UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 19

JULY 23, 1974 TO JULY 30, 1974
(PAGES 24533 TO 25914)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1974

grains supply only 24 per cent of the caloric intake. The difference is that North Americans and, increasingly Europeans and Japanese, consume large quantities of meat, milk and vegetables.

However, because much of the meat and dairy products consumed in the United States require grain for their production, the average American diet requires about five times as much grain to be grown as does the average Indian diet.

The "Green Revolution" has been criticized as giving all the advantages to large-scale high-technology farmers who then squeeze out their smaller competitors. Because most of the world's farmers have been too poor to buy irrigating equipment and fertilizer and too isolated to get the needed technical advice, they have not taken advantage of the new farming methods as readily as have wealthier farmers.

NEW CREDIT SOUGHT

For these and other reasons, Green Revolution farming has not been practiced on one-half the arable land in any developing country, and in most of those countries it has been used on less than one-tenth the farmland.

Thus, agricultural researchers like Mr. Borlaug note, the full gains to be made through the Green Revolution have yet to be realized. Efforts are now under way through many agencies to develop credit mechanisms for small farmers to enable them to invest higher yields and to improve the teaching of new farming methods to small farmers.

In small countries where this has been done, such as Taiwan, where the average farm size is 2½ acres, it has been found that small farms outproduce the huge "agribusiness" farms of the United States. American farms yield an average of 3,050 pounds of grain per acre per year. Taiwanese farmers get 3,320 pounds.

While a long-term solution of the world food crisis depends on fundamental changes in the policies and practices of most small countries, the short-term solutions, many authorities feel, depend more on United States policy.

From the mid-nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-seventies, while the United States Government was buying surplus grain to keep market prices up, much of the developing world relied on this excess production to prevent famine. Through a change in Department of Agriculture policy, American grain reserves have now been largely eliminated.

To an extent greater than many people realized, it was American surpluses that stood as the world's buffer between enough to eat and famine. Now there is considerable controversy over whether the United States should reestablish large grain reserves or, as an alternative, contribute to a proposed world granary that famine-stricken nations could draw upon.

The debate includes concern over the impact of an American reserve on domestic prices, with the perennial conflict between farmers who want to sell for high prices and consumers who want to buy for low.

Although many food experts see a world grain reserve as essential in dealing with sporadic famines, most agree that, for the long range, even the vast productivity of American farms cannot forever make up the world's food deficits. Population is growing too large.

While every country produces all or most of the food it consumes only a handful produce much more than enough for domestic needs, thus providing large quantities for export. Besides the United States, the major food exporters include Canada, Australia and Argentina.

REALISTIC SOLUTION

For the long-term solution, few experts see any realistic solution other than to intensify the agriculture within the developing countries, trying to make each country as nearly self sufficient as possible. The agronomists note that because agriculture in the United States and other developed countries is already operating near the limits of presently available technology, whatever gains that can be expected must come from improvement in the countries where agriculture remains poor.

However, the experts note, upgrading agriculture in the poor countries will not be easy, because that effort would depend on ample supplies of fertilizer (and the petroleum from which much fertilizer is made), irrigation equipment and know-how, new credit mechanisms and continuing plant-breeding programs to adapt the better strains to local climatic conditions.

Much of this effort is becoming increasingly costly in a world of scarce resources and tight markets.

Many experts, such as George Harrar, a pioneer in breeding better food plants and a former president of the Rockefeller Foundation see difficult conflicts between the humanitarian desire to rescue famine victims with food handouts and the need to increase incentives for poor countries to become more self-reliant in food.

"Why should we feed countries that won't feed themselves," Dr. Harrar often challenges.

While no one advocates abandoning innocent famine victims, many agree with Dr. Harrar that ways must be found to end the history of dependence on the United States for food that many small countries have had.

Because of the great complexity of the food problem, and because of the increasing interdependence of nations in matters of food, fertilizer, energy and raw materials, many authorities see a need to develop new world institutions to deal effectively with the problems.

Even then, most experts are not sanguine, for there remains the problem of population growth.

"I don't think there's any solution to the world food situation unless we get population stabilized," said Sterling Wortman, vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation. "Those of us who have been working to increase the food supply have never assumed we were doing any more than buying time."

CITY OF CHICAGO'S PROCLAMATION ON GSA DAY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, July 1974 marks the 25th anniversary of GSA and I was pleased to learn that earlier this month the city of Chicago recognized GSA's 25th year of Government service by proclaiming July 1 GSA day in Chicago. I share the city's sentiments that GSA has been dedicated to the goals of efficient service and excellence in performing its Federal management responsibilities. Much of this recognition can be attributed to the outstanding leadership abilities of the Administrator of GSA, Arthur F. Sampson. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate each of the 40,000 GSA employees for 25 years of excellent service to the Federal Government, and I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the proclamation issued by the city of Chicago.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, a quarter century ago, on July 1, 1949, the General Services Administration was established by Section 101 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 379); and

Whereas, the General Services Administration has served the public and the agencies of the Federal Government effectively carrying out its procurement and property management responsibilities; and

Whereas, the observance of this 25th Anniversary of the Administration will be a period of recommunication and rededication to the goals of efficient service and better management within GSA, and a renewal of efforts to improve all phases of GSA operations; and

Whereas, loyal employees who have served GSA during these 25 years will be publicly recognized and honored; and celebrations are planned which will include all 40,000 GSA employees throughout the nation:

Now, Therefore, I Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim Monday, July 1, 1974, to be General Services Administration Day in Chicago and urge all citizens to take cognizance of the special events arranged for this time.

Dated this 18th day of June, 1974.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently I chaired hearings before my Subcommittee on Children and Youth on the subject of children and youth camp safety. Every year 7 million children attend camps in this country. When they leave home for summer camp, they and their parents look forward to the recreational and educational experiences that camping has to offer. Yet, for some, camping turns to tragedy.

Testimony before the subcommittee brought forth many facts which bear upon the question of whether the Federal Government should develop national standards for youth camps. We learned, for instance, that in 1973, at least 25 children died at camp; 1,448 were injured; and 1,223 suffered serious illness while they attended camp. We also learned of the personal tragedy suffered by families of campers who are injured or killed at summer camp. We also learned that only six States have good camp safety laws which are adequately enforced.

Clearly, parents and campers have a right to expect that the camps that they attend are safe and responsible. They have a right to expect that those few camps which do not meet minimum health and safety standards will not be permitted to operate until violations are corrected.

In a recent Washington Post article, Bill Gold does an excellent job of pointing out the need for Federal legislation to protect children at camp. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1974]

ONE TEACUP AT A TIME

(By Bill Gold)

An ocean of words washes over newspaper editors each day as they scan incoming dispatches. Their task is to distill it into teacups of information that can be passed along to subscribers whose time is limited.

This week, for example, Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) convened his Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth to bear testimony on the Youth Camp Safety Act.

This is a measure that would, if enacted, set federal safety standards for the camps to which millions of parents send their children.

Staff writer Richard E. Rotman was sent to Capitol Hill to cover the hearings, and returned to write a fact-packed report for the next day's paper. He was allotted space enough to give the essence of what the legislation would do, what the situation is now, who testified and what was said. It was a "hard news" report on what happened.

What Rotman had no space to tell, and what there is seldom space enough to include in a news dispatch, was a book-length background of detail. Yet to understand why safety standards are being proposed for youth camps, one needs to know that testimony was given that:

Youngsters are in some instances packed into ancient multiple-story hotels without fire alarms, fire escapes, or emergency exits. When fires broke out in facilities of this kind in "New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania and elsewhere," deaths resulted.

In California, 62 children and eight leaders were transported for a 200-mile trip over a high speed highway in an open tractor-trailer truck driven by a young counselor. Five were killed and all the others injured.

The witness who gave this testimony was Mitch Kurman, whose young son had drowned in an earlier camp "accident." Kurman testified that he sent a check to California authorities for an official report on the highway tragedy; his check was returned and he was informed that "this information is not available to the public."

Children from a Long Island camp were sent to visit Pennsylvania "in a bus with faulty steering" driven by "a driver whose license had been revoked for previous violations." Seven died and 53 were injured.

One camp had a 15-year-old part-time dishwasher and part-time "instructor" in charge of its rifle range. When a young camper's rifle jammed, the instructor took over the rifle in an attempt to fix it. The young camper was shot in the abdomen.

Youths at another camp were permitted to float down a swift river in inner tubes with counselors who were "untrained in lifesaving and resuscitation techniques."

The children were not given lifejackets. One child became entangled in a fallen tree in the water, and began to drown. When a counselor was asked what she did when she saw the girl drowning, she said, "I screamed." Asked what she did next, she said, "I cried." The child died.

Fifteen children were left in the care of a 15-year-old "counselor-in-training" at one camp. It was testified that the 15-year-old "used a hoe handle as a bat to strike the eye of a camper and blind him." The parents of the child were ignored by camp authorities for eight months. Only when the parents filed suit did the camp file a report with the state health department. The law requires that a report be filed within two days—but there is no penalty for late filing.

The testimony went on for hours. There is no space to print it all, and you wouldn't have time to read it all. But even without reading a word of it, we have long known the basic facts.

We know that children at camp have been beaten, injured, crippled, blinded, sexually molested, drowned and killed in accidents and fires. We know that there are no federal standards (and adequate state standards in only six jurisdictions) covering the safety of buildings, electrical wiring, equipment or vehicles. We know that although some camp operators voluntarily maintain right safety standards, others do not, and no federal law requires them to adhere to any level of training or competence for their employees.

If there are no federal standards, how is a parent to know which camp is safe? The Youth Camp Safety Act has been studied, debated, pigeonholed, and studied again—all without affirmative action—for two chief reasons. Nobody likes to be regulated, and camp operators are not exception. More pertinent, perhaps, is this: camp owners are campaign contributors, and Congress has been catering to their wishes rather than to the wishes of the millions of parents who send their children to camp.

POSTSCRIPT

I'm reminded of George Jean Nathan's observation: "Bad officials are elected by good citizens who do not vote."

REFORM OF OUR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the recent issue of variable interest rates notes by Citicorp has brought to public attention the low rate of interest offered to the small consumer-saver and the need to press for orderly, constructive and comprehensive reform of our financial institutions.

It is apparent that our present financial structure has become less flexible, unable to meet the challenges posed by a changing economic climate. Savings minded individuals are finding financially advantageous avenues which totally bypass our financial institutions. The situation is complicated for we must balance the interests of all participants in our financial system—savers as well as borrowers. Congress must face this dilemma head-on and resolve the conflict between consumer savers who are entitled to a fair rate of return on their savings and the potential adverse effects on financial institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Chicago Tribune and an article from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD to aid in clarifying the current situation and add that both follow recent editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post calling for sound comprehensive structural reform of our financial institutions.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 16, 1974]

SHORT-CHANGING THE SMALL SAVER

The proposal by two New York bank holding companies to offer small savers a new type of high interest investment has raised a vital, but too little discussed, question: Should small savers be forced to suffer financially thru low returns on their savings in order to generate low-cost money for home mortgages?

Tho never stated quite that bluntly, current national policy is that they should. Altho the intent is desirable—to provide reasonably priced financing for new housing, the result is unfair discrimination against the small saver.

Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks are the main sources of home mortgage money, and the government has fixed prices to give them special treatment. S & Ls and mutual banks have been protected from price competition by government-imposed ceilings on what they can pay depositors, while the flow of savings money to them has been encouraged by allowing them a higher ceiling than that set for commercial banks. Laws have likewise held down the rates on mortgages.

Now, Citicorp and Chase Manhattan Corp., the holding companies that own the First National City Bank of New York and Chase Manhattan Bank, want to offer savers notes that would have an interest rate set 1 percentage point above the average rate on U.S. Treasury bills.

Citicorp has set an initial interest rate of 9.7 per cent on its offering, far above the 5.25 per cent paid by S & Ls and mutual banks on regular passbook accounts or the 7.5 per cent they pay on four-year certificates of deposit. Altho the notes would be sold in minimum amounts of $5,000, the thrift institutions nevertheless fear that the drain on their deposits will speed up. They fear especially that the idea may spread, or that the minimum may be reduced.

The thrift institutions regard the notes a scheme to get around the government's interest rate ceiling on banks. Since the notes are issued by the parent holding companies and not by the banks, the Federal Reserve Board says it can't block the plan.

But the Fed has urged a delay, and Sen. William Proxmire and Rep. Wright Patman have called for new legislation to limit such notes.

In response to Federal Reserve Board pressure Citicorp has extended the intitial redemption period to two years, after which the six-month periods would take effect. That makes the notes significantly less attractive.

Government maneuvers to restrict the options of small savers are not new. Last year the ceiling was briefly removed from four-year certificates, but the high-yielding CDs proved so popular that the government reimposed the ban—with the support of the S & Ls.

For years, Treasury bills were sold in amounts as little as $1,000, but the minimum has been raised to $10,000. Government opposition is said to have sidetracked a proposal by American Telephone & Telegraph to offer bonds in units as little as $100.

The effect of such measures has been to keep interest payments to small savers low and to block alternatives by keeping minimum purchases high. The small saver is thus locked in, while the rich and corporate savers are free to desert the thrift institutions for more fertile fields of investment.

Even in a free market, there would be some spread between the interest rates payable on small deposits and on large ones. But as the latter rates have risen to record highs, the spread has become far more than is fair, and funds have been flowing out of S & Ls and savings banks, thus making money for mortgages almost unavailable. The proposed notes, it is feared, would mean disaster.

But we can't see that the solution lies in efforts to extend controls and arbitrary restraints. It lies rather in the opposite direction. Usury ceiling have already been lifted in many states, including Illinois, and there is talk of variable-rate mortgages on which the interest charge would vary to reflect the rising and [one hopes] falling cost of obtaining deposits.

More attention should be given instead to the recommendation made in 1971 by the governmental Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation that interest rate ceilings be phased out. This would be fairer to small savers and would lure back many larger savers. If it should mean higher interest rates on mortgages, it would be better than having no money available at low rates. And the problem would at least be faced without making the small saver the victim.

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1974]

"FLOATING INTEREST" NOTES

(By Philip Greer)

NEW YORK.—Sometime this week, probably on Wednesday, the parent company of First National City Bank will finally get its