

The question is: What can be done to relieve the present emergency? The honest answer is: all too little. But even at that, we can and must do something for the immediate problem, and we must couple that action with long-term deregulation of new natural gas. That is the only real solution to our recurring shortages.

First, this legislation allows emergency purchases by distressed pipelines for periods of 100 days. It eliminates producer uncertainty by specifying that intrastate sellers will not fall under Federal Power Commission regulations.

Second, it addresses long-term problems by encouraging better conservation of our most precious fuel, and by eliciting greater domestic supplies. It bans new contracts of natural gas for unnecessary boiler fuel use, and grants priority use of gas for agriculture, including fertilizer production and food processing.

Le Fontaine tells the parable of the grasshopper and the ant: the grasshopper fiddled all summer while the ant stored grain for the winter. Unfortunately, Congress has fiddled while it should have been storing. And today, many constituents are in the cold as a result. It is time to stop fiddling and get to work. The American people expect and deserve no less than speedy congressional action to guarantee them an adequate supply of natural gas for residential heating and industrial purposes.

NATURAL GAS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1977

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. HUBBARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this critically needed measure which my distinguished and able colleague, BOB KRUEGER, has introduced and which I have co-sponsored. By promptly enacting this legislation, the House of Representatives can rectify its mistaken judgment of last February when the Krueger amendment to deregulate interstate natural gas prices was tragically defeated by a three-vote margin. We must not compound the harm our Nation is now suffering because of that mistaken judgment by disapproving this measure or failing to act favorably upon it with all deliberate speed.

During last February's debate, opponents of interstate natural gas deregulation argued that the precariousness of the economy, the reputed adequacy of existing reserves, and the profits of the domestic private natural gas industry rendered our proposal unacceptable. It seems that every possible factor was considered except one—the commonsense realization that the Nation might experience a severe winter. This oversight has now come back to haunt us.

The heat of last February's debate will not keep the water pipes from bursting; it will not keep the factories open when there is no energy with which to run them; it will not provide employment to the more than 100,000 Americans who have been sent home from their jobs; it

will not open the countless schools which have been locked; and it will not help the hospitals in my home State of Kentucky which have been cut back to that amount of natural gas which is essential to offer the most basic of human services.

Temperatures in Kentucky have averaged 13½° below normal for the first half of January. Natural gas supplies are seriously understore. Due to the cold weather and the dearth of stored reserves, there is not enough pressure to move what little gas we have to the places we need it. In human terms, the situation is disastrous. The Louisville Gas & Electric Co. has been forced to cut off supplies for the entire winter to 113 industries and large commercial users who need natural gas for boiler fuel. This month, that company has had to terminate natural gas delivery to an additional 435 customers, including 200 schools. Those educational, commercial, and industrial users who are fortunate enough not to have been totally cut off, must now cope with 45- or 55-percent curtailments rather than the 10-percent curtailments provided by allocation.

Opponents of deregulating the price of interstate natural gas talked a great deal about the jobs which would be lost if deregulation were achieved. But, what do those people now have to say to the more than 100,000 workers who are without jobs because of the lack of natural gas? What will be the cost of the unemployment compensation benefits which must be paid? What will be the cost of alternate forms of energy which must replace natural gas if gas is no longer available?

The people of my State and my district have been hit hard, and we will probably be hit much harder as the cold spell continues. Next year's outlook will not be any brighter unless we in the Congress move immediately to deregulate interstate natural gas prices to give producers the incentive necessary to develop new natural gas resources.

Perhaps it is time to revise the adage that everyone talks about the weather, but no one ever does anything about it. Though Congress seems to talk about everything else, it has ignored the threat of cold weather to the health, safety and welfare of our citizens. The time for doing something about it is now.

STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTS UNDERSTATE HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act, the State Department at the request of Congress compiled reports on the human rights situation in six countries which receive U.S. military assistance: Argentina, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Peru, and the Philippines. After repeated insistence by myself and other members of Congress, these reports were finally declassified and released to the public on December 29, 1976.

Based upon my own experiences as a

member of a delegation organized by Amnesty International to investigate the human rights situation in Argentina, it seems clear that the State Department reports seriously understate the extent of human rights violations. During the 10 days which I spent in Argentina in November 1976, I learned of the arrest and imprisonment of thousands without charge or trial, the widespread use of torture by the police and the military, the suspension of all civil liberties, the dissolution of parliament, the prohibition of all political activity, and the complicity of the Government in an indiscriminate campaign of terror.

Perhaps the most outrageous single action of the military government in Argentina is its failure to produce a list of those imprisoned. The families of labor and political leaders, professors, students, and others who have been arrested without charge in many cases do not know of the fate of their relatives. I have witnessed firsthand the suffering endured by these families, and I can only conclude that a government which inflicts it merits the condemnation of the world community.

The State Department report on Argentina dismisses the suspension of parliament and the ban on all political activity in a single sentence. It asserts that "legal redress for governmental abuse of basic rights is normally available" while this is plainly not the case. It fails to state unequivocally a fact well known to everyone in Argentina: That the military government is directly involved in right-wing terrorist activities, for the commission of which not a single individual has been arrested or detained. It grossly understates the very strict Government censorship of the press. It fails to suggest any new initiatives which the United States might take to bring about a reduction of the military junta's abuses of power. And it recommends the continuation of U.S. military assistance to Argentina.

While a leftist terrorist movement does exist in Argentina, the measures taken by the Government far exceed the legitimate needs of a vigorous antiterrorist effort. The official Amnesty International report on human rights in Argentina will be available in the near future, and I will share with my colleagues the results of that comprehensive study. For the present, it is clear that the United States must reassess its policy toward Argentina and other governments which violate the fundamental human rights of their citizens. According to legislation enacted during the 94th Congress, the United States must terminate all military assistance to such governments. Additional initiatives are also available. International pressure, in the United Nations, the Organization of American States, or other appropriate forums; various forms of economic sanctions; and positive economic incentives based on improvements in the human rights area.

Not all of the preceding approaches will necessarily be appropriate in all cases, but their serious consideration and judicious implementation are long overdue. The lack of sensitivity to the human

JANUARY 19, 1977

rights issue represented by the State Department report on human rights in Argentina must cease.

There has been considerable criticism of the State Department human rights reports. Two editorials in the Detroit Free Press on January 7, 1977, pointed out the inaccuracies and deficiencies in the reports and highlighted the particularly disturbing situation in Argentina. On January 17, 12 church and political groups, including the Americans for Democratic Action, clergy and laity concerned, and the Friends Committee on National Legislation, released a sharply critical analysis of the reports. The analysis of the reports. The analysis accompanied a letter to President Carter requesting that more and better information on human rights be made available.

The editorials from the Detroit Free Press and excerpts from the letter to President-elect Carter and the accompanying analysis of the Argentine situation follow:

(From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 7, 1977)
 REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS FAILS TO TELL IT
 LIKE IT IS

The State Department, at the request of Congress, has reported on human rights violations in six countries that receive American military support.

The reports make us think the folks at State would have described Jack the Ripper as "a person accused of certain misdeeds and limited mayhem, although these allegations are not fully substantiated."

The State Department under Henry Kissinger has not been eager to make such reports. In fact, last year Secretary Kissinger refused to comply with a law requiring reports on human rights violations in all countries receiving our aid.

Because of that, Congress stiffened the law. The reports released Saturday on six countries were requested by the House International Relations Committee, partly in order to test the State Department's willingness to comply.

The department's reports say human rights have been violated in varying degrees in Argentina, Haiti, Iran, Peru, Indonesia and the Philippines. They tell of torture, arbitrary arrests, prolonged detention without charges and other violations (though not all of these were found in all the six countries).

This is obviously a tricky business for the State Department, and some of its caution in the reports is understandable. Even so, these are "soft" reports. Other sources have detailed, in convincing fashion, much stronger accounts of violations in some of these countries.

The State Department wants our aid continued to the six countries in the reports, despite human rights violations. In our view this sometimes may be in the national interest. But it also is true that the United States can have great influence upon other countries' readiness to violate human rights.

We probably have had some impact, for instance, in moderating the harshness of Haiti's regime. American protestations have even influenced the Soviet Union, at times, to be less repressive in the case of Jews. In short, it is simply not true that our expressions of concern about human rights can be easily ignored abroad.

Members of Congress, as they deal with aid programs, should raise questions and demand answers concerning human rights. Further, the State Department should be prodded to "tell it like it is" when Congress asks for reports on violations.

Otherwise, Washington will be making a mockery of the foreign aid law's requirement that the United States refuse aid to any governments that engage in "a consistently pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights."

IN ARGENTINA, TERROR RULES

When Argentine, Gen. Jorge Videla led the coup that toppled the elected government of Isabel Peron last March, it generally was agreed he had a six-month "grace" period in which to restore the country's equilibrium. But after almost 10 months, Argentina still is floundering in a twilight zone of human-rights repression, terrorism by the left and the right, and persecution of political refugees on a scale that surpasses anything known in pre-coup days.

The Videla junta understandably is anxious to nurture the world's goodwill and economic assistance, and has hired public relations agencies to spread the story of a declining inflation rate and a foreign debt that has been halved. But until the junta addresses the pervasive problem of political repression, it must expect to remain isolated on the fringes of respectability.

If the junta is sincere about making a new beginning, however, this "International Prisoners of Conscience Year," as Amnesty International has labeled 1977, provides a good opportunity. The respected London-based organization, which has documented torture and other abuses of detainees in Argentina and elsewhere, says it will launch "an all-out offensive on behalf of human rights throughout the world" this year.

The Carter administration and Congress can join that offensive by denying the Videla regime further military assistance, by offering sanctuary to South American refugees whose lives are imperiled in Argentina, and by exerting strong diplomatic and other pressures on the junta to stop the repression.

Further evidence of just how far the Argentine political situation has deteriorated is expected later this month when Amnesty International releases a report compiled in part by Rep. Robert Drinan, Roman Catholic priest and Democratic congressman from Massachusetts, who was on a three-member team that spent 10 days in Argentina last fall.

Noting the "incredible tales of torture being used" by the Argentine government, Mr. Drinan says "there's no reason to deny or question the veracity of witnesses. It's just an unbelievable situation."

Earlier, Rep. Edward I. Koch, D-N.Y., told his colleagues that "Argentina is embroiled in a near civil war, and many innocent persons are being caught in a cross fire of leftist guerrilla warfare and government-sponsored counter-terrorism."

Already the political fatalities are nearing the 1,500 mark that was the estimate put on terrorist killings during Mrs. Peron's 21-month rule. The instability that these killings produced was one of the reasons for the Peron government's collapse.

Church sources estimate that at least 5,200 political prisoners are being held, without being charged with any crime and often without any trace being provided as to their whereabouts. The junta's reign of terror recently has taken an ugly anti-clerical turn, as a result of the church having been the one organization that has not been afraid to speak—as one pastoral letter put it—on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves.

Clearly, the political future of Argentina—as of Chile, Uruguay, Brazil and other South American dictatorships—lies in the hands of those upon whom the repressive governments depend for economic and diplomatic survival. To the extent that the United States provides a portion of that sustenance, 1977 should be the year that leverage is brought to secure human-rights reforms.

President-elect JIMMY CARTER,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT-ELECT CARTER: We write to convey our urgent concern about the State Department's superficial treatment of human rights violations. We have been very heartened by your statements on human rights throughout your long campaign and believe that you will share our frustration with the present State Department's way of dealing with human rights.

On January 1, 1977, the House International Relations Committee released partially declassified human rights reports by the State Department on six countries that receive security assistance. The inadequacies of the reports on Argentina, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran and the Philippines compel us to challenge both their content and their conclusions.

After careful scrutiny of these statements, we conclude that the State Department figures given for political prisoners are consistently underestimated and do not take into consideration higher estimates by international organizations. Responsible reports from international legal and human rights groups alleging widespread and routine torture by police and army personnel with the sanction of government leaders are downgraded or disregarded entirely. (A detailed analysis is attached.)

Americans for Democratic Action, Anti-Martial Law Coalition (Philippines), Argentine Commission for Human Rights, Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy, Church of the Brethren, World Ministries Commission, Clergy and Laity Concerned, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Friends of the Filipino People, Haitian Refugee Concerns, National Council of Churches, Jesuit Office of Social Ministries, New York Solidarity Committee with the Argentine People, Washington Office of Latin America, Sr. Ann Gormly (U.S. Catholic Mission Council), Morton Sclar (Catholic University Law School), Fernan Will (United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society).

ARGENTINA

Political Prisoners. The State Department report on Argentina asserts that "in all probability" the current number of political prisoners detained without trial for unlimited periods is lower than the 4,000 persons Amnesty International (AI)'s 1976-1976 Report estimates to have been in detention at the time of the March 24, 1976 military coup. This assertion ignores two other statements by AI in that same report:

1. "Several thousand people were arrested immediately after the coup . . ."
2. "... estimates received by AI claim that the number of those in detention is as high as 20,000."

Even if we accept the Argentine government's claim to have released 1,079 political prisoners since the coup, AI's other figures make it impossible to believe the State Department's estimate that less than 4,000 are now political prisoners in Argentine jails.

Government Terror. The State Department report acknowledges that "active duty and retired military and police personnel are reportedly members of vigilante squads" that operate "with apparent impunity." However, the State Department attempts to disassociate the Argentine government leaders from the acts of their subordinates. The report states that Argentine leaders have stated as a matter of policy they do not condone and are seeking to curb violations of human rights, but that in the present atmosphere of terrorism, they cannot yet control the situation.

Father James Weeks, an American born

priest who lived in Argentina for eleven years and was kidnapped on August 3, 1976 in the city of Cordoba, testified before the House Subcommittee on International Organizations on September 28, 1976:

"In summary, from my own experience and that of others with whom I have personally spoken, there appear to be certain common occurrences experienced by each of the victims throughout their ordeal:

"First of all, all the kidnapers were identified by their captives as police or military men. They were specifically addressed as 'Chief', 'Captain', 'Colonel', 'Lieutenant', etc.

"Third, all the kidnap victims were taken to predestination centers, police stations or military headquarters."

It is widely accepted among most observers of Argentina, including those in the State Department, that the present military government's two major priorities are to stabilize the economy and to wipe out "subversive" elements on the left. In that latter task, the present government, as did the government of Isabel Peron, encourages the actions of semi-clandestine, well-disciplined squads of military and police personnel. This is done not only because these often capture and/or assassinate suspected left-wing guerrillas but also because they intimidate the general population keeping it from opposing the government's other policies. As reported in AI's 1975-1976 report, the present government, as the one before, "has made remarkably few arrests in connection with AAA (Argentine Anti-Communist Alliance), a (rightwing) organization which has carried out more than 2,000 political assassinations since 1973." In summary, groups like the AAA, which include police and armed forces personnel, would appear to be exempt from prosecution, because their activities are compatible with the Argentine government's policies and supplement the repressive activities of the legal security agencies.

Torture. The State Department report acknowledges the existence of torture, but implies that it is something exceptional:

"While torture, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment have not been a general practice in Argentina, such methods are reportedly used by the security forces to extract information from some prisoners, particularly suspected or proven terrorists."

The Amnesty International assessment is quite different:

"However, torture is allegedly a routine practice in many local police and military headquarters throughout the country."

Counterinsurgency. The State Department report states: "U.S. military credits have little or no bearing on the counter terrorist capability of the Armed Forces." This is directly contradicted by the Congressional Presentation Document on the Security Assistance Program (March 8, 1976) which states: "The FMS credits being proposed for Argentina will support their program of armed forces modernization, particularly their counterinsurgency and sea control capabilities."

Military credits for FY 77 authorizes the Argentine government to buy 12 OH-119 helicopters (HOUEY) of the type commonly used in Vietnam for the insertion of troops into combat zones. Significantly, these additional aircraft would expand the helicopter fleet of the Argentine forces from 107 to 119, according to figures in the "Military Balance", the 1975-76 Report of the London based International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Security Assistance. The State Department offers five reasons for continuing security assistance to Argentina:

1. "Security Assistance demonstrates our desire to cooperate militarily with a country which has 1,000 miles of coastline on the South Atlantic reaching to Cape Horn."

2. "(Security Assistance) offers the United States the possibility of improved communication with the Argentine military who have always influenced events in their country and are now the dominant factor."

3. "Argentina is already a middle power in terms of development..."

4. "...it has substantial uranium deposits, well-trained physicists and ambitious plans for nuclear power development."

5. U.S. trade and investment are significant and "we have a credit exposure of \$2.7 billion."

None of these reasons cite a vital U.S. interest. None of these reasons point to an external threat to Argentina. They are the kind of flimsy reasons that have caused the U.S. Security Assistance Program to come into such disrepute among the American people.

Since the Argentine government clearly acquiesces to terror, if it does not actively promote it, US Security Assistance should be terminated immediately.

ABOLISH THE COUNCIL ON WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which addresses two matters that have become increasingly important during the past several years: First, the credibility of Government to deal with vital national problems, in this case, inflation, and second, the creation of an ineffective bureaucracy despite the best intentions surrounding its creation. The bill I propose abolishes the Council on Wage and Price Stability. The Council cannot and has not done the job of stopping inflation and it continues as a beguiling but ineffective agency of Government to the detriment of public belief.

Let us look at the record of the Council on Wage and Price Stability and how it came to be.

For 3½ Nixon years, we witnessed and suffered under the dismal failure of mandatory wage and price controls under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970. It was painfully clear that under this program with its phases 1, 2, 3, et cetera, price and wage controls to contain inflation were not effective, and business and labor became vigorously opposed to this form of mandatory regulation. The distortions of prices, wages, supply, and demand in the market place also hurt the public.

Recognizing the need to do something to halt the double-digit inflationary spiral gripping the country at that time, and the failure of controls, it was decided to eliminate the controls and use the market place, persuasion and information instead.

It was felt, however, that the public would feel better if it was told that some other agency of Government was still in the ball game.

Consequently, in August 1974, Congress, at the administration's suggestion, created the Council on Wage and Price Stability. This Council was supposed to monitor wages, prices, dividends, interest rates, and concentration of business power and antitrust activities. As well, the Council was authorized to participate

in collective bargaining activities and rulemaking functions of Federal agencies.

The committee report which accompanied the bill creating the Council in 1974 stated that the Council would "have power to monitor the economy generally," have no mandatory or standby control over the economy, "work with labor and management in an effort to improve the structure of collective bargaining and encourage price restraint," and "be authorized to conduct public hearings to help publicize the inflationary problems and to focus attention on the need to increase productivity in all sections of our economy."

In short, the Council has the responsibility of monitoring and impacting upon all—repeat, "all"—decisions in the private sector and all—repeat, "all"—decisions in government which have an inflationary consequence.

The Council, for the most part, has operated with a staff complement of 48 persons of which only 26 are professionals—10 for monitoring all decisions in private business, 7 for monitoring all government activities, and 9 for other responsibilities such as general counsel, public affairs and the director's office. From time to time, the Council has employed the services of outside consultants, specifically six consultants during the first 10 months of its existence. This is the total capability of an agency that is supposed to watch over the total activities of government and private sector operations. When one considers that 535 Members of Congress with over 3,000 staff members cannot even keep up with the government end, not to mention the private sector, who can really believe that in supposedly doing its job, the Council checks into those government and private decisions which may be inflationary? How can they do this with such an inadequate staff?

I should point out here that the Council has some excellent people in its staff including the present and past directors. These have been able, dedicated, and articulate men. It is not their failure I condemn; it is the failure of the Council's statutory charter. These men, properly utilized elsewhere, could be of great help in a meaningful fight against inflation.

During the last Congress, my Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs of the Government Operations Committee conducted oversight hearings on the Council on Wage and Price Stability. At that time, representatives of the Council stated that the work of the Council was initiated by reading newspapers, reviewing the Federal Register, and receiving letters from the public and Members of Congress, all on a haphazard and catch-as-catch-can basis.

Using this less-than-systematic procedure, the Council has conducted to date 33 studies of profit monitoring and filed approximately 90 formal comments with Federal agencies—this in the name of doing something about stopping inflation. Who is kidding whom? What about the hundreds of thousands of inflationary decisions that went unnoticed?

The Council has obviously not been