

Senator.

Yes I was very interested to know, that the very first step to cut federal spending was to cut the agriculture bill, after all the farmer & cattle men are a small minority.

They can take it on the chin again. Their so damn dumb we can take 5 billion out of their pocket by cutting the food stamps and they won't even know it.


after all food stamps only by food. If it could be cars & boats & campuses then we wouldn't cut it. By spending ~~the~~ stamps that way we would be helping the majority.

If anything you as an Senator  
should be looking for new  
ways to help ~~the~~ the farmer  
sell more of his product.

Food stamps to anyone who  
can get them seems to me  
would buy more food & in  
turn get the demand for meat  
& other foods up.

I see the 130 million in  
Public works & 150 million  
in Treasury bills failed

I wonder why



food stamps

October 10, 1974

[REDACTED]  
Atchison, Kansas 66002

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your letter concerning food stamps in the Agriculture Appropriation Bill.

As you may know, I have publicly stated many times that I do not oppose food stamps and food assistance programs for those in need. I do strongly oppose paying tax dollars and hiring Federal bureaucrats to issue food stamps to people with an income such that they are able to purchase the same amount of food with their own money. Since its inception only a few years ago, the food stamp program has grown 40,000 times. Several experts predict that 1 in 14 Americans will be receiving food stamps within a few years and that at the current rate of expansion under the present rules, the Federal government will be bankrupted by the food stamp program. Among those receiving food stamps are students whose parents are wealthy enough to pay high out-of-state tuition fees and individuals who are earning in excess of \$10,000 a year. Obviously, the food stamp program is in need of revision. In my opinion, rather than permitting a continued rise in expenditure in this program, Americans could better benefit by a tax break and a reduction in the large number of tax dollars spent on the thousands of Federal bureaucrats who are employed to administer the food stamp program.

Concerning the Agriculture Appropriation Bill, the House of Representatives recently passed a revised version of the bill which was reduced by \$192 million. In making this reduction, the House was able to redistribute funds so as to actually add \$21 million to the rural development portion of the bill, which, as you know, provides additional funds for soil conservation projects and for watershed, water district and other projects under the Farmers Home Administration. These funds are directly for the benefit of farmers.

By its action, the House of Representatives has apparently agreed with me that a great deal of fat could be cut from this bill without adversely affecting farmers. The vast bulk of the \$192 million cut from the bill is in administrative funds. This reduction will decrease the amount of funds to pay Federal bureaucrats while the

Page 2  
October 10, 1974

food stamps

actual programs as they affect farmers will not be hurt. The Agriculture Appropriation Bill will not be referred to the Senate and it is my feeling that the Senate will also agree with me by its vote that the bill could and should have been reduced originally.

Thanks again for your letter, and please let me know if we may ever be of assistance in any way.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE  
U. S. Senate

BD:sla