## EDITORIAL

## This Means You!

If you are an upstanding citizen who has never contacted a congressman or state legislator, now is the time to make their acquaintance. Either the pesticide industry—and everyone connected with it—mobilizes now, or it can find business unnecessarily restricted.

Last month we mentioned that DDT was on trial. It is. Consider the pending legislation: Illinois—House Bill 81 introduced January 22 proposes to prohibit sale or use of DDT. An earlier Illinois watershed bill specifies that it be "... unlawful to use or dispose of any persistent pesticide in such a manner or in such a location that it is likely to flow into the watershed of Lake Michigan." Persistent pesticide is defined in this Illinois bill as "any pesticide composed of or containing any of the following: aldrin, chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor or lindane."

Connecticut: Introduced January 14, 1969, a bill to prohibit the distribution, sale, delivery or use of DDT in that state. The bill proposes that the chemical may be used only as a public health measure in emergency situations and under the direction of the commissioner of health.

Maine: Bill similar to Connecticut was intro-

duced January 15, 1969 and would prohibit sale or use, but does not contain the emergency measure. Minnesota: Bill to prohibit sale of economic poisons containing DDT was introduced January 17, 1969, At least two additional states are expected to receive proposed legislation this session.

In no case to date have the penalties called for in the bills been severe. But penalties are not the issue.

Should bills be passed in any of these or other states, the door is open to amendments to include other chemicals for uses wholly unrelated to the DDT problem. Legislators, both state and federal, need all the informed thinking available on this subject. You, regardless of your position in the pesticide industry, need to contribute. You can call, wire, write, or visit the people who represent you.

As for the case of DDT, existing federal controls protect man and his food. Little evidence can be found concerning DDT injury to man. Wildlife which we all appreciate is the sole area of contention. We need more study and more solid information before legislation. Let's make sure that the case is tried on its merits rather than emotion.

