If Dickens were writing A Christmas Carol today, he would probably have Scrooge hassling Bob Cratchit over his food-stamp allotment, because food stamps provide most of the Christmas fare for the poorest of the nation's poor. This $6-billion Federal program also provides much food for thought for the nation's lawmakers. Indeed, Congressmen have put about 160 separate reform bills in the Congressional hopper this year in different attempts to reshape this big, complex and expensive program.

Over the years, the program has lost much of its earlier constituency, with farmers in particular no longer relying on government programs to get rid of their surplus commodities, especially when the world market beckons so invitingly. Yet with the growth of the program to encompass 3 percent of the nation's total food spending, it has gained a wider constituency; today, about 60 percent of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's total budget is allocated to food stamps and related programs. To many observers, this method of upgrading nutrition and redistributing income represents a backdoor way of achieving what the Nixon Administration hoped to accomplish with the still-born Family Assistance Plan of 1971.

Stamps for the poor
The food-stamp program provides eligible households with monthly allotments of coupons that are redeemable for food. The value of the monthly coupon allotment varies by household size and is based on the U.S.D.A.'s "economy food plan"—a basic quantity of food designed to provide a certain daily allowance of major nutrients. Participating households with little or no income receive their entire coupon allotment free, while households at the upper end of the eligibility range pay 75 to 85 percent of the value of the coupons received. The difference between the value of coupons issued to households and the amount households pay for them represents the value of "bonus" stamps—that is, the amount of the government subsidy.

According to the U.S.D.A., 87 percent of all food-stamp participants lived in households with take-home pay below $6,000 a year in late 1973, while 97 percent were below $9,000 a year. (About two-thirds of all participants had incomes of less than $3,000.) Program participants included 58 percent of all four-person households with income under $3,000, but only 1½ percent of all four-person households in the $6,000-$10,000 range. About 80,000 participating households had incomes of $12,000 and over, in households which averaged seven persons in size.

Administration and Congressional critics have attacked those regulations which permit middle-income families to qualify for stamps, and a number of bills propose an upper income limit on...
participation in the program. Other points of criticism concern
the distribution of stamps to striking workers and to middle-
income college students. Criti-
cisms of mismanagement appear
less valid; according to a U.S.D.A.
quality-control survey, 4.3 per-
cent of all participating house-
holds have been wrongly de-
clared eligible, mostly because of
clerical errors. (Fraud was found in
about 0.08 percent of all cases
studied in the survey.) Indeed,
errors are bound to arise in view
of the program's immensely com-
plicated eligibility rules, some 144
pages of single-spaced type.
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The program's increasing complexi-
ty reflects the way it has ex-
panded and shifted focus over the
years. It was designed first as a
means of disposing of farm sur-
pluses, and then as a means of
fighting malnutrition among the
destitute—and now it has become
also an income-supplement pro-
gram for the working poor. Al-
though welfare families are en-
rolled automatically in the pro-
gram, working families recently
have outnumbered welfare fami-
lies among stamp recipients. In the
1974-75 recession, the food-
stamp program—along with un-
employment compensation and
social security—played a major role
as an automatic stabilizer, cush-
ioning the recession's impact on
family incomes.

Why it grew
Federal programs to feed the
poor began in the 1930's and
usually involved the distribution
of farm surpluses. (A minor-scale
food-stamp program existed during
the 1939-43 period.) The present
program started as a modest pilot
project in 1961, but in recent
years it has grown to cover the
nation, replacing other programs
in the process. One such program,
involving distribution of surplus
commodities, supported
about 7½ million people as
late as 1962.

The food-stamp program has
grown very rapidly in the present
decade, with Congress rewriting
the legislation to guarantee a "nutri-
tionally adequate diet" to all
possible needy applicants—and
with Congress attaching a price
escalator to offset the impact of the
dramatic escalation in food prices.
By the end of 1970, 4 million
persons were on the rolls, but that
figure doubled within a year and
tripled within three years' time. In
1974 the rolls jumped to 14½
million people as Congress made
the food stamp program manda-
tory nationwide, replacing the
surplus-food program altogether.
The advent of Puerto Rico into
the program added almost 2 mil-
lion people, or roughly 80 per-
cent of the island's population.

Despite these changes, the com-
bined enrollment in all Federal food
programs changed hardly at all
from late 1971 to late 1974. Then
came the recession; as unem-
ployment soared by 70 percent,
food-stamp participation jumped
30 percent to 19½ million people. However, in the early months of recovery, participation fell by about 700,000, indicating the strong cyclical nature of the program.

**Will it grow?**
Will the food-stamp program continue to grow at its recent pace? A U.S.D.A. analysis, relying on the disappearance of the recession-created bulge, argues that participation could decline 10 percent by 1980. At the same time, the escalator provision would insure that any future rise in food prices is reflected in the overall cost of the program.

On the other hand, several forces could expand participation even above 1975 levels. Given the way the regulations are written, there may be just as many eligible people not enrolled in the program as there are recipients, even though nationwide coverage has already been achieved. In fact, the U.S.D.A. is under two court orders to recruit some 20 million “missing” participants. This feature reflects the open-ended nature of the program, since unlike other public-assistance programs, it has no arbitrary upper limit on income eligibility. Under present regulations, a complicated series of income-tax-style deductions make it possible for people with relatively high incomes to qualify for food stamps. However, most major reform bills now before Congress would end this feature by imposing a ceiling on the total income permitted for eligibility.

Program costs could also soar because of the legal language which says that the food-stamp allotment must provide “a nutritionally adequate diet.” The present coupon allotment is based on the U.S.D.A.’s “economy food plan,” which costs 20 to 25 percent less than the U.S.D.A.’s “low-cost” food budget. But according to the Department’s nutrition survey, less than half of all families spending at the economy cost level can achieve even two-thirds of their recommended dietary allowances. Consequently, a U.S. district court last June ordered the U.S.D.A. to issue more adequate allotment schedules—and this decision (if enforced) could as much as double the program cost.

The nation’s experience with food stamps may influence its future actions with other types of income supplements. Housing allowance experiments are now going on in 13 locations throughout the country. Educational vouchers are being tested in a demonstration program in California. Some groups also have proposed energy or gasoline stamps, and others have proposed clothing stamps. As the Washington Post recently noted, “The trump will be played if and when the U.S. Treasury proposes the stamp stamp—they might call it money.” In that case, the Family Assistance Plan will have become reality after all.

William Burke
### BANKING DATA—TWELFTH FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT

(Dollar amounts in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Assets and Liabilities</th>
<th>Amount Outstanding</th>
<th>Change from 12/10/75</th>
<th>Change from year ago Dollar</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans (gross, adjusted) and investments*</td>
<td>88,511</td>
<td>+ 1,136</td>
<td>+ 2,213</td>
<td>+ 2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (gross, adjusted)—total</td>
<td>65,785</td>
<td>+ 328</td>
<td>+ 89</td>
<td>+ 2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security loans</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>+ 254</td>
<td>+ 99</td>
<td>+ 5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and industrial</td>
<td>23,287</td>
<td>+ 27</td>
<td>- 1,336</td>
<td>- 5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>19,630</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>- 358</td>
<td>- 1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer instalment</td>
<td>10,114</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td>+ 291</td>
<td>+ 2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury securities</td>
<td>10,015</td>
<td>+ 766</td>
<td>+ 4,487</td>
<td>+ 81.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other securities</td>
<td>12,711</td>
<td>+ 42</td>
<td>- 205</td>
<td>- 1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits (less cash items)—total*</td>
<td>88,887</td>
<td>+ 994</td>
<td>+ 6,310</td>
<td>+ 7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand deposits (adjusted)</td>
<td>24,723</td>
<td>+ 590</td>
<td>+ 1,074</td>
<td>+ 4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government deposits</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>- 76</td>
<td>+ 61</td>
<td>+ 17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time deposits—total*</td>
<td>61,821</td>
<td>+ 481</td>
<td>+ 4,688</td>
<td>+ 8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States and political subdivisions</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>+ 154</td>
<td>- 15</td>
<td>- 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings deposits</td>
<td>21,794</td>
<td>+ 24</td>
<td>+ 3,804</td>
<td>+ 21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other time deposits†</td>
<td>30,257</td>
<td>+ 226</td>
<td>+ 957</td>
<td>+ 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large negotiable CD’s</td>
<td>16,441</td>
<td>+ 410</td>
<td>- 69</td>
<td>- 0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes items not shown separately. †Individuals, partnerships and corporations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Averages of Daily Figures</th>
<th>Week ended 12/10/75</th>
<th>Week ended 12/03/75</th>
<th>Comparable year-ago period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Bank Reserve Position Excess Reserves</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net free (+) / Net borrowed (−)</td>
<td>+ 71</td>
<td>+ 80</td>
<td>- 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds—Seven Large Banks Interbank Federal fund transactions Net purchases (+) / Net sales (−)</td>
<td>+ 2,351</td>
<td>+ 1,767</td>
<td>+ 1,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions of U.S. security dealers Net loans (+) / Net borrowings (−)</td>
<td>+ 1,154</td>
<td>+ 707</td>
<td>+ 879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information on this and other publications can be obtained by calling or writing the Public Information Section, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, P.O. Box 7702, San Francisco 94120. Phone (415) 397-1137.