced diet and at the same time, to distribute the commodities through the regular channels.

We trust that you will do what you can to kill this bill and continue the Stamp Program as it is now set up.

Thanking you for your consideration of this request, I am

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE M. PINSON,
Western Grain Co.

APRIL 10, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
3213 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been advised that the Federal Food Stamp Program, which has been so successful in feeding the needy, is now before Congress with a bill which proposes to revamp this program by requiring participating states to pay for 20 percent of the bonus coupons issued to the recipients. It is our understanding that this amendment has passed the House Agriculture Committee and should be voted upon by the House in the near future.

This is a very unwise proposal and one that could not secure immediate funding by the State of Alabama. In urging previous support by the Alabama Congressional Delegation of the Food Stamp Program, we pointed out that this method built self respect among the needy and placed their purchases of food products in the regular channels of trade. If the states do not accept the bonus stamp proposal which would require them to raise a 20 percent matching fund, then the former program would again be activated. Under this plan, surplus commodity products were given to the needy without regard to the quantity of each product or to the family's ability to consume same. Much of it was fed to pigs and livestock. Some was wasted and others bartered for something the recipient desired. May we depend upon you to vote against the proposed amendment which would require the states to purchase bonus coupons in the amount of 20 percent of the face value.

As you perhaps know, the Alabama Food Council, which we represent, has as members all segments of the food industry—manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and others. We are united in believing that the best method of improving the diet of the needy is through the coupon method.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. DURRETT,
Manager, Alabama Food Council, Alabama Merchants Association.

SALEM, OREG.,
April 24, 1967.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
*U.S. Senator,
417 Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR WAYNE: We were recently advised by Farris Bryant of the Office of Emergency Planning, that H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Authorization Bill, has been amended by the House Committee on Agriculture to require, effective July 1, 1969, each participating state to contribute 20 per cent of the bonus value of the stamps. In view of our having observed the simultaneous operation of the Food Stamp Plan and the Abundant Foods Plan in Oregon, I feel it appropriate to advise you of our thinking on the proposed change.

The practical effect of the Food Stamp Plan, since its initiation in 1963, has been to decrease participation in Multnomah County. In November, 1962, the last full month of the Abundant Food Program, 25,025 persons (4.75 per cent of Multnomah County's population) participated. In November, 1966 under the Food Stamp Plan, 10,557 persons took advantage of the stamps. This accounted for 1.9 per cent of Multnomah County's population. Even more significant, however, is the massive decrease which has occurred in the number of non-Public Welfare recipients taking advantage of these programs. In 1962, over 50 per cent of the persons drawing Abundant Foods were non-Public Welfare Assistance recipients. A similar percentage was reflected in the rest of the state. By 1966, the proportion of non-public assistance recipients participating in all counties other than Multnomah County, had risen to 55.4 per cent. Under the Food Stamp Plan, however, the proportion of non-public assistance recipients had dropped to 16.4 per cent of the already reduced total number served. I am attaching a brief schedule which indicates the comparisons which can be drawn between 1962 and 1966.

One of the basic reasons for these results is the restrictiveness of the Food Stamp Plan coupled with the lack of clear guidelines on the part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. On several occasions the Department of Agriculture has refused to clearly lay out the rules and regulations for operation and has asked for the best judgment of officials of the State of Oregon. After consideration, when specific proposals for modifying operating practices were forwarded to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, these have been denied.

The primary area of restrictive rulings is in the amount of the individual's budget that must be spent in order to qualify for the stamp program. A second area is the requirement of regularity of purchase, which means, as now interpreted, that if the individual misses purchasing more than two times in six months, he must go through the complete recertification process. This has resulted in certification costs approximately 60 per cent higher per capita in Multnomah County than in the rest of the State of Oregon. While Federal matching funds are available for certification costs of non-public assistance recipients, these only partially offset the additional costs.

In view of the above factors, while we feel the Food Stamp Plan could be of significant benefit, as it is now administered by the U.S.D.A., we would prefer that the program be withdrawn and replaced with the Abundant Foods Program, if we were required to bear a portion of the stamp costs. If, however, we were given the discretion necessary in terms of the amount of stamps required to be purchased, coupled with a significant relaxation or elimination of the restrictive provisions relating to regulation of purchase, we would be in a position to consider participation in the cost of the stamps.

I hope this information will be useful to you in your consideration of these amendments and the Food Stamp Program as they will be presented to you in the coming months. If we can provide you with any additional information on this subject, please let me know.

Sincerely,

TOM MCCALL, *Governor.*

Comparison of food stamp and abundant food programs

	November 1962 Abundant food	November 1966 Food stamps
Multnomah County		
PA.....	12,386	8,818
Non-PA.....	(50.5%) 12,639	(16.4%) 1,739
Total.....	25,025	10,557
All other counties		
	Abundant food	Abundant food
PA.....	14,990	19,766
Non-PA.....	(51.6%) 15,988	(55.4%) 24,557
Total.....	30,978	44,323

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 25, 1967.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to the legislation to extend the Food Stamp Plan which is now before your Committee.

Farm Bureau policy on this issue is as follows:

"The government food stamp plan, started in 1961 on a pilot basis, has been expanded to include a number of additional areas. It has not increased food consumption significantly. Instead it has transferred a part of the total cost of food for relief distribution to the federal government. While we recognize that there are some people in this country who need diets with higher nutritional standards, we do not believe that it is the responsibility of the federal government to distribute free food to improve dietary standards through a government food stamp plan. We are opposed to any food stamp plan."

We would appreciate this letter being made a part of the hearing record.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

APRIL 15, 1967.

SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture Research
and General Legislation, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The National Farmers Organization strongly supports and urges the passage of Bill S953 to extend the Food Stamp Act. We oppose the State sharing provision that was included in the House committee report. The food stamp plan should play an ever increasing role in overcoming the financial limitations to better diets on the part of our low income families. We request that this statement be included in the Record.

HARVEY SICKELS,
Secretary, National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

WASHINGTON D.C., APRIL 25, 1967.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Research and General Legislation,
Agriculture and Forestry Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JORDAN: The Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, consisting of 60 affiliated trade unions, with 6½ million members, strongly supports the Food Stamp program.

When the Food Stamp Act became law in 1964, it marked the first victory in this nation's war on poverty. It established public policy that fully recognized

that a nutritionally adequate diet is a prerequisite for breaking the poverty cycle among the poor.

We urge the permanent extension of the Food Stamp program. We firmly oppose any amendments which would reduce its scope. We strongly oppose any amendments that would require local or state governments to pay matching grants, or otherwise finance this program. We also oppose any amendments that would reduce the federal authorization.

We believe that the Food Stamp program is intrinsically superior to the direct food program. It utilizes normal channels of distribution with resulting economies. It is more convenient for the needy. It provides the poor a much greater range of foods—essentials such as meats, vegetables, fruit and milk—with resulting improvements in nutrition. Any increased imposition of costs on local governments will inevitably result in a decrease in participation and without even the assurance that counties discontinuing food stamps will institute the inferior direct distribution program.

Our support for the Food Stamp program is also in keeping with the IUD's record, and the labor movement's as a whole, of support for measures designed to support farm prices and farm incomes, and the record over the years will demonstrate this support. We have not taken a narrow parochial view of rural problems although we have few members there. We have insisted year in and out that the problems of rural people are problems for urban people and for organized workers. We do not believe that prosperity and the good life can be obtained by urban people unless they can be shared by rural people.

As we have supported agricultural production control legislation, we have also supported the use of our agricultural abundance for supporting free governments abroad and reducing poverty here at home. We have always supported the school lunch program, the milk program, the direct food distribution program and the food stamp program—all on the grounds that these programs contribute to higher farm incomes while at the same time improving the health and living standards of the American people.

We are frank to say that improvements in the present program should be made. But such improvements can only be achieved if federal moneys are *not* cut and if local and state governments are *not* required to provide additional financial support. Obviously, one of our prime concerns is the lack of adequate food for the poor.

Neither the direct food distribution program nor the food stamp program has reached many of the poorest counties in the nation, apparently because local governments largely have been unable or unwilling to take advantage of the programs. How many of the non-participating local units have failed to establish these programs because of the current costs of supporting them we do not know, but it appears obvious that cost is and has been an important factor in denying to many of our poorest citizens access to the minimum necessities of life. In Mississippi, for example, the operation of such programs was at a minimum until the Office of Economic Opportunity provided funds to subsidize local costs of administration.

Even under existing authority and financing arrangements, we are informed that less than 2 percent of the poor in South Carolina and Virginia have access to any food distribution program. In Alabama less than 12 percent of those in poverty have such access. In view of the impact which continuing mechanization and the new cotton program are having on small farmers, sharecroppers and farm workers in the South, the need for the kind of assistance provided by these programs is increasing, not decreasing. In all humanity we urge that this is no time to attempt to shift an additional financial burden onto these areas; the result will inevitably be curtailments of existing operations, and a postponement of the day when other counties can be added. Were it to happen, there would be an increase in the numbers of people suffering from malnutrition rather than a diminution. Studies indicate that there are serious deficiencies in the existing food programs.

Large numbers of desperately poor people receive no food from any federal program, since many of the poorest counties are without any program. In the shift from direct distribution to food stamps there is in many areas a sharp drop in the number of families participating, due in part to the mechanics of recertification, and in part to other factors, including the difficulty with which people living on low and frequently intermittent or seasonal incomes adjust to fixed monthly payments. Moreover, even with the small payments presently required by the Department of Agriculture, some families simply do not have even those small

amounts and must endure without even the amount of aid they enjoyed from direct distribution.

The IUD has already recommended to Secretary Freeman to direct federal distribution where local governments refuse to allow their poor to take advantage of these programs. We have urged the Secretary to make stamps available free to families without income, and to smooth over the transition from direct distribution to food stamps more carefully to reduce the adverse impact demonstrated in the past.

But these suggested improvements of the existing program only demonstrate our concern for continuing the Food Stamp program.

We would appreciate inclusion of this letter as part of the hearing record. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JACK T. CONWAY,
Executive Director, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO.

○

The first step in the process of stamping is the preparation of the stamp itself. This involves the selection of a suitable material, such as wood or metal, and the carving of the design into the surface. The design is then inked and pressed onto the paper, creating a clear and legible impression. This process is repeated until the desired quantity of stamps has been produced.

The second step is the distribution of the stamps. This is done by sending the stamps to the various offices and departments where they are needed. The stamps are then used to create official documents, such as contracts, orders, and receipts. This process is essential for the efficient operation of any organization.

The third step is the maintenance of the stamps. This involves regular cleaning and inspection to ensure that the stamps are in good working order. If a stamp becomes worn or damaged, it should be replaced immediately to avoid any delays or errors in the stamping process.

In conclusion, the stamping process is a vital part of any organization's operations. It ensures that all documents are properly recorded and that the necessary information is available to the right people at the right time.



