

of entering statements in the RECORD, and entering bills and resolutions, petitions, and memorials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TIME LIMITATION FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, with respect to the period for transaction of morning business tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that that period be limited to not to exceed 10 minutes, with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STONE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF RAY MARSHALL TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following that period for the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Mr. Marshall, with the time then to begin running.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, that just about states the program so far as I know it for tomorrow.

I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. We have a resolution from the Committee on Foreign Relations. Is it the intention of the majority leadership to call it up tomorrow?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes, I am glad the distinguished Republican leader reminded me of this.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 48 TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the

disposition of the nomination of Mr. Ray Marshall tomorrow, the Senate resume legislative session immediately and without any intervening motions or debate, and that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of Senate Resolution 48, the resolution with respect to the release of Abu Daoud.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I repeat my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I think I should state that it is possible, certainly to be hoped, that the Senate can find a way to act on the emergency legislation that will be sent up tonight or early tomorrow morning by the President to deal with the shortage of natural gas. I am in no position to state at this time what the prospects are, at least until we can see the legislation and Senators may have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BAKER. I share the hope that we can turn to the prompt consideration of the President's proposal in this respect. There are few things that are more urgently important than the preservation of the health and comfort of the people of our country and the warmth of our citizens. From that standpoint, I can assure the majority leader that the Members on the Republican side of the aisle

will do their very best to try to read, digest, and understand the proposal when it is sent to us by the President. We do not yet have a copy of it. Parenthetically, I hope the White House will get that to us yet tonight so we can study it overnight. Then we can consider the procedural question of whether or not to refer it to one of the committees, perhaps the Committee on Commerce, to proceed to its consideration. I hope we can arrive at an agreement whereby we can proceed to its consideration on tomorrow or the day following.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Republican leader. I share that hope. Perhaps tomorrow, we shall be in a position to see what the realities of the situation may be.

Mr. President, the Senate is recessing in executive session, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:12 p.m., the Senate recessed in executive session until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1977, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1977:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Griffin B. Bell, of Georgia, to be Attorney General.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Coast Guard nominations beginning Allan H. Gifford, to be captain, and ending Robert W. Sprick, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 10, 1977.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DOES ANYBODY REALLY LIVE IN QUEENS?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1977

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, many people are familiar with the borough of Queens as the home of Archie Bunker from "All in the Family." But Queens is much more than that: It is the home of two world's fairs—1939 and 1964—the New York Jets and the Mets; two of the world's busiest airports, Kennedy and LaGuardia; the Queens Botanical Gardens; and Flushing Meadow-Corona Park, the city's largest park.

Originally a collection of villages going back to 1683, Queens today consists of numerous communities that still retain much of their original character. According to Prof. Andrew Hacker of Queens College, many residents choose to live in Queens because "it is a set of suburbs within the borders of the city."

I wish to share with my colleagues the unique atmosphere of this borough which offers both city and suburban life for its citizens. For those who enjoy walking, there are scores of bakeries, clothes shops, movies, restaurants, and groceries which can fulfill this pleasure. On the other hand, Queens provides suburban breathing space for those who wish to live in such an environment. Proof of this is that a majority of its citizens reside in single- or two-family homes,

many owning two or three cars. Queens is situated in such a fashion that both the bustling life of Manhattan and the more relaxed surroundings of the suburbs are easily accessible to its residents.

I am proud to represent, along with my colleagues JOSEPH P. ADDABO, JAMES J. DELANEY, LESTER L. WOLFF, MARIO BIAGGI, and JAMES H. SCHEUER, the 2 million residents of Queens. Our county provides an alternative for those citizens who do not want to reside in the center of a city but wish to partake of its assets.

Professor Hacker has written a delightful, intriguing article about this borough which bridges city and suburbs. I wish to share his article, which was published in *Newsday*, January 9, with my colleagues:

DOES ANYBODY REALLY LIVE IN QUEENS?

(By Andrew Hacker)

Nobody lives in Queens.

Nobody, except for 2 million residents of New York City who make their homes and receive their mail in communities like Woodside and Sunnyside, Rosedale and Glendale, Jackson Heights and Cambria Heights, Richmond Hill and Forest Hills. (Address a letter to "Queens, New York" and you risk having it returned "No Such Place.") There is a College Point which never had a college. Long Island City, which was really once a city. And Flushing, named after the Dutch town of "Vlissingen," which has nothing to do with plumbing.

Queens began as a collection of villages, and it retains that character today. Indeed, that is why most residents choose to live there. It is a set of suburbs within the borders of the city. And city life with suburban breathing space. A majority of the citizens live in the borough's 282,360 single and two-family homes, plus an occasional "illegal three" in what was once the two-car garage. The borough has eye-catching high-rises, especially along Queens Boulevard. But complexes of over 100 units house less than a tenth of the total population. Most people sleep close to the ground and wake up looking at a lawn.

Still, Queens is very much a city. Perhaps its most striking urban characteristic is the number of people one sees walking. As it happens, a majority of families own cars. (In fact, 79,902 households have two; and 9,956 claim three.) Nevertheless, people are constantly on the streets, en route to shops or a movie or a meal. True to its village tradition, each community has a central crossroads; Roosevelt Avenue and 82nd Street in Jackson Heights; 71st Avenue and Austin Street in Forest Hills; Ditmars Boulevard and 31st Street in Astoria. The stroll to the bakery, the dry cleaner or the drugstore is a daily household institution. The suburbanite surrenders to his car; walking takes place chiefly in shopping center parking lots. (Hence the need for tennis, to make up for the lack of exercise.)

Queens owes much of its charm to several centuries of isolation. For the first 226 years of its history, it could only be reached by ferry. The borough began life in 1683 as a colonial county, named for Queen Catherine of Braganza, the consort of England's Charles II. (Catherine, a Portuguese princess, was accused of trying to poison her husband, as part of the so-called "Popish Plot.") Happily for local history, she was exonerated of all charges.) Until 1898, when it joined New York City, Queens included all of what is now Nassau County. As a price of becoming a borough, it set its Nassau portion adrift—a decision some later came to regret. Even so, Queens remained largely a countrified cousin. The Queensborough Bridge, completed in 1909, was intended to relieve Manhattan's congestion. However it failed to bring out an immediate influx of migrants. For one thing, the bridge let out on 59th Street on its Manhattan side, still well north of most shops and offices and factories. (Bloomingtondale country was still far in the future.) To commute from Sunnyside to a desk down on 23rd Street might take two hours and three changes of trolleys. The first subway, now the No. 7 line to Flushing, opened in 1915. Nevertheless, the borough's growth remained gradual. It took until 1939 to reach the one million mark, and to 1960 to come close to two million.

Because it had space to spread—the borough covers 120 square miles and runs 150 miles from Steinway to the Rockaways—Queens never built the physical contours of a city. It lacks Brooklyn's serried ranks of brownstones, or the Bronx's acres of six-story apartments. The borough has few architectural landmarks, apart from some

early churches and the 47th Avenue gingerbread firehouse. The shopping complexes in Rego Park and Jamaica cannot count as urban centers; in fact, the borough has no geographic midpoint. When Queens residents want to be in the middle of things, they journey into Manhattan. However, those trips tend to be fewer and farther between than the price of a subway token might suggest.

To begin with, over a third of the 759,587 employed residents have their jobs in Queens itself. (Almost 40,000 work in Nassau; and—so says the census—335 are employed in Ohio.) The borough makes Bulova watches, Swingline stapler, Dentyne chewing gum and Bestform undergarments. Dannon churns out several million yogurts every week, while Steinway handcrafts 3,800 pianos annually—some with price-tags approaching \$15,000. But aviation is the borough's biggest industry. Adding Kennedy and LaGuardia together, Queens leads the nation in takeoffs and landings.

However, half of all Queens dwellers work in Manhattan, mostly in managerial or other white-collar occupations. Of this group, about 40 per cent are women, almost half of whom are working wives. Queens provides a solid and indispensable phalanx of the city's administrators, salespeople and service workers. For the great majority, the ride to work is on the subway, which usually means standing as one travels. Another 43,112 come by car; 21,222 take a bus; and an intrepid 682 say they walk—no small feat, since the Queensborough Bridge is now closed to pedestrians. Moreover, these Manhattan workers return home in the evening. For entertainment, they tend to prefer the amenities closer to home.

Queens is commonly called a middle-class borough. In fact it is more of a mixture. In a not untypical family, the father may be a foreman at a factory in Hollis, while the mother heads a typing pool on Wall Street. There are plenty of comfortable households, but few rank as really rich. According to the 1970 census, Queens had only 4,668 families with incomes exceeding \$50,000. The well-off do not cluster in a single Gold Coast section—Douglaston would be the closest contender—but rather scatter across most of the borough. Of course Queens has people at the other extreme. The census found 3,362 homes still using coal-fuel furnaces, and 55 cooking with woodburning stoves. A total of 3,143 shared their bath or shower with a neighbor; while 1,918 made do with only cold water. But if 56,504 Queens families lack a telephone, another 32,269 own a second home.

Much is made nowadays of ethnicity. People, we are told, like to live among "their own kind." Queens can be seen as an ethnic borough; still the point should not be pressed too far. For example, long stretches of Bayside, Whitestone and Little Neck combine a variety of religions and national origins. Many streets in Flushing and Jamaica alternate Jewish and Italian families, not to mention intermarried households. Nor has Queens the kind of Old World enclaves still found in Brooklyn and the Bronx. It has no counterpart to Williamsburg's Hasidim, or the Sicilian flavor of Belmont in the Bronx. The borough's black neighborhoods tend to be sedate, certainly when compared with Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Perhaps the best way to put the matter is to say that Queens offers an ethnic freedom of choice. A family of Irish origins wishing to keep attuned to its Hibernian heritage can settle down in Woodside and send its children to St. Sebastian's. Parts of Ozone Park are almost exclusively Italian; and Far Rockaway is mainly Jewish. Astoria has risen as a new Athens, with Greek movies playing next to the local McDonald's. Queens also

has a French colony in Sunnyside, which boasts a well-recommended restaurant called Les Halles. There one can dine pleasantly on *Coquilles Saint-Jacques* or *Canard Grand Marnier*, while watching the Flushing line thunder overhead.

One of the most impressive immigrations has been among Hispanic-Americans. On the whole, Queens has fewer Puerto Ricans than most of the other boroughs. The new arrivals, clustering mainly in East Elmhurst, hail from Cuba, Colombia and the Dominican Republic. Indeed, Queens is now the chief port of entry for all of America's immigrants. Kennedy Airport has replaced Ellis Island. The International Arrivals Building has etched on its wall Emma Lazarus' stirring words, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." (Left off is her next line: "The wretched refuse of your teeming shore." Current immigration legislation sets higher standards than prevailed in our grandparents' day.)

Queens politics defy prediction. Once again, it would be misleading to theorize in ethnic terms. If Staten Island remains a Republican stronghold, and Manhattan is reflexively Democratic, Queens keeps even the experts in suspense. Over the past dozen years, its voting has covered a broad ideological spectrum. Back in 1965, the borough's choice for mayor was a little-known Republican congressman, who happened to be named John Lindsay. Queens was then traditional GOP territory where one voted the party line on faith. It took less than a year to realize that Lindsay was not quite what they had bargained for. In a raucous 1966 referendum, Queens turned down Lindsay's pet project, civilian review for the police, by an overwhelming margin. Observers saw that vote as a conservative catalyst: Tantamount to firing on Fort Sumter, it was an act of secession from Gracie Mansion. The mayor was advised to make any trips to the airport via a Brooklyn back entrance.

Undaunted, Lindsay decided to run for reelection. His own party refused to nominate him. Queens Republicans rejected him in their primary, with a scorn reserved for renegades. The 1969 mayoral contest offered some choices that finally made sense. Everyone who was anybody knew that Queens would go for either John Marchi or Mario Procaccino, candidates who understood the feelings of the neighborhoods. But of course the analysts were wrong. Running as an independent, Lindsay actually topped his two opponents, both in Queens and across the city. Indeed he improved his performance, compared with the review board referendum, in Woodhaven, Maspeth and Ozone Park, not normally liberal outposts. One survey showed that Lindsay, a Social Register Protestant, received a third of his votes from Catholics. So much for ethnic explanations.

But a year later the borough was giving a solid plurality to James Buckley, the Conservative Party's candidate for senator. And in 1972 its choice was Richard Nixon, with a very impressive majority. Queens, we were told, was the urban arm of Mid-America, CBS started "All in the Family" and chose to place Archie in Glendale. Yet by 1976, the borough had become Carter country. And voters dismissed James Buckley, a man almost typecast to represent them, for a Harvard professor from Cooperstown. (As it happens, Daniel Patrick Moynihan spent a bit of his boyhood in Astoria. But not many voters knew that.)

So where stands Queens on the political spectrum? A borough that chooses a Nixon, a Buckley and a Lindsay is hard to fit to a pattern. Clearly it is not in the hip pocket of any political party. The impression arises that voters feel they cast their ballots in good faith, only to get candidates lacking competence or character. Queens residents believe they contribute much to their city and their country, and receive less back from politics

than is their due. Yet anyone predicting a conservative resurgence would do well to examine the figures on the Equal Rights referendum of 1975. Queens rallied behind that amendment—unlike the suburbs, which voted it down. Right now the borough casts more votes than any other county in the state. Its mood demands some understanding and deserves to be taken seriously.

Queens clearly has a future. Even as the city draws in its economic belt, the borough will obviously survive. In many ways it is renewing itself. St. Albans boasts one of the country's most successful black communities. New arrivals in Astoria and East Elmhurst evidence energy and ambitions of a kind unseen in the city since the early years of this century. Not a few are so anxious to make it in America, they bypass immigration formalities altogether.

But if one wants a glimpse of the decades ahead, perhaps the best site to visit is the intersection of Kissena Boulevard and Melbourne Avenue in Flushing. The borough may not have an official or agreed-upon center. However Queens College comes closest to filling that function. Its students commute from every section of the borough, often leaving the Rockaways before dawn and returning to Bellerose after dusk. Graduates of Mater Christi and Monsignor McClancy and St. Agnes sit beside products of John Adams, Grover Cleveland and John Browne. Indeed, the ambience of the college is summed up in the person of its recent president: a remarkable man named Murphy, who just happened to be half Jewish.

A half-dozen years ago the majority of Queens students had their hearts set on moving to the suburbs. Going to college meant graduating to swimming pools and station-wagons. But that consensus no longer holds true. More than ever before, they say they want to stay in the city. If that turns out to be the case, Queens may well have a lesson for the nation: a way of combining several worlds in a single location and way of life.

ELIE WIESEL PROTESTS FRANCE'S RELEASE OF ABU DAUD

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1977

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the recent decision of a French court to release the individual known as Abu Daoud, the alleged leader of the terrorist attack at the Munich Olympic Games which resulted in the murder of 11 Israeli athletes. This deplorable action by the French authorities shocked men of conscience throughout the world.

One such man is Elie Wiesel, author of the internationally acclaimed "A Beggar in Jerusalem" and many other outstanding works. Mr. Wiesel survived the horrors of the concentration camp at Buchenwald and lived thereafter for many years in France.

Mr. Wiesel writes:

Although born in Eastern Europe, I owe France more than I owe my native land. I owe France my secular education, my language, and my career as a writer.

Despite his profound love for his adopted homeland, Mr. Wiesel was so

shocked and disappointed by its actions in the Abu Daoud matter that he was moved to write an eloquent, open letter of protest to President Giscard d'Estaing. This letter, which appeared in the New York Times on January 20, 1977, expresses the outrage and dismay felt by all men of conscience upon learning of France's deplorable action.

I would like to share Mr. Wiesel's eloquent letter with my colleagues.

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT GISCARD D'ESTAING OF FRANCE

(By Elie Wiesel)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is because of my love for France, and my respect for its people, that I feel compelled to express to you my sadness and my indignation—shared by many other Americans—over your handling of the Abu Daoud affair.

Although born in Eastern Europe, I owe France more than I owe my own native land. I owe France my secular education, my language, and my career as a writer.

Liberated from Buchenwald, it was in France that I found compassion and humanity. It was in France that I found generosity and friendship. It was in France that I discovered the other side, the brighter side, of mankind.

I was proud of France.

France, to me, represented humanity's highest values in a sterile and cynical society. It evoked Rousseau and Bergson, Proust and Zola, Camus and Mauriac. It symbolized an inspiring quest for justice and brotherhood. In France, I thought, the word humanism does not make people laugh.

Yes, I was proud of France.

France, the birthplace of revolutions against tyranny, France, the ally to our American independence, France, the herald of human rights, France, haven for the persecuted, France and its freedom fighters, France and its Resistance, France, and its response to Dreyfus.

No nation had so much prestige. No culture was as readily accepted. No example as universally extolled.

And now, Mr. President?

Now, what has become of France?

Its moral leadership is gone, and its luster tarnished in the eyes of men of conscience. In fact, few countries have lost so much prestige so quickly. What has become of France?

It has betrayed its own traditions.

France has become as cynical as the rest of the world.

Why did your government free Abu Daoud? And why so hastily?

He lied under oath about his false identity.

Why wasn't he held until Germany or Israel could offer evidence of his crime?

Why was he allowed to leave Paris in the comfort of a first class airline seat, when 11 Israeli athletes left Munich in coffins?

Your prime minister claims that the courts were not politically motivated. Does anyone believe him in your country?

Not in mine.

In my country we believe that France quite simply, and quite shockingly, yielded to killers' blackmail, oil merchants' bribery, and the chance to sell some fighter planes. And in doing that, France deliberately humiliated the victims' widows and orphans, and insulted the memory of their dead.

Are you surprised the world responded with dismay and outrage?

Your own people rose to speak out against you.

Because while you have visited Auschwitz, you have forgotten its lesson.

But then, in truth, one should have ex-

pected nothing else from France today. In recent years the signs have multiplied.

Offensive statements. Sneering remarks. Sudden policy reversals. Strange alliances. Broken promises. One-sided embargoes. The Cherbourg affair. The Mirage sale. French governments have rarely missed an opportunity to demonstrate their hostility to Israel and the Jewish people.

France even abstained on the infamous resolution equating Zionism and racism.

For ideological reasons?

Much worse: purely for money.

Yes, Mr. President, I used to be proud of France and what it stood for.

I no longer am.

ELIE WIESEL.

TOWARD A NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1977

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, Saturday's Washington Post included a column by Mr. John C. Sawhill, the former Federal Energy Administrator, about the need for a strong, comprehensive national plan to deal with the energy crisis. While I do not necessarily endorse every point in Mr. Sawhill's column, I commend it to my colleagues as an excellent outline of the energy policies that we must vigorously pursue:

TOWARD A NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN

(By John C. Sawhill)

There is a growing national awareness that we face a serious energy problem in both the short and long term. And there is a general consensus that we need a national energy policy to deal with those problems. But turning that consensus into effective action has so far eluded us.

The new administration must move quickly beyond mere rearrangement of boxes on our federal organization chart—one of the few concrete proposals that has surfaced so far. For so little has been done since the 1973 Arab oil embargo that imports now account for a higher percentage of total U.S. consumption than they did then. And our energy conservation program is so ineffective (ranking near the bottom of the list of industrialized nations) that we are missing our best chance of defusing the Arab oil weapon.

The immediate problem is the growing U.S. dependence on oil imports increasingly concentrated in the Middle East. The longer-range problem is the need to find alternative sources of energy to sustain the world's economy in the next century when oil and gas supplies are depleted. Unless we solve the near-term problem, our domestic economy and our foreign policy will remain unduly vulnerable to manipulation by the Arab states, and the mounting debt burdens on the non-oil producing less-developed countries will continue to threaten international financial stability. Unless we solve the longer-range problem, we will have difficulty maintaining a rising standard of living once liquid hydrocarbon reserves are exhausted.

Several critical decisions are called for, the first of which is to establish short- and long-range goals for U.S. dependence on foreign sources for petroleum. A second is to set a target for reducing the growth of energy consumption and to enact a package of tough energy-conservation measures. Somewhat higher fuel prices, coupled with other eco-

conomic incentives (like tax credits for insulation) and regulatory measures (such as banning nonreturnable bottles), could reduce the rate of energy-demand growth well below 2 per cent a year.

One of the most pressing energy issues before Congress is whether the government should continue to regulate oil and gas prices. Opponents of regulation claim that controls encourage consumption, discourage investment in new production, and maintain an unnecessary government bureaucracy. Proponents argue that oil prices have always been regulated de facto—first through production limits set by the Texas Railroad Commission and later through the import-quota program.

If controls were completely eliminated today, the price for oil would not be determined by free market demand-and-supply conditions, but by the OPEC cartel. U.S. oil prices should be as consistent as possible with U.S. economic recovery and energy objectives; it is unlikely, to say the least, that the OPEC managers will act on this criterion. My own view is that complete deregulation is not the best course. The United States must continue to regulate crude oil prices with a view toward keeping our economic engine lubricated, but permit them to rise enough to encourage conservation, new exploration, and the development of new facilities. Petroleum product prices and the price of new natural gas at the wellhead should be deregulated, however, since they will tend to move with crude-oil prices.

The best way to moderate world energy prices is to reduce our import dependency. Beyond this, however, there are other actions that should be explored. One is the possibility of establishing a government agency to purchase some imports (such as those necessary to build an oil stockpile) under a system whereby OPEC suppliers would be required to submit sealed bids for access to the U.S.

market as a means of fostering competition among them. The dissension at the recent Qatar meetings suggests that there may be opportunities for the new administration to widen cracks in the cartel, and thereby bring downward pressures on prices.

In addition to prices, a pressing question facing the new Carter energy team is the future role of nuclear power. Reducing our dependency on oil as a primary energy source in the longer term will require much expanded capacity for electrical generation besides an increased role for coal. This means some firm decisions on nuclear energy. The current debate on this issue has centered around questions of reaction safety and waste disposal and, as a result, has tended to obscure the more critical issue, which is the problem of weapons proliferation. The key to reducing the proliferation risks is to limit the spread of plutonium until appropriate safeguards are in place.

Fortunately, the U.S. has sufficient uranium reserves to last well into the next century. For this reason, we are in a position to defer the decision on plutonium recycling and on commercialization of the breeder reactor (which uses plutonium) in order to influence foreign suppliers to do the same. Simultaneously, we should work from the other end to persuade potential buyers of these facilities that their benefits are outweighed by the risk of weapons proliferation. Strengthening and broadening the mandate of the International Atomic Energy Agency would help to enforce measures to limit proliferation.

In sum, then, we need serious commitment to a national energy plan. We will be able to measure the seriousness of this commitment by the speed with which proposals are made and decisions are reached on these overall goals. The consequences of continued inaction are grave indeed.

GEORGIA LAND

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 25, 1977

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a good friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Carlos Hopkins, of Atlanta, has composed a poem on Georgia and dedicated it to President Jimmy Carter.

I bring this poem to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

GEORGIA LAND

I've roamed the States, from Coast to Coast,
Have slept in every Town;
From Frisco Bay, to Old Broadway,
Key West to Puget Sound,
I've travelled cross the Ocean Blue,
Have trod the Desert Sand,
But, Listen Mate! there's just one State,
And we call it Georgia Land!

CHORUS

I'm going back Home to Georgia,
To that dear old Southern Clime,
Where my friends all wait to greet me,
As in days of Auld Lang Syne.
There are Peanuts, and there's Honey
And we're never out of Money,
In my Dixie Home so grand,
So take me back, I'm going back To Dear
Old Georgia Land!

Sincerely dedicated to Honorable Jimmy Carter, President-elect of the United States of America and a resident of Plains, Georgia.
January 11, 1977.

CARLOS HOPKINS.

SENATE—Wednesday, January 26, 1977

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 19, 1977)

The Senate met in executive session at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Reverend James K. Mathews, Ph.D., D.D., bishop of the Washington area of the United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we are bold to call Thee Father, for Thou hast called all people to be Thy children. We acknowledge that we are bound together in one human family of which this fair land is a part. Grant us, though unworthy, to be servants as well as sons, ever faithfully committed to the common good.

For our heritage as a people, we thank Thee. For the hope which Thou hast generated among us, we praise Thee. For the challenge and responsibility of our own day, we offer Thee our gratitude.

Help us to cast our cares upon Thee. Grant that in matters public and private we may discover the way that is pleasing to Thee and then walk in that way. Teach us that devotion and humility

which will assure that the just powers of government may not only derive from the consent of the governed, but may also reflect Thy perfect will for society and so conform to the demands of Thy kingdom.

Give peace in our time, O Lord, and "let justice well up like fresh water and righteousness roll in full tide."

All this we ask in the name of the one whose name is above every name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., January 26, 1977.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FORD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 25, 1977, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that our guest chaplain today is the first guest chaplain in the new Congress.

It is also of interest that 20 of the 100 Senators, or one-fifth of the Senators, are members of the United Methodist Church.