264 GROSS PROCEEDS FROM NEW SECURITIES OFFERED FOR CASH IN THE UNITED STATES 1

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967		
	In millions of dollars									
Grand total	25, 468	31,773	28, 222	30, 252	34, 030	37,836	42, 502	65, 670		
Corporate 2Norcorporate	8, 081 17, 387	9, 426 22, 347	9, 016 19, 206	10, 872 19, 380	10, 865 23, 165	13,720 24,116	15,561 26,941	21,954 43,716		
U.S. Government. Federal agency. State and municipal. Foreign governments. International. Nonprofit institutions.	1,672 7,230 395 110	12, 253 1, 448 8, 345 220 16 66	8, 590 1, 188 8, 558 554 183 133	7, 213 1, 168 10, 107 772 0 120	10, 656 1, 295 10, 544 480 153 126	9, 348 2, 731 11, 148 460 201 228	8, 231 6, 806 11, 089 513 85 217	19, 431 8, 180 14, 288 1, 281 380 155		
Municipal indtustiral development bonds	41	72	84	133	193	212	504	1,390		
		PERCENT								
Corporate as percent of grand total	31. 7 31. 0 38. 4 . 16	29. 7 38. 6 26. 3 . 23	31. 9 30. 4 30. 3 . 30	35. 9 23. 8 33. 4 . 44	31. 9 31. 3 31. 0 . 57	36. 3 24. 7 29. 5 . 56	36. 6 19. 4 26. 1 1. 19	33. 4 29. 6 21. 8 2. 12		
municipalities	. 57	. 86	. 98	1.32	1.83	1.90	4. 55	9.73		

Includes corporate and noncorporate bonds. Excludes preferred and common stock.
 Breakdown by industry is available.

Source: Statistical Bulletin; U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and tabulations by Investment Bankers Association.

PERCENT YIELDS ON NEW BONDS OFFERED FOR CASH IN THE UNITED STATES, 1960-67

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967 1
Domestic corporate bonds average	4.73	4. 66	4. 62	4. 50	4. 57	4. 64	5. 34	5. 82
	3.51 4.01	3. 46 3. 90	3. 14 3. 95	3.18 4.00	3, 20 4, 15	3. 28 4. 21	3.83 4.66	3. 96 4. 85

¹ Unweighted average of monthly averages.

Source: Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, February 1968; Business Statistics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1965 edition.

Governor Rockefeller. The data indicate that the volume of taxable bonds sold has increased at a more rapid rate than the sales of tax-exempt bonds, and that the interest on tax-exempt bonds has not increased as rapidly as the interest rate on corporate taxable bonds.

Thus, it would appear that eliminating the present tax exemption for clearly public purpose bonds—such as those for pollution abatement purposes—is not really reaching the basic factors affecting municipal bond market conditions.

Furthermore, the marketability of municipal bonds would be

jeopardized if the tax exemption were removed.

Smaller communities in particular might well be seriously affected, as well as the bonds of such agencies as the New York Pure Waters Authority, created at my recommendation in 1967 to assist municipalities finance and construct sewage systems and treatment facilities.

Federal legislation removing the option for tax-exempt bonds would threaten progress of the entire water pollution abatement

I would like to add parenthetically if I may, Mr. Chairman, that eliminating the tax-exempt feature of State and municipal bonds has been an objective of the Treasury Department for some 20 years