

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-107		7739	10	3	3
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environment</i> 512-518 • <i>Environment</i> 521 • <i>Environment</i> 524 • <i>Environment</i> 526 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1434- 1437 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1161- 1163

H-110

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
974-1450**

Tuesday, April 13, 1971 91

Total number voting 144. Necessary for passage 73.

EFH

"Yea" 96. "Nay" 48. Absent and not voting 34.

MR. SPEAKER:

Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 284, substitute for H.B. No. 7739, an Act prohibiting the sale of certain wild animals and wild animal products.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the House please return to order so we can complete Calendar business. Those Members who have executive sessions and Committees still ongoing, will you return to those, so that the floor can be cleared.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Clerk has an Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

He has House Amendment Schedule "A". For what purpose does the gentleman from the 122nd rise?

GERALD F. STEVENS:

Mr. Speaker, excuse me. I was going to move the Amendment, but perhaps the gentleman is going to do so.

Tuesday, April 13, 1971 92.

MR. SPEAKER:

EFH

The Clerk is not in possession of a copy of the Amendment. Would either the Majority or Minority Leader provide the Clerk with a copy of this Amendment, if they're in the possession of one.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, I move the Amendment.

THE CLERK:

I have a copy of an amendment offered by Mr. Stevens of the 122nd. Is that the correct Amendment, sir?

DAVID LAVINE:

Yes, it is.

THE CLERK:

In Lines 39 and 40, delete the words "terms and conditions" and insert in lieu thereof the word "regulations." In Line 40, delete the word "prescribe," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "promulgate pursuant to sections 4-41 to 4-50, inclusive, of the general statutes,".

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A".
Will you remark.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, these are technical additions to the Bill, which change the terms, and I move that we accept the amended... amendments as presented.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tuesday, April 13, 1971 93.

Question's on adoption of Schedule "A". Will you remark EFH further. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Amendment is adopted. It's ruled technical. We'll proceed with the Bill as amended.

DAVID LAVINE:

Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Bill now as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

DAVID LAVINE:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to keep the remarks brief, because I know we have substantial business still before us. However, what we are looking at in this Bill to prohibit the sale of certain wild animal and wild animal products is an important Bill. I think that we probably don't recognize the extent to which some of these animals, which are on the endangered list, have been sold in the United States. Just briefly, we've had over 17,000 snow leopards sold in the United States in 1968 and '69, and we had over 3,000 cheetahs' skin sold during that comparable period. And just to give you an indication of the seriousness of this problem, one of the great national parks in the world is the Krueger National Park in southern Africa. It covers over 73,000 miles. In that particular land, which once teemed with wild life, and particularly with cheetah, they took an animal count and found that no more than 250 cheetah were now roaming that particular environs. This represents a very, very serious problem, as it does for

Tuesday, April 13, 1971 94.

several other animals which are endangered throughout the world. EFH
Now, the animals which are being protected are listed in the Bill.
I feel that this is a important and necessary step to take to provide for species which are becoming extinct. I move that we accept this Bill as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended.

ROBERT A. ARGAZZI:

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent Bill. It's one that Mr. Hogan and I introduced. It has the support of the Audobon Society, and it's also been...the type of legislation which has been introduced in many other states previous to this. I'm not sure that by passage of this Bill we're going to necessarily insure the fact that these animals as listed will necessarily survive. Maybe in 50 years none of them will be here. But perhaps by removing the profit motive, or prohibiting people from killing these animals for a profit motive, we can at least extend their existence. Many of the animals, it has been mentioned, are already on the endangered species list and, hopefully, this type of legislation will become more uniform, and we will have some protection for these animals.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks. The question is on acceptance and passage as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Those opposed. Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

**S-78
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
957-1456**

April 21, 1971

Page 31

increasingly attractive. And what happens is that, most of these kids are away from school and are unable to get the parental consent. So at times, they do contribute blood. Now, the question arises that perhaps some legal problems, if there should be some infection or some consequence that affect the donation of blood. I think at this age, they are old enough to decide whether they can contribute.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor say, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 277. File No. 218. Favorable report of the joint committee on the Environment. Substitute House Bill 7317. An Act Concerning Travel Trailers and Campers.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move that we pass this retaining its place.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. There being no objection.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 278. File No. 219. Favorable report of the joint committee on Environment. Substitute for House Bill 7317. An Act Prohibiting the Sale of Certain Wild Animals and Wild Animal Products. As amended by H. A. A.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. First of all, there are some amendments and if you look on page 2 of your files, you'll find that the line 39, the

~~terms and conditions is deleted and inserted~~

April 22, 1971

Page 35

On line 40 delete, prescribe and in place thereof, put in will promogate pursuant to section 4-41 to 4-150 of the General Statutes. All this amendment really do is that, any regulations that they will promogate will be in line with the procedures that are set forth in these sections.

VICE CHAIR:

Senator, are you talking about the House Amendment already adopted?

SENATOR PAC:

This is a House Amendment, but, I'm exxplaining.

As for the bill, this bill would prohibit the sales or the introduction of commerce of any the endangered species. Now, the problem arises really the country of origin can prohibit and ban the killing of these animals. But, as long as you don't dry up the marketing areas, the area where it is sold, it has no effect. For instance, in India, there was som many tiger skins being exported yearly, when they p... it fell off completely. But, in the pall over night, the export ran ten times the previous figure. It is apparent that there was a great deal of smuggling. So, this bill, in effect, will put the State of Connecticut on the side of New York and other states who are prohibiting the sale of this species. It provides for a fine of not more than \$1000 for each day of violation which is rather stiff but, I think the people who traffic in these kind of goods or wares are aware or should be aware of the consequences. This is about the whole gist of the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR POWER:

Mr. President, I also, urge for passage of this bill. I believe this is very necessary to protect the lives of these endangered species. As we

legislation is presented

April 21, 1971

Page 30

the bill is of nature. If you don't believe what I say, I have a dozen telegrams that can back me up. I urge passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 150. File No. 160. Favorable report on the joint committee on Insurance and Real Estate. Substitute Senate Bill 178. An Act Concerning Exemptions From the Real Estate Conveyance Tax. As amended by Senate A.

SENATOR RIMER:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report on passage of the bill. Very briefly stated, this changes the existing law on the Real Estate Conveyance Tax, making it now based on the consideration received for the transfer of the real property as opposed to the fair market value of the property, for taxation. I think it is a good change in the legislation and I urge its support.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay".

THE CLERK:

FOOT OF THE CALENDAR:

CAL. NO. 194. File No. 210. Favorable report of the joint committee on Corrections, Welfare and Humane Institutions. Substitute Senate Bill 178. An Act Concerning the Entering of Unauthorized Items or Person into Correctional Institutions.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 2
339-691**

1971

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

way of finding out about these sales would be through the complaints from people, or knowledge that comes from the public. There could also be policing of this. I haven't specifically stated how it shall be policed. But the mechanism for making sure the public is aware of the bill is included in the bill.

Rep. Matthews: For example, the furriers and the clothing people have any sort of bulletin that is made available to them from the state, or organization that would be able to pick up this knowledge, this list that the Secretary of State would have, and get it to them, rather than each one having to contact the Secretary of State perhaps.

Jerry Gorman: I believe they do; yes, and there are magazines, or inter-organs for the fur industry, and they sort of favor the idea. Many have volunteered that they would not sell the pelts of certain endangered species already, and you see these notices in the paper periodically. I think there is internal communication between those organizations.

Rep. Matthews: What effect would this have on certain business people whose interest in business is a furrier? Is this going to put them out of work? I mean, it may be that they can get into something else, but it is a possibility.

Jerry Gorman: I don't think so. To my knowledge a furrier, which would be a very effected industry. No furrier makes exclusively from endangered species that I know of, or even a large portion of it. There are a great many for instance mink is a large one, and that of course they are grown specifically, and domesticated for that purpose. So I would say that it would not seriously effect any industry; I don't think.

Sen. Pac: You really talking about alligators, leopords?

Jerry Gorman: Well; there is one other possibility. There are certain endangered species of whales, and whale meat is often used as cat-food, but there are a lot non-endangered species of whales and there are other sources of cat food. So I don't see how it would work a hardship on anyone. There aren't that many endangered species that are the sole source for any one thing that I know of.

Burtram Cadbury: I'm from Farmington, and I represent the Ecology Classes at Miss Porter's School in Farmington which has become interested in a number of environmental problems. I'm speaking in favor of H.B.7739. I think that by being rather specific, and indicating which species are in danger, and therefore the ones that really need to be protected; it is perhaps a preferable bill than the other one. I think also experience has shown that a similar bill which was recently passed in New York State has cut down considerably on the value of poaching. Two or three times in the last few years I have been in parts of Florida where poaching of alligators has been a very successful business. I think that most people involved with conservation organizations such

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

as the Audubon Society, feel that the best way to protect these and other similar endangered species, is by cutting off the possibility of the sale of these materials through commercial channels. Therefore, I think this bill should be favored. Also I think it should be favored because of the fact that there are rather specific fines outlined, and rather specific methods by means of which it can be enforced.

Morris Hogan, 177th District: Mr. Chairman; I introduced one of these bills for one of my constituents, and he had the misfortune of having his father die the night before last, and it was impossible for him to be here. But, a representative came here for him, Mr. E.R. Riccuiti, the curator of the Department of Publications, Public Relations for the New York Zoological Society. I'd like to have you hear from Mr. Riccuiti at this time.

E.R. Riccuiti: Thank you. I've got some hastily assembled material for you. I'm here representing the New York Zoological Society, and the American Alligator Council of which I'm a member, also the Board of Directors in Bridgeport Metropolitan Zoological Society, and under another hat I'm here as a citizen of Connecticut (resident of Fairfield). What I would like to do if possible is to distribute a few statements by various scientific people who have studied the old question of endangered species. I have written a letter, and sent some material to this company, and I assume you've received it so I'll try to take as little time as possible. I'd also like to read some excerpts from statements that have been given before other state legislative groups. This is the statement on animal hides, by Joseph A. Davis, who is Chairman of the Conservation of Land Mammals Commission American Society of Mammalogists. I have several copies which I can distribute. If you don't think it's necessary to read it I won't at this point. Mr. Davis states that, clothing and other articles made from the skins and furs of wild animals are luxuries for which no need exists. I think this is an important point in considering any bill regarding endangered species. Society can exist very well without the hides of endangered animals. It should be recognized that there is no essential product made from the hides and skins of any endangered species alive today. Actually, all of these wild animals in this case, Mr. Davis's statement, wild mammals, have been reduced in numbers by activities related to hunting for hide, and or sport. Now I'm not here to discuss the case of species which are not endangered, we're merely talking of the species that are endangered. It might be noted that all of the larger spotted cats are threatened with extinction, and many of them are very very close to the brink. The tiger has been reduced in all it's different races, and sub-species has been reduced to less than 3,000 animals according to the latest estimates of biologists who have studied them. The snow leopard numbers only in the hundreds. I have some figures in the importation of skins into this country which I will give later. I would like to read a few pertinent paragraphs from a statement recently made before a committee up in Massachusetts legislature by William G. Conway, who is the General Director of the New York Zoological Society. This statement has to do with the impact of the trade in wild animals skins upon wild-life populations. He states, an

FRIDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

examination of the pressure the U.S. wild animal products business exerts on the survival of other nation's wild-life is long overdue. Among these pressures, those by the fur and hide industries are the least excusable. As the nation's fashion center, New York recently exacted protective legislation has already had a beneficial effect on the survival of some wild animals. Now I can say this from personal experience, and field work done in the Southeastern U.S., that in the last 2 years since the passage of New York cities law banning the sale of american alligator products, and more recently of the Mason law that the alligator population in the Southeast which were at a bare minimum have now started to show signs of an increase for the first time in many many years. I think you can see almost a direct correlation between the elimination of the main market in New York, and a resurgence, very slight at this point, but the signs of a resurgence of our Southeastern populations of the American alligator. Mr. Conway notes, that there is pressure from countries whose animals populations include endangered species, there is pressure for American legislation to curb the market in these skins. The Director of the National Parks of Kenya has pleaded for the passage of American legislation to curb the market for leopard, cheetah, and crocodile skins and hides, and so has the Indian Consulate General in New York. A spokesman for the fur trade has stated in New York that hides of the big cats are such an insignificant part of the fur market that there is no profit in trading these species. As a consequence, he claimed that the New York fur trade did not include most of these cats. I think we might examine some figures on the importation of skins of these cats in the last few years. During 1968 and 1969, 17490 skins of leopards, snow leopards, and clouded leopards were imported into the U.S. 3168 cheetah skins, 23,347 jaguars skins were imported, and so were 200,062 ocelot and margay skins. These are a vast amount of animals that are coming out of only a very few countries. In the case of the jaguar and the ocelot and margay, these are new world and central south american countries. In 1970, and we feel this reflects nation-wide concern over the fate of wild animals, there has been a decrease. No cheetah skins were imported, 996 leopard skins were imported, 7758 jaguar skins were imported, and 8615 ocelot skins were imported. It's important to note that some fur bearing animals are being managed, and people who are doing so view these animals as a renewable wild-life resource. But not one population of the big cats is being managed on a substained yield basis anywhere in the world, and no fur company has ever legan either a capture-breeding process or even a sustained-yield management study on any of these big spotted cats. From the figures on importations it might seem that distant wilds have abundant wild-life. This was once true, but it is no longer the case. The cheetah is no where common, it is all but extinct in India, and even in preserves it's population is low. In the 73,040 square miles of Kruger National Park in South Africa, there are only about 250 cheetahs. The Senegal Plain, 5000 square miles of Tanzania, it was once famour for it's cheetahs, the population there is 150 animals. In otherwords, there are only 400 cheetahs in a protected area as large as Massachusetts and Connecticut combined. That is something to think about when more than 3000 cheetah skins were imported into the U.S. during 1968 and 1969. I mentioned the tiger; all the sub-

FRIDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

species of the tiger add up to only 3000 animals. This means that in the case of the Bali Tiger, the Bali tiger is probably extinct; nobody has seen one for many many years. The Sumatran tiger is down to a few individuals. The Siberian tiger exists in numbers of less than 200, there's no distinction there. When a tiger-skin comes into the country there's no distinction made as to race or sub-species. We might talk for a moment about the cougar, or mountain lion. This is a very wide-spread cat; it runs from North to South America. Some areas mountain lions are still common, but in many others, various sub-species are down next to nothing. The Florida panther which is a sub-species of the cougar may number only 25 or so individuals. I have another statement that I've only to quote excerpts from, and this is by the gentleman who planned to be here today; Dr. F. Wayne King, who is Curator of the New York Zoological Society, and has studied crocodilians and many of the other larger reptiles in many parts of the world. He is quite active in many of our conservation programs. Dr. King points out that during the last 170 years it has been calculated that 2½ million alligators, pardon me, during the last century 2½ million alligators were slaughtered in Florida. The drop in the number of hides handled has reflected not so much a decrease in hunting, but a decrease in the number of alligators. In 1904, U.S. tanneries were handling approximately 100,000 alligator hides annually. 25% of this comes from Florida, 20% from Louisiana. The number of skins taken Florida each year from 1929 until 1943 declined until 1943. Less than 7000 hides were taken, and that is a major drop in the number of hides, and it is not at all to lack of hunting. The American alligator is protected in many of the states in which it exists. By 1968 and 1970 the two remaining with alligator populations, Georgia and Texas also prohibited alligator hunting. However, until legislation was passed in New York, where a major alligator-hide market exists, poaching continued to take a journey upon the alligators. Now the gator is, as I have said, beginning to show signs of increase, yet crocodilians, crocodiles, and gavials in other parts of the world are very much still in trouble. The Nile crocodile in Africa, that's the crocodile you see in the Tarzan movies, that has been exterminated over large parts of it's former range. So many of these have disappeared, that hunting the species is prohibited by law in many East African countries, poaching however, continues. South Africa is even hatching and raising young Nile crocodiles so that they can be released in areas where they once were common. You might say, why should we worry about protecting crocodilians and alligators. The case of the alligator plays an important role in the maintenance of wetlands in the Southeastern U.S. The everglades, for instance, the wetlands are swept by periodic draughts, the alligators dig what they call gator holes which actually are large wallows, and during the draught when the rest of the glades go dry, these wallows contain reservoirs of water. In these reservoirs fish and vertebraes of many kind find a haven, the only haven that they can during draught. When the rains come again, then the grades fill with water, and the animals that have survived in these gator-holes reproduce and repopulate the glades. I

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

can't give you an exact statistic on this, but I have seen studies that indicated the alligators disappear tomorrow from Southern Florida. Engineers would have to blast gator wallows, artificial gator wallows in the glades to preserve wild-life there during the drought. Also, it is interesting to note that many of the croccodilians, the American alligator, Nile croccodile, salt-water croccodile, and many others generally improve human fisheries because they eat the rough fish, and alligators will take what ever they can get, and the easiest way possible, and it usually will go for the garfish which really aren't important in our fisheries; they cause problems in the sport fisheries. I'd like to next read a few excerpts from the number of articles published by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. This organization studied animals that are endangered throughout the world and publishes the famous Red Book which is a catalogue and a status report on threatened species. This is their bulletin, and it reports that Great Britain, Board of Trade and Industry has benned vicuna wool imports from South America. Vicuna is a threatened species. The International Union itself has become convinced that the status of the tigers throughout India has become increasingly precarious, and has asked that all tiger hunting be banned. Subsequently all the Indian states, and union territories with the exception of one imposed a temporary moratorium on tiger killing for five years. Now, this again does not eliminate poaching as long as there is a market for these hides. The IUCN has stated in this bulletin, "to the best of our knowledge, and I can give you this, no tiger population exists anywhere in India at the moment which is capable of maintaining itself adequately. To maintain a genetic pool of sufficient variety in a population of animals like the tiger, it is essential a continuous population totaling at least 300 head exists. All known populations of tiger in India are as far as available information goes of a much smaller number than this, and the area separating the small remaining populations are of such a nature as to be absolutely prohibited to regular genetic exchange between them. Hence, the estimated number of 2 to 4000 tigers is still existing in all India, and this brackets the 3000 that most biologists agree upon, is misleading, since no single population is large enough to maintain the healthy stock. Furthermore, legalized hunting is to a large extent trophy hunting, and trophy hunting is a deteriorating effect on the quality of the opopulation. We'll go from tigers now back to the croccodilians. There is one more figure I would like to give you; what is called in Brazil a Jacare, is what we know as the black kannan (*melanosuchus riger*). It is often sold as alligator by the trade, but it is a kannan, which is to the layman relatively alike, but it is a different animal. Now, in 1950, 4,926,908 jacare black kannan skins were exported from Brazil, a figure in 6 years bound to slightly more than 1 million. By 1962 less than 2000 hiades were exported. I think that this continued to drop until today. I've had reports from people that have come back, that have traveled all over rivers, where of course, this is where they formally have seen large numbers of these reptiles, and now see none. Again, this drop in the number of hides where in no way reflects a drop in the intensity of hunting, but in disappearance of the animal. I think it's rather ironic that hunters put themselves out of business far more effectively than what the zoologists are asking for. Yesterday at the New York Zoological Society, a meeting of 3 days was completed, a meeting of croccodilian experts from around the world who composed a survival service commission of the IUCN croccodile specialists group. I didn't

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

get a chance to see the New York Times this morning, but I would imagine that it would be quoted in the Times as stating, as it did at a press conference, that croccodilians of all types throughout the world are declining rapidly, severely in fact. Many, if not most are threatened with the extinction and of these, only the American alligator is beginning to show some signs of making a comeback, and, this of course, is correlated with the passage of legislation. I, in my capacity as a curator with the Zoological Society, cannot advocate passage of any legislation; I can merely provide this information which feels pertinent to any consideration of bills regarding endangered species. I wish if I could, as a private citizen and resident of Connecticut to urge passage of this bill introduced by Rep. Hogan. I feel as one who writes and edits articles on wild-life, and who done some field work, I have seen the tremendous depletion of many wilf-life populations that whose skins and hides are used by the trade, and I think unless something is done to control this, our children will ask, "what's a tiger Daddy?" I would like my children to grow up and to know that somewhere in the world there's a tiger. Thank you.

Rep. Pugliese, 33rd District: I think obviously this Committee would be interested in preserving any species that are endangered, but there are two things that leave a question in my mind on this bill. First of all, it deals exclusively with animals. I suppose there are probably good reasons why you feel that this should be handled separately, but the second thing which I think is more important from a standpoint of Connecticut legislation, is that it appears to one, that every species mentioned is a non-Connecticut species, and not even an American species. I'm just wondering if legislation passed by the State of Connecticut would have only a limited effect on these endangered species, and should it be more properly be handled on a national level?

E. R. Riccuiti: What is happening now is that many of the states from California to Massachusetts are considering legislation of this type. At this time Pennsylvania and Mass, and Mississippi, and I believe Colorado, already passed this legislation, and the theory behind this type of legislation is that by eliminating markets you elimante the pressures upon the wild-animal populations. With the power of American consumer today, the buying power, you can effectively cause the dissimination populations several thousand miles away. Take the case I always like to refer to, in the Orient many people feel that rhino-horn is an aphrodisiac if it's ground up, and this had contributed to a large extent to the depletion of rhinos.

Rep. Ciampi: Excuse me, I have a question on that. Can we have a carload of rhino-horns?

E.R. Riccuiti: They do bring fantastic prices. I've often thought of sawing one off at the zoo.

Rep. Rep. Pugliese: Do you feel that Connecticut is a mojor market for these particular species, or a potential market?

E.R. Riccuiti: Yes, potential or major. I would like to state that there

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

are many birds that are threatened now, and largely by habitat destruction. Almost, or more than a half century ago the plume trade was exterminating the egrets. Of the other rades and legislation passed in New York stopped poaching, hunting of these birds, and now you can go down there and see numbers of them.

Rep. Tiffany: Isn't the cougar a determine called predator or something?

E.R. Ricculti: In some states it is. Just as Connecticut has a bounty on the bob-cat. It has been changed. Has it been changed? Oh; very good, thank you. Many states are doing away with this classification of the cougar as a predator. I think it's been proved scientifically, and I can't at this moment give you the references, but it has been proven that the cougar has an effective control on deer herds, and on smaller wild mammals. It does not raid chicken coops or herds of deer or sheep.

William C. Glynn: I'm appearing on behalf of the Connecticut Water Works Association in opposition to H.B.7097. Earlier this week your Committee heard testimony on H.B.7394, and at that time we submitted on behalf of the Association a memorandum. I believe that, if it's in order, I would just like to leave a copy of that memorandum in connection with this Mr. Chairman. I would also just point out that, although it's indicated in the memorandum, we are fortunate in Connecticut in having a very high quality of drinking water, and naturally we're interested in maintaining that quality. As our population grows, it's true there are other means we have to use to satisfy the consumer needs through water, and the legislature in it's wisdom two sessions ago saw fit to permit the use of river water, and this of course is probably going to be in the future in meeting our needs. We do feel very strongly that it is essential that we try and maintain the highest quality of water while we can without the necessity of unduly treating it, which is needed as more and more contaminates go into the water. I would like to just point out to the Commieett, and this I would not like to represent that this article I'm about to hand to you has a direct bearing on this bill; but it does point out, and I refer to an article which appeared in yesterday's Hartford Times entitled "Dirty Water Disaster Feared Big City Fate". This is under the date-line by Washington, and it points out that there is concern in some areas of the country about what could happen if there was a major pollution disaster to a public water supply of a major city. It's clear in reading this article they are referring more to cities which draw water from lakes such as Chicago, or that of the waterways that they are concerned about the possibilities of pollution from spills and other matters. I thought that it had some bearing on this bill, and I would like permission to leave it with you.

Sen. Pac: Yes; you certainly have. Any questions from the Committee?

Rep. Matthews: Why is it Mr. Glynn that you feel that people on the premises would pollute, basically is what your saying, the water?

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

ment here: The Humane Society of the United States in Connecticut requests that you support House Bill 7739. All of the animals enumerated in the bill are in danger of extinction because of the depredations of man. A particularly devastating assault on their survival stems directly from the demand for skins for coats, capes, shoes, purses and the like. Such demand incites greedy people to hunt for high profit. Protective laws in the lands of the animals habitat are of little avail. Poachers can and do operate on the assumption that the returns are worth the risk. It follows that the only way to save the animals is by removing the profit incentive. Bill 7739 will accomplish this by banning the sale of endangered species and the products of such species. Passage of the bill here coinciding, as it does, with enactment of similar legislation in other states will halt both demand and slaughter of these threatened animals. I have two statements relative to recent conversations I've had with, one was with Jim Thorn, who frequents Kenya, Africa, he's written several books about it. He has just come back, and he said this poaching thing is absolutely beyond belief. You go outside Nairobi for instance, every half mile, there's a dead animal; if the pelt or the head isn't good they just abandon it. It's the kind of poaching that's even worse than the poaching in the U.S. It's practically full time that they are trying to save animals. He thinks the only way they can be saved is at this end of the line. Somebody previously mentioned the Sumatran tiger. When I was in Indonesia in 1963, people were still hunting the Sumatran tigers. Roger Karass, the wild-life television producer come back and told me the Sumatran tiger is gone. This thing has ruined the genetic progression. I might add as far as the commercial people are concerned in Connecticut, when G. Fox President found out that the Polar Bear was endangered, he took it off the market right away. I don't think that most people need this kind of fur, they've indicated it by there are plenty of other kinds of furs that can be used. Some of the synthetics that are coming out now are pretty good. The other bill that I wish to speak to is H.B.7629, AN ACT CONCERNING CRUELTY TO ANIMALS. I don't know, I guess it's just by coincidence it's been 300 years practically to this minute since Connecticut had an anti-cruelty law on the books. Surprisingly enough, this 300 year old bill reads almost like the modern one, except it isn't robust, and they substitute the word brood-creatures for animals. I think the only way I can approach this is to read this statement; it isn't too long. The Humane Society of the United States in Connecticut requests that you support H.B.7629 as legislation which will strengthen the laws relative to cruelty to animals. Basically, the bill is the same as the present anti-cruelty law with four qualifying words removed. As the law presently exists these words offer legal loopholes for the perpetrators of cruelty. These legal loopholes in what is essentially a good law can in court negate the efforts of law enforcement officials. And whenever a manifestly guilty malefactor escapes penalty by a clever duel in semantics, the whole structure of law enforcement is weakened. We have seen this happen in laws relating to conduct of human beings toward one another or toward our institutions. It happens just as readily in man's conduct toward animals. The enforcement officer trying faily to enforce law and order in our state should be fully backed by the law whether the offense concerns armed robbery or animal torture. In the case of the anti-cruelty laws

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

Society. We appreciate this opportunity to testify before you on behalf of Mr. Hogan's bill, H.B.7739 which we think is essential if we are to join in preventing the extermination of a number of important world-wide wild-life species, more particularly the spotted cat. Before showing more why we think it's so crucial that we join in doing this gentlemen, I'd like first of all to alert you the fact that the considered H.B.7393, Mr. Connelly's bill although well intentioned unfortunately would be perhaps more harmful than having no bill at all. As you were told a moment ago, not only is it impossible for a state agency to determine at what point a species half way across the world reaches or passes below the level of 1000 individuals. We know this to be impossible for anyone, I've been the East Africa three times, for example, and I quite familiar with many of the problems there. This is why we want to emphasize the contrast between these two bills, and ask you to pass H.B.7739, which has a clear cut approval and approach to protected species. I would suggest to you that it is important for Connecticut and New Jersey to join New York State in passing this type of law, because our three states form the principle market for these things in world traffic. We have been involved in studying this now for some 3 years, we unearthed a great deal of information, and I can provide you for example, with evidence to show you what happens when traffic is controlled. I call attention for example that simply looking at the traffic in leopard skins from India we find that at in October 1968, this is the first chart here, India attempted to prevent the exportation of some of these animals, leopard in particular. You will notice that the column at the right represents Nepal's exports. Nepal began exporting the same materials that India was trying to protect; if you know a little about the geography of South East Asia you will remember that Nepal is a very tiny country that has no wild-life populations of it's own. This means therefore that what was once legal traffic from India, immediately was taken up by Nepal, and became illegal. In 1969 for the first five months there's a little bit of traffic from India, and that was because the U.S. was not helping enforce India's own law. In June 1969 when the U.S. put a stop to the importation of leopards from India in order to help India enforce it's own game laws, you would notice that nothing came from Nepal where we know that none of these animals exist. This is absolute evidence to the effect that these animals were being smuggled out of India, and sent to the market, which is the U.S., via Nepal. There's a sheet labeled Leopard with a whole series of diagrams, and these are all data obtained from the U.S. Department of Commerce that shows once again, even though Kenya in East Africa was attempting to stop the traffic and protect it's animals. It had never the less exported over 2000 skins to the U.S., and we account for this from the fact that these animals are first of all smuggled out of the country, then shipped back in. An import is not subject to game laws and after a month or two in the warehouse it can be exported as something which has earlier been exported. A very interesting illustration is the one of a case of simple smuggling which we've charted for you here. In which in 1968 Ethiopia authorized the exportation of only 6 leopard skins, and yet we know from the U.S. Department of Commerce figures that the U.S. imported over 2300 methods, all of them labeled

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

Rep. Clemente: The answer is that we have passed an endangered species act in Washington, but unfortunately it is not strong enough. It has this requirement that the Secretary of the Interior must decide when a species has become endangered because it's population has gone below a thousand. As a biologist, as one who has been to Africa, it is impossible to decide the leopard or any other species, especially a predatory animal which is secretive, and many of them working at night. It's impossible to establish a population level and therefore what will happen is that these species will be pushed so low that they cannot recover even when we wake up and try to do something about it. It's not a logical rational approach. We objected to this in Washington, but we didn't win our argument. August R. Helberg, Director of the Animal Division of the Connecticut Humane Society. First I'd like to speak on H.B.7629, AN ACT CONCERNING CRUELTY TO ANIMALS. This bill is primarily the legislation that we officers in the field work with. In earlier testimony you heard the length that this bill was enacted. It is true on occasions I may have been frustrated to the point of where these words if unnecessary, and unnecessarily have caused as us a loss in a case. Primarily the concern of cruelty to abandon an animal, it is conceivable as illustrated that an animal could be abandoned, and not be in the process of suffering. In cases like this, these people who are abandoning these animals are relieving themselves of their responsibility to someone else's hands which is not fair to the other individual. Of course this phrase as cruelty has a big part to play there. We would definitely support this bill. The Connecticut Humane Society as a affiliate member of the American Humane Association, and the International Society for Protection of Animals, I'd like to go on record in favor of those bills pertaining to the endangered species. Just as a side note, not only are the pelts important, but we in the humane field find that the live animals that are imported are a big problem here too. Many times our people are in the field rescuing owners from these exotic animals that primarily come under these areas. These animals are not good pets, they aren't considered household pets by many naturalists, and they are a problem in this country. I know this is not in the bill itself, but just as a side note, these animals are in trouble, and we would like to go on record in favor of these bills. Thank you.

Dennis Hopkins: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I am a student at Eastern State College, and represent the College Environmental Action Group. I am here today to express support for H.B.7739 introduced by Rep. Morris Hogan of the 177th District, "AN ACT CONCERNING SALE OF WILD ANIMALS OR ANIMAL PRODUCTS." We believe it is imperative that protection be given those species of organisms that are threatened by extinction by man's destructive and often misguided motives. The thought that the future may be one in which large segments of the world's natural fauna will be extinct is completely abhorrent to those of us who have seen a little of the wonder and beauty of nature, understand its place on the earth, and would like this beauty to continue to be part of the natural scheme. By preventing the sale of goods from the animals listed in the bill, this legislative body will have contri-