

House, of buying votes. This was a dangerous act. Thang was a powerful figure, much feared in Saigon, a man who had gradually become Thieu's most important political adviser—and a man who handled important political and personal funds for Thieu. Thang was a shrewd and wily businessman who had made his fortune in the lucrative pharmaceutical trade. He dealt with anyone it was profitable to deal with, and it was rumored that this included the Communists. He was said, too, to have made private soundings at one point on behalf of Thieu for some sort of political deal with the Communists.

Even if Chau had not had a Communist brother in Saigon's hands, his attack on Thang would have been enough in itself to incense Thieu. And Chau's defiance of Thieu was soon compounded by a more important stirring in opposition ranks. In November, Generals Duong Van Minh and Tran Don called for a popular referendum and began to talk publicly, if vaguely, about a "third force," accommodation, "reconciliation," and other phrases that smacked of coalition and a toppling of Thieu.

FORTRESS

In 1969, American withdrawal was the central political fact of South Vietnam, and it was just a question of time before it would alter the basic context of Vietnamese politics. The Americans had hoped that their disengagement would instill a sense of crisis in both pro-regime and independent Vietnamese nationalists, and convince them that they had to pull together against the Communists for self-preservation.

Until the end of 1969, Thieu did leave open the option of cooperation with a broad spectrum of non-Communist nationalists—either deliberately or just because his natural style was a network of intricate maneuvers that never committed him to any one person or any one course. But as the U.S. troops pulled out, Thieu pulled in as if to a fortress to the right-wingers, the Northern Catholics, and the Army, rather than reaching out to less hard line elements.

Previously, Thieu had contained the more left-leaning figures by ignoring them and leaving them to their own divisiveness. Now, however, he began to take Minh and Don seriously. If unchecked, the two generals could easily become the focal point for vast public war-weariness and discontent with rising prices—and latent anti-Americanism.

But it would have been awkward for Thieu to attack Minh and Don directly. The easygoing Minh was popular in the South. Both men were still the residual heroes of the 1963 coup. Most important, both had a considerable potential following in the Army.

Tran Ngoc Chau, however, was an altogether different matter. He presented an inviting target just when Thieu needed one. The President could crack down on Chau to symbolize his new toughness and issue the appropriate warning to would-be third-force opposition, to anyone tempted to make a separate deal with the Communists (or the Americans) at Thieu's expense. And this could be done, it appeared, without stirring up an unmanageable backlash.

At this point, for some reason, Thieu moved beyond a rational political tactic and became personally obsessed with punishing Chau. The Saigon political world and province chiefs throughout the country took Thieu's rage as weakness rather than strength. There was a backlash after all.

To summarize the ensuing kaleidoscopic developments, Thieu asked the National Assembly to strip Chau of parliamentary immunity so that he could be prosecuted (a move allowed by the Constitution if three-fourths of Chau's peers approved). The Lower House balked. Government officials responsible to Thieu, therefore, goaded the

National Assembly by unleashing a paid mob of about seven hundred to riot in the legislative chambers. Still the Lower House dragged its feet. So Nguyen Cao Thang decided to circulate among deputies an undated petition asking for Chau's prosecution. Thang reportedly boasted to friends that he spent ten million piasters (about \$80,000) to get signatures. And money was supplemented, according to numerous deputy accounts, by blackmail and intimidation. By February, 1970, by hook or by crook, Thieu had a document authorizing trial of Chau.

In March the III Corps Mobile Military Field Court, a court created by Diem to try political dissidents, sentenced Chau to ten years of imprisonment and hard labor.

Chau's final words in court were defiant. "I have served the country twenty-three years, an officer in the field who received medals on the battlefield," Chau said vehemently. "These last few days I came to the courtroom wearing black pajamas. You can say I am Communist or you can say I am an agent of the CIA because Revolutionary Development cadres wear black pajamas. But I wear black pajamas as a symbol of a good Vietnamese citizen. When I die, I ask the favor of being buried in a military cemetery." Chau's lawyers appealed the case to the Supreme Court. In May the Supreme Court ruled that Chau's conviction was indeed unconstitutional and said further that the whole mobile military field court was unconstitutional. In October the Supreme Court decided that Chau should be freed.

In response, Thieu replaced the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and got the legislature to pass new laws that effectively renewed the same old military field court. Chau remains in prison under increasingly severe conditions. He has been allowed to see no visitors except his wife for the past four months, and such information as dwindling contacts with him provide indicates that he is allowed little exercise and has been in a state of depression since the final Supreme Court ruling.

THE AMERICAN HAND

Significantly, throughout the entire Chau affair, the American Embassy in Saigon approved Thieu's actions by praising him with very faint damns. The Embassy first gave Thieu *carte blanche* in July, 1969, when it imposed a gag rule on those American officials who had been close to Chau. (The Americans who knew him best were his most ardent supporters.) They were not to see Chau, nor were they to discuss the case with any outsider, whether Vietnamese official or American journalist. This was serious. At one point, according to a Foreign Service Officer in the Saigon Embassy, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker delivered a personal ultimatum to John Vann, an old Vietnam hand, the American head of pacification in the populous Mekong Delta, and a staunch defender of Chau: if Vann talked to one more reporter about Chau, he would be summarily fired.

Then, in its own reporting to Washington, the Embassy consistently downplayed the significance of the affair and glossed over the illegalities to which Thieu was resorting in his pursuit of Chau. Curiously, it even portrayed Chau as favoring coalition with the Communists, though Chau had never advocated any such thing. And in political and diplomatic circles in Saigon, the Embassy circulated the view that Chau was himself pro-Communist. Thieu therefore came to assume, quite correctly, that he could imprison Chau without incurring any American reprisals.

Why did the American mission in Saigon, which has long been searching for committed, independent, non-Communist leaders of Chau's caliber, back off so totally on an unambiguous political issue as it is ever likely to have in Vietnam? Why did it ratify yet one more instance of the cannibalization of lead-

ership that has plagued South Vietnam ever since its inception? The answer would seem to reside in a failure of perception, reinforced by policy considerations.

To begin with, neither Ambassador Bunker nor his major advisers on the case, the Embassy political counselor and the CIA chief in Vietnam, had much affinity for the complexities of Asian politics. Bunker is a gentleman, an American aristocrat, a successful businessman, an able negotiator and compromiser. But that is not to say that he is a politician. His instincts favor "hard" military analysis over "soft" political analysis.

The then political counselor, Martin Herz, was described by his subordinates as being in the older-style State Department mold. He was accredited to the Thieu government, credulous of what the Thieu government said, suspicious of what government opponents or independents said. The CIA chief was a brilliant technician in intelligence, in the view of some American officials who know his work, but, like his colleagues, was simply not a political animal. And Chau's past squabbles with the CIA hardly recommended him to the local head of the agency.

Thus, when these men were given questionable information about Chau, they believed it instead of challenging it. Bunker accepted the opinion that Chau really was pro-Communist. And he apparently accepted, at least in part, Thieu's hints that army generals were pressing him to be tough with Chau and might even try a coup if he did not respond.

Furthermore, given the tensions created by American withdrawal, Bunker was unwilling to squander, on minor issues, what leverage the United States had over Thieu. To him it would have been wrong to risk so much for some abstract consideration of legality, or for some chimera of broadened political participation. Stability was the important desideratum. Chau was just the unfortunate man in the middle who got in the way.

In the short run, South Vietnamese stability probably was strengthened by the imprisonment of Chau. And yet, in the long run, Thieu's handling of the Chau affair led to a serious ebbing of confidence in the President's judgment, control, and predictability. Latent discontents burst forth in the period after the Chau trial. They were contained, and Thieu's rivals were silenced, but it was an augury of developments that may be expected any time Thieu again seems to be showing weakness or misjudgment. And the opportunities for Thieu to fumble will increase when his real power base—American military forces in Vietnam, and will to back him up—dwindles.

SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the General Assembly of South Carolina has passed a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to continue price supports and other aid programs to tobacco farmers.

This resolution calls attention to the alarming fact that legislation is pending in Congress which would discontinue tobacco supports and other aid programs beginning with crops to be harvested in 1972.

Mr. President, the importance of the tobacco industry to the economy of South Carolina and to the economy of this country cannot be measured. In addition, legislation which would abolish these self-supporting programs would cause a tremendous loss of revenue to the Federal Government in taxes.

Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Hollings and myself I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO CONTINUE PRICE SUPPORTS AND OTHER AID PROGRAMS TO TOBACCO FARMERS

Whereas, pending legislation is now before Congress which would discontinue tobacco supports and other aid programs beginning with crops to be harvested in 1972; and

Whereas, this has been a self-supporting program and if this legislation is enacted it would mean a tremendous loss of revenue to the Federal Government and would severely cripple this one hundred million dollar industry; and

Whereas, tobacco has for many years been one of South Carolina's main sources of revenue and the discontinuance of these programs would bring irreparable damage to the tobacco farmers of this State, particularly the smaller growers.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take such action as it deems necessary in order to continue the price supports and other aid programs to tobacco farmers.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator and each member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina and to the Clerk of the United States Senate and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

IMPROVED POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Postmaster General announced the introduction of a new postal service designed to guarantee overnight delivery for airmail letters mailed to a destination within 600 miles from the place of mailing. I was glad to see this new policy develop; it caught the attention of the television newscasters; perhaps the most apt comment was by Harry Reasoner, who said that such timely delivery restores postal service to the level that was common in 1935.

The irony of his remark is that while many Americans look back fondly on the good old days of efficient and prompt mail delivery for 2 cents a letter, you do not have to go back very far to find overnight delivery of first-class mail and airmail to be commonplace. The bold new program proposed by the Postmaster General is considerably less than the mail service which the public received and relied upon in 1967 and 1968. When the present postal administration came into office in 1969 and announced that the archaic post office needed to be converted into a Government corporation, it also proceeded to dismantle piece by piece the best mail delivery service the country had ever known—overnight delivery of first-class mail. So I think that in honoring the "fairness doctrine" it is incumbent upon me as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make known what the situation was compared to what it is proposed to be.

In 1967, upon the specific instruction of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Postmaster General

Larry O'Brien introduced a new air taxi and airlift program on a nationwide basis to insure overnight delivery, or at least 2-day delivery, of all first-class mail. With remarkable efficiency and effectiveness, the rank-and-file officers and employees in the Bureau of Transportation and International Services established an intricate network of transportation patterns to move first-class mail from the post office where it was mailed to airports where it was dispatched either on a "space available" basis on the next scheduled air carrier going out or by a special "air taxi" air carrier on contract basis.

The program was an outstanding success. Regular first-class mail dropped into the mail chute at 5 o'clock in the afternoon here in Washington could be delivered the next morning to offices and residences clear across the country. The cost to the mail user for that service was 6 cents. In the past 2 years, the Post Office Department, in its continual quest for reductions in operating cost, has intentionally destroyed most of that prompt and efficient delivery. Airlift and air taxi operations for mail destined to a destination not greater than 750 miles away has been discontinued. Thus, within-State delivery overnight has come to an almost complete stop. First-class mail matter entered at Dallas, Tex., for instance, destined to El Paso, Tex., a distance of 630 miles, no longer is entitled to receive airlift transportation. Instead, it is carried by a start route highway contractor and there is no possibility that a 5 o'clock letter can be delivered the next day.

The ABCD same-day delivery program instituted by Postmaster General J. Edward Day in 1963, which virtually guaranteed delivery within the city of any business letter mailed before 11 o'clock in the morning, was discontinued, as was the afternoon delivery on business routes. Special delivery services were changed by increasing the postage stamp cost by 50 percent and reducing the service to a regular route carried not more than four times a day.

The new "managed mail program" discontinued the distribution of first-class mail between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. and reduced the number of employees working mail on the weekends. Prior to this new efficiency, first-class mail was given immediate and continual handling 24 hours a day in order to insure next day delivery wherever possible. Pickup schedules for street mailboxes have been reduced in many cases to one pickup a day and that by a letter carrier on his regular route rather than a special messenger.

The sum of it all is that what the American people got from the archaic Post Office Department in 1967 and 1968 for 6 cents will now be offered by the new businesslike, efficient U.S. Postal Service for 11 cents. I have never enjoyed being critical of the management of Federal agencies unless evidence convinced me that the policies and practices of the agency should and could be revised to benefit the public. It is easy to complain about poor mail service, but it is extremely hard to do anything about it. Unfortunately, what the present

postal administration is doing about mail service seems to be a conscious, deliberate effort to reduce the costs of running the Post Office to the point that the Postmaster General can say he is breaking even regardless of the kind of postal service provided. Unfortunately, the real price paid for the pursuit of that illusive goal is poor postal service, poor public relations, poor congressional relations, and the growing conviction in the average American's mind that the Post Office simply does not do the job.

The committee warned the Post Office Department against this policy last year when, in our report accompanying the Postal Reorganization Act, we specifically disapproved the discontinuance of air taxi and airlift programs—proven winners for good postal service. Our recommendations for continuing that policy were disregarded. In fairness to the committee and the public, the Postmaster General might consider amending the language of his recent press announcement to say that after 2 years of constantly declining postal service, the U.S. Postal Service has decided to reinstitute the practices of the archaic Post Office Department regarding mail transportation, except that now you will pay twice as much for the same service.

OPPORTUNITIES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CAREERS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the period of April 18 through 24, has been proclaimed by President Nixon to be Earth Week, 1971. In urging the 50 Governors' cooperation, the President wrote:

The difficult decisions before us must be wise ones, and I hope that Earth Week will see educational institutions of all levels considering ways in which the learning process can best foster understanding of environmental needs and opportunities.

This week also has seen the publication of a new vocational guidance manual, "Opportunities in Environmental Careers," written by Odom Fanning, a well-known science writer, who has served as public affairs officer of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development and as a consultant to the Council on Environmental Quality. He was editor-in-chief of the First Annual Report on Environmental Quality, submitted to the Congress by the President last August, and he is author of an earlier vocational guidance manual, "Opportunities in Oceanographic Careers."

Mr. Fanning's new book is aimed at young people. It identifies 655,990 environmental management jobs today and predicts an increase to 1,181,890 by 1980, close to a doubling in a decade.

I have no doubt that Mr. Fanning's prediction of environmental manpower needs from now until 1980 is close to the mark. And yet I foresee many problems in achieving our national goals in the environment. To achieve the desired progress in ecology, we must strengthen our economy. To make progress, we must strengthen our technology.

Americans can take pride in this Nation's role of leadership in trying to preserve our world environment. In this connection, I was disappointed to learn

Gallatin steam plant may be lengthening the growing season for catfish fingerlings. Furthermore, 1 billion gallons per day of hot water from the AEC plant at Aiken, S.C., seems to stimulate growth of fish, turtles and alligators in Par Pond.

Studies have shown that about 20,000 miles of desert coastline around the world could be converted into likely locations for integrated power-water-food complexes. Large quantities of a number of different vegetables such as beans, beets, broccoli, cabbage, cantaloupes and watermelons have matured much more rapidly and at higher yields while growing in sand within enclosures that are heated and humidified to the 100% level.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am introducing today a resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to investigate the potential of waste heat reutilization, both technologically and economically, so that Congress may have a report on this important subject and be able to act accordingly within the next several years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

S.J. RES. 71

Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study of the possible reuse of waste heat for productive purposes

Whereas the Congress is vitally concerned with environmental quality and the preservation of scarce mineral resources;

Whereas the Congress recognizes that much wasted heat energy is released to the environment in the various processes of converting fossil fuels into electrical and mechanical energy and converting nuclear fuels into electrical energy;

Whereas the Congress recognizes that while there are many potential uses for waste heat, including the desalination of salt water, the heating of buildings, additional conversion to mechanical and electrical energy, facilitating the destruction of biodegradable wastes, and many others, there has been little research into either the technology or the economics of this concept;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency are authorized to carry out a study and investigation of the possible uses of waste heat and of the economic feasibility of so utilizing waste heat.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such study and investigation authorized by the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency are authorized to enter into contracts or other arrangements with public or private agencies or institutions, or individuals.

SEC. 3. On or before the expiration of two years following the date of approval of this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall transmit to the President and the Congress a written report of their activities pursuant to this joint resolution, including their findings and recommendations resulting from the study and investigation authorized herein.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed \$500,000, as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 28

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of waters of certain streams.

S. 219

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 219, a bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to terminate all price support programs for tobacco beginning with the 1972 crop of tobacco.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, the American Forestry Act.

S. 575

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in behalf of my senior colleague (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) be added as cosponsors of S. 575, authorizing funds for the extension of the Appalachian regional development program.

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

S. 592

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) were added as cosponsors of S. 592, to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950).

S. 687

At the request of Mr. BOGGS, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 687, the Opportunities Industrialization Assistance Act.

S. 698 AND S. 699

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 698, a bill to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States; and to S. 699, a bill to require a radiotelephone on certain vessels while navigating upon specified waters of the United States.

S. 835

At the request of Mr. HARRIS, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 835, the Alaskan Native claims bill.

S. 1026

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) was added as a cosponsor to S. 1026, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended.

S. 1071

At the request of Mr. BOGGS, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1071, a bill to clarify the status of funds of the Treasury deposited with the States under the act of June 23, 1836.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. RIBICOFF, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1111, to allow a tax credit for certain expenses of higher education.

S. 1113

At the request of Mr. BAKER, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to establish a structure that will provide integrated knowledge and understanding of the ecological, social, and technological problems associated with air pollution, water pollution, and other related problems.

S. 1116

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) be added as cosponsors of S. 1116, a bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free roaming horses and burros on public lands.

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

S. 1191

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added to the list of cosponsors of the bill introduced earlier today by Senator MCGOVERN.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

At the request of Mr. BAKER, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 66, providing for the designation and adoption of the American marigold as the national floral emblem of the United States.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. BYRD of Virginia, the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 68, a joint resolution restoring full rights of citizenship to Gen. R. E. Lee.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Con-

of a tax payment, and includes an activity of the taxpayer or of a person (including an agency of a State or local government) receiving payments from or making payments to the taxpayer.

(b) **COMPUTATION OF TAX LIABILITY UNDER DISCRIMINATORY LAWS.**—When any State law is in conflict with subsection (a), tax liability may be discharged in the manner which would be provided under State law if the occurrence in question were within the taxing State.

SEC. 322. PROHIBITION AGAINST OUT-OF-STATE AUDIT CHARGES.

No charge may be imposed by a State or political subdivision thereof to cover any part of the cost of conducting outside that State an audit for a tax to which this Act applies.

SEC. 323. PERMISSIBLE TAXES.

The fact that a tax to which this Act applies is imposed by a State or political subdivision thereof in the form of an excise, privilege, or license tax shall not prevent the imposition of the tax on a person engaged exclusively in interstate commerce within the State; but such a tax may be enforced against a person engaged exclusively in interstate commerce within the State solely as a revenue measure and not by ouster from the State or by criminal or other penalty for engaging in commerce within the State without permission from the State.

SEC. 324. RECIPROCAL COLLECTION AGREEMENTS.

When authorized by State law, reciprocal agreements may be made between two contiguous States for the purpose of requiring a seller with a business location in one of the States to collect applicable state use tax (including any tax treated as a State tax under Subsection (b) of Section 205 of this Act) for, and to remit that tax to, the other State into which the seller makes sales of tangible personal property, even though he is otherwise not subject to the jurisdiction of such other States under Section 101 of this Act.

SEC. 325. LIABILITY WITH RESPECT TO UNASSESSED TAXES.

No State or political subdivision thereof shall have the power, after the date of the enactment of this Act, to assess against any person for any period ending on or before such date a sales or use tax with respect to tangible personal property, if during such period that person was not registered in the State for the purpose of collecting tax, had no business location in the State, did not regularly solicit orders for the sale of tangible personal property by salesmen, solicitors, or other representatives in the State or did not regularly engage in the delivery of property in the State other than by common carrier or United States mail.

SEC. 326. EFFECTIVE DATES.

Sections 101, 321, 322, and 325 of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 205 shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing five years after the enactment of this Act. The remaining provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar quarter commencing after the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to provide for a 1974 Centennial Celebration Observing the Introduction into the United States of Hard Red Winter Wheat. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION IN RECOGNITION OF THE HARD RED WINTER WHEAT CENTENNIAL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to provide for a 1974 centennial celebration observing the introduction into the United States of Hard Red Winter Wheat. This joint resolution is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator BOB DOLE. This resolution has been introduced in the House by Congressman KEITH SEBELIUS, whose Big First District is the heart of the Nation's Hard Red Winter Wheat region.

Mr. President, the Russian Mennonite families who settled in the community of Hillsboro, Kans., brought from their native land a portion of seed wheat, which they first planted in 1874. This wheat was new to the Western Hemisphere. It was the original Hard Red Winter Wheat, which since has been responsible for the prominence of Kansas as "Breadbasket" for all Americans and millions of other people throughout the world.

The legislation which I introduce today would provide for a 1974 centennial celebration in Kansas to commemorate the historic introduction of Hard Red Winter Wheat in this hemisphere. This proposal has been drafted, also, to recognize in an appropriate manner the dedication with which Kansas wheat farmers have served the Nation and the hungry everywhere.

I believe it entirely appropriate for Congress to request a Presidential proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this centennial, with appropriate ceremonies and activities to be focused in the State of Kansas where such wheat was first grown.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of these remarks the text of this joint resolution, and urge that its provisions be considered by Congress at the earliest practicable time.

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

S.J. Res. 69

Joint resolution to provide for a 1974 centennial celebration observing the introduction into the United States of Hard Red Winter wheat

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the national and international significance of the introduction of Hard Red Winter wheat into the United States in 1874 and the advantages it has brought to our way of life by increasing the supply of grain essential to the Nation's diet, permitting the cultivation of the High Plains area, giving impetus to the development of the farm implement industry, and providing a nutritious staple for our food-for-peace program and for combating malnutrition and hunger throughout the world, the year 1974 be designated as a Centennial for Celebrating the Introduction into the United States of Hard Red Winter Wheat, and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such centennial, with appropriate ceremonies and activities to be focused in the State of Kansas where such wheat was first grown in the United States.

By Mr. TOWER:

S.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study of the possible reuse of waste heat for productive purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the proper care of our environment is a subject that is of extreme importance to us today, and for as long as the human race continues to survive. We have long since passed the population levels where humans could afford to act on the environment and leave it to handle its own repair and renewal. We have to plan ahead to counter the deleterious effects we have on the environment.

One area where we are behind in planning is in the field of making the maximum use of our fuel and energy resources, so that not only are they conserved for future use, but there will be greater benefits to be derived for our effort expenditure. An aspect of proper fuel utilization is the case of finding more ways to utilize waste heat from our many sources of energy conversion: Fossil-fuel-powered electrical generators, nuclear-powered electrical generators, automobile engines, building heating and cooling plants, incinerators, and so forth. A recent article from the publication Chemical Engineering on this subject describes several potential uses of waste heat, which will be of interest to anyone interested in the care of our environment and the minimization of pollutive substances at large in our world. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

WASTE HEAT MAY BECOME AN ASSET BY THE END OF THIS DECADE

New power generating capacity to be planned within the next year or two will include concepts for actually using heat that is now being discharged directly into waterways or into the air by means of cooling towers.

The first method to be incorporated in designs will couple a giant water desalting plant to a nuclear power generating station. At a capacity level of 50-million to 100-million gallons per day, actual cost of the fresh water will probably be down to about 35¢ to 40¢ per 1,000 gallons in contrast to 85¢ to \$1 desalted water today.

Considerable attention will be paid to developing satellite industrial and residential areas around future nuclear generating plants. Waste heat could then be delivered to the industries at reasonably low cost and to nearby homes for hot water and space heating. On the Hudson River near Indian Point, N.Y., eleven power plants planned or operating could heat 800,000 housing units while supplying 5,500 megawatts of electricity.

Cooling water from a nuclear power plant may be particularly suited to aquaculture. Near the Hinkley Point power station, Bridgewater, England, for example, shrimp are maturing three times faster than normal in water that is 7 degrees warmer than in the nearby Bristol Channel. And TVA is gathering evidence that heated water from its

Title IV recognizes the existence of a number of interstate tax problems which would not be resolved by the other titles. It provides for continued congressional scrutiny in these problem areas, and calls upon congressional committees to make specific recommendations if the States do not resolve these problems on their own initiative.

Finally, title V of the bill contains definitional and miscellaneous provisions, one of which is especially significant in the matter of liabilities for past years which I discussed previously. Under section 525 of title V, there is a total forgiveness for all unassessed taxes for all back years in which the taxpayer did not have a business location in the State. This section will, in effect, defuse the time-bomb which is currently in danger of exploding at any time for interstate companies all over the United States.

Although title V embodied in my bill today is substantially the same as in H.R. 7906, and the corresponding title of my bill, S. 611, it contains an additional significant provision relating to the income taxation of affiliated corporations. Under this provision which appears in section 512(d), a State may not require a corporation with a business location within its border to combine or consolidate its income for income tax purposes with any other corporation which does not have a business location within the taxing State. This provision was originally proposed by our colleague, Senator Ribicoff, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. I have included it in my bill because it corrects an inequity in the present system that arises in States attempt to use the consolidation device as a means of taxing income that would otherwise be beyond their jurisdictional reach.

I am strongly convinced that in its entirety my bill will restore an atmosphere of free trade within the United States of the type originally envisioned by our Founding Fathers. The results will be beneficial for the economies of all of the States and for the Nation as a whole. In an immediate sense no State will stand to gain or lose a significant amount of revenue under this proposal. Yet, in the long run, since the proposal will stimulate our national economy, the results will be reflected in increased revenues to all of the States. Under the circumstances, I wholeheartedly urge all of my colleagues in this body to support this bill.

S. 318—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE A THREE-UNIT CONNECTICUT HISTORIC RIVERWAY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a three-unit Connecticut Historic Riverway.

Earlier this week, I introduced S. 36, which would immediately establish the Connecticut portion of these units, the Lower Connecticut Historic Riverway. In October 1969, the Senate Interior Committee and the full Senate approved the Connecticut unit. I hope that this Congress can take prompt action on S. 36,

for when it is enacted it will be the first step toward protecting one of America's most beautiful riverways against any future desecration.

Preserving the river in its southernmost stretches will, however, not be enough. We must ultimately provide protection in the two other units—the Coos Scenic Riverway near the river's source and the Mount Holyoke Riverway in central Massachusetts. My bill in early 1969 originally included these two units as well, and I am reintroducing this three-unit bill today to give the Senate Interior Committee the opportunity to study the entire Connecticut River. Establishment of all three units is a goal all concerned citizens and governments should work toward.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 318) to preserve and promote the resources of the Connecticut River Valley, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 322—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO TERMINATE PRICE SUPPORTS ON TOBACCO

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to terminate all price-support and assistance programs for tobacco beginning with all crops of tobacco to be harvested in 1972. The bill would also terminate direct or indirect Federal subsidies for export of tobaccos to any foreign country after December 31, 1972.

I introduced this same bill in the 91st Congress—on May 12, 1970. Then on July 8—2 months later—I offered a relatively simple amendment to end price supports to the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriations for fiscal 1971. Neither the bill nor the amendment was successful but they produced some enlightening dialog.

One soon becomes aware that the tobacco business is very big business. Perhaps that is to be expected, with a total crop in 1970 of 1,905,751,000 pounds. However, the acreage is comparatively small, with only 899,000 acres harvested in 1970—less than one three-hundredths of total crop acreage harvested in the United States last year. There are a few large companies in the storage and manufacturing aspects of the tobacco business.

The argument is offered that many growers, and most of them small growers localized in two States, would be irreparably injured if the Federal Government does not continue to supply assistance and supports of existing types at current levels. But then we hear—and sometimes from the same person—that present Government programs for tobacco are costing our public nearly nothing. In truth, it has proven to be difficult to find out what the programs do cost. This information gap appears to be partly the result of the long storage between harvesting the crop and finally processing it into the end products. But it should be pos-

sible to arrive at some interesting and significant data if only the problem were to receive adequate attention.

Mr. President, I think we should give this problem this attention. I am aware that there are many problems—that alternate crops would have to be found for the small farmer and the processor now dependent upon the production of tobacco and the manufacturing of cigarettes for their livelihood. And there are the many people who have jobs in tobacco processing plants to be considered.

But it seems quite clear to me that our Government cannot long continue in the indefensible position of aiding and abetting production and export of this product. On the one hand, month by month, we become increasingly aware of its dangers to health. Since early this month there has been an official ban on radio and television cigarette commercials. Yet, officially, we continue with price-support and other assistance programs for tobacco here and we continue our attempts to build overseas markets.

What I am proposing today is that my bill be appropriately referred and that hearings be held promptly in 1971. Our Government dilemma in this respect is becoming acute. The matter is deserving of full hearings and a vigorous search for a way out of our present untenable position.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 322) to terminate all price support programs for tobacco beginning with the 1972 crop of tobacco, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 324—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FAIRER TAXATION FOR PRIVATE AIRCRAFT USERS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970, signed into law on May 27, imposed an aircraft use tax on all piston-engine civil aircraft. This tax requires a yearly payment of \$25 for each of these aircraft, plus 2 cents per pound for the total gross weight of each aircraft weighing over 2,500 pounds.

Subsequently, Public Law 91-614, signed into law December 31, 1970, and to become effective July 1, 1971, establishes that a 2-cents use tax is required only on total pounds above 2,500.

But, Mr. President, the May 27 law, as modified, still places an inordinate financial burden on the owners of small private aircraft. Therefore, in an effort to provide a fairer tax for them, I am today introducing a bill to increase the exemption based on certificated gross weight for piston-engine civil aircraft from 2,500 to 6,000 pounds. I have chosen the 6,000-pound weight, because generally those aircraft below this figure are used for private business and pleasure purposes, while those above are used for commercial purposes. This legislation would exempt approximately 115,000 of the 125,000 general aviation aircraft. The present law exempts 80,000 to 90,000.