

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 20

SEPTEMBER 23, 1969, TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

(PAGES 26565 TO 27858)

governments, and that the increases will be passed on to their taxpayers.

Urges elimination of the provisions for including interest paid on State and local government bonds in the Limit on Tax Preferences and in the Allocation of Deductions proposals, as well as the provision for an interest subsidy.

HON. GRADY L. PATTERSON, TREASURER, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
State and local bonds

Urges that all proposals affecting the exempt status of the interest on State and local government bonds be deleted from H.R. 13270.

Contends that these proposals strike at the sovereignty of the State and will substantially increase the local tax burden due to increased interest costs.

Argues that the tax-exempt status will be destroyed by the "minimum tax" proposal, and damaged by the allocation of deductions proposal by jeopardizing investor confidence.

Maintains that the tax exemption is a direct method of revenue sharing. Feels that the interest subsidy proposal would result in administrative complexities.

Believes that investors in municipal bonds are paying a tax by accepting a lower yield. States that the secondary bond market of commercial banks will be irreparably damaged as a result of the proposed change in tax treatment of bond sales by banks.

HON. JAMES H. J. TATE, MAYOR, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AND VICE PRESIDENT U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

State and local bond interest

States the House proposals respecting tax-exempt bonds would permit the Federal Government to begin to exercise the most coercive form of dominion over State and local governmental functions by subjecting them to financial controls through the use of taxing power.

Characterizes the proposals as "fiscal irresponsibility," and states the financial liabilities they would impose upon State and local governments would overwhelmingly exceed any gross return to the Treasury in the form of income taxes. Claims the proposals would actually cause a net loss in tax revenues to the Federal Government.

Suggests that the passage of any legislation which would result in even the indirect taxing of tax-exempt bond interest would insure the continuing chaotic state of the bond market for years to come because litigation challenging the constitutionality of such legislation would be inevitable.

Indicates disapproval of the interest subsidy provisions of the House proposal because of the wide latitude given the Treasury to determine the amount of the subsidy and also because the Congress could curtail or eliminate the subsidy at any time. Believes this proposal would result in a loss of independence by the State and local governments.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—LV

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, many people alarmed about the dangers of persistent, toxic pesticides have lamented the lack of information on how to safely dispose of the pesticides which are presently sitting on their shelves.

Unfortunately, there has been very little published on this problem. The Department of Agriculture 5 years ago put out a booklet on safe disposal of dangerous pesticides, but it apparently badly needs updating. The State of Michigan has been a leader in establishing controls on the use of DDT and related

pesticides and earlier this year ordered a ban on DDT in that State. Following through on that ban, the State Department of Natural Resources has now published a bulletin entitled, "How to Dispose of DDT," which is available on request in single copies, small numbers or large quantities. As this information is of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

**HOW TO DISPOSE OF DDT
HOMEOWNERS**

To get rid of DDT (dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane) products such as aerosol bombs, liquid sprays, powders, and dusts—bury them on your own property. If each homeowner does so, these products will be safely dispersed and will reduce dangerous concentrations of DDT and other toxic materials at public disposal sites. By law, ingredients are listed on the label.

1. Select a place away from trees and other desirable shrubs or plants and at least 50 feet from any well or surface water such as a lake, stream, pond, or drain.

2. Dig a hole deep enough to cover the DDT products and containers with three feet of dirt.

3. Aerosol (pressurized) cans should not be punctured, but put in the hole intact.

4. Glass and metal containers should be opened and put in the hole tilted down to allow drainage. The glass should not be broken.

5. Bags and boxes should be buried intact.

6. The hole should not be left open. It should be filled with three feet of dirt immediately.

The only exception to the above recommendations is if the water table on your property is less than five feet below the ground. (If you do not know your underground water level, call your local health department.) If the water table on your property is less than five feet below the ground, your health department will advise you on what to do.

(NOTE.—DDT and other toxic products should not be flushed down the toilet, poured down a drain, put in the garbage or trash can, or taken to a public dump or landfill.)

**AGRICULTURAL, COMMERCIAL AND MUNICIPAL
USERS**

The disposal of DDT in larger quantities should be done in one of the following ways:

A. Bury on own property

1. Select a site at least six feet above the highest ground water table in an area that is not likely to be used for crops or building purposes. The site should be at least 300 feet from any well or surface body of water including lakes, streams, ponds and drainage ditches.

2. Dig a hole deep enough to cover the insecticide and containers with three feet of soil.

3. Open containers of liquids before placing them in the hole so as to permit drainage of the insecticide from the containers.

4. Place bags or cartons containing wettable powders or dusts in the hole intact.

5. Fill in the hole with soil immediately.

*B. Disposal through Michigan Department of
Natural Resources*

Notify your field office, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, of products to be disposed of, particularly those in 30 and 55 gallon drum lots. The Michigan Department of Natural Resources will take them to central collection facilities. Here, storage facilities will be posted and locked and materials will be held for proper disposal.

In case of accidental poisoning or suspected poisoning—a local poison control center or physician should be contacted immediately.

**PACE OF TROOP WITHDRAWAL
FROM VIETNAM TOO SLOW**

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I welcome the administration's announcement of further troop withdrawals from Vietnam by December, but I am disappointed. Our disengagement from the war is too slow.

It is time to recognize our mistakes in Vietnam, to wind down the tensions of the war, to end needless American deaths and to end the costs and inflation brought by the war. We must turn the war back to the South Vietnamese, fairly and systematically, but completely.

According to a recent editorial in the Minneapolis Tribune the administration's total scheduled withdrawal of 60,000 men in about 6 months is an average of 10,000 men a month—an average which would keep U.S. troops in Vietnam until 1974. This is not "ending" the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Withdrawal of 35,000 More Troops" from the Minneapolis Tribune for Wednesday, September 17, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WITHDRAWAL OF 35,000 MORE TROOPS

President Nixon's decision to withdraw 35,000 more troops from Vietnam by Dec. 15 is another step toward winding down U.S. involvement in the war. But it is not enough.

The total scheduled withdrawal of 60,000 men in about six months represents an average of about 10,000 a month. At this rate, if it were to be continued, American troops would not leave Vietnam until nearly 1974—or four years from next Christmas. Four years is longer than Americans fought in World War II.

In reaching his decision, Mr. Nixon apparently sought a middle ground between the recommendations of some advisers (civilians) who wanted a bigger troop cut and of other advisers (military) who are resisting pressures to withdraw from Vietnam.

Since President Nixon first pledged 18 months ago that a new administration would end the war, 19,000 Americans have died in Vietnam, died in a war that few still say is vital to our national interest. Meanwhile, while the President tells the nation that he will not negotiate the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future free from outside influence, this country continues to prop up a repressive, unrepresentative, corruption-scarred government in Saigon. And this country continues a massive presence in Vietnam which not only is devastating vast areas of that country but which saps the will of many South Vietnamese to fight what should be their cause, not ours.

Through his announcement Tuesday, Mr. Nixon has moved in the right direction and has demonstrated, we believe, his desire to end the war. But he has again made an end of U.S. involvement dependent upon a response from North Vietnam and the Viet Cong and dependent upon the actions of the South Vietnamese generals. The President has not—or at least his announcement suggests he has not—made the decision to get out of Vietnam within a reasonable time. Ten thousand troops a month is too slow.